

IN PARLIAMENT SESSION 2022-23 HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL BILL MEMORIAL Complaining of non-compliance with the Standing Orders of both Houses of Parliament TO THE EXAMINERS OF PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND THE EXAMINERS OF PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS THE MEMORIAL of Sir Peter Bottomley MP and local residents

SHEWETH as follows

A Bill (the Bill) has been introduced into the House of Commons entitled

*A Bill to make provision for expenditure by the Secretary of State and the removal of restrictions in respect of certain land for or in connection with the construction of a Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre.* The restrictions to be removed are imposed by the London County Council (Improvements) Act 1900 (the 1900 Act).

"On its ordinary and natural meaning, Section 8(1) of the London County Council (Improvements) Act 1900 imposes an enduring obligation to retain Victoria Tower Gardens for use as a public garden," said Mrs Justice Thornton.

Your Memorialist (I) asks the Examiners to accept the first person style of this memorial and to associate this with the table shewn in the Memorial of Westminster City Council.

Please accept this request that the Holocaust Memorial Bill 2022-23 be classified hybrid because it significantly affects particular private interests differently from the private interests of other persons or bodies of other persons or bodies of the same category or class.

I submit this petition and memorial as a member of parliament and as a local resident who has enjoyed and benefited by the Victoria Tower Gardens (VTG) park for seventy years, living close by for half that time.

Peter Bottomley

For about a year and a half I served on the first HS2 bill select committee, hearing objections from groups accepted as having interests that justified consideration before further stages of consideration in the Houses of Parliament. Previously I had heard representations by interested parties on Private Bills. As a Transport minister, I spoke for the Dartford Thurrock Crossing Bill before it became an Act in 1988.

Bills proposing the undertaking of works of national importance in a local area have usually been hybrid.

Between a hybrid bill's introduction and Second Reading, time is provided for members of the public to comment on the environmental statement published with the Bill.

Classifying the Bill as hybrid would require and allow that to happen.

Others and I with private interests would expect after the anticipated Second Reading to petition against aspects of the Bill to which there are objections.

One illustrative example is the power the unamended Bill gives the Secretary of State or his agency unlimited power to take the entire gardens for an unlimited period or to deny access by local residents to two thirds of the gardens for four years during the expected construction time.

Many residents in Westminster in the area bounded by Vauxhall Bridge Road and Victoria Street have few alternatives to recreation in the small Victoria Tower Gardens.

Because of decisions by successive Secretaries of State, the usual ways they and we can be heard and to put our private and public interests to decision-making bodies are removed if this Bill is not classified as hybrid.

Any body, other than the Secretary of State, whether directly or in the form of the Holocaust Memorial Foundation, would consult on alternative sites. This has not happened. The only consultation on possible sites was in September 2015.

See

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/holocaust-memorial-foundation-takes-forward-prime-ministers-pledge-to-survivors>

and

[https://gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/459046/National\\_Memorial\\_and\\_Learning\\_Centre.pdf](https://gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/459046/National_Memorial_and_Learning_Centre.pdf)

Search for a Central London site.

Page 10 shows the area considered by UKHMF to be sufficiently central to meet the visions set out by the Holocaust Commission: west of Regent's Park; Spitalfields and the Imperial War Museum. VTG was not mentioned; neither was the now-declared requirement of Palace of Westminster proximity.

One criterion was local authority approval.

In 2016 government announced the unexpected decision to insist on using the local park of Victoria Tower Gardens, irrespective of the protection given by the London County Council (Amendments) Act 1900. [My grandfather Richard Robinson III was within a decade leader and chairman of the LCC.]

Using and enjoying the VTG park is a private interest. A resident local to the park has an interest different from other London residents; so does a local worker including staff in the Palace of Westminster and members of the Houses of Parliament.

Any other developer would consult neighbours, users and the known relations of those involved with the gift of parts of the park and of the interesting memorials in VTG.

Other than the invitation to give a preference for one design or another, none of us with affected private interests have had the opportunity or the right to be heard by a decision-making body.

Such a person would expect a consultation on the site. There was no consultation.

Such a person would expect to respond to Westminster City Council when that planning body considers an application. The Secretary of State removed that opportunity.

Such a person now asks the Parliamentary decision-makers to classify this Holocaust Memorial Bill as having elements of hybridity, thus allowing interests adversely affected to be put for consideration by a select committee after the expected Second Reading.

Your Memorialist requests a hearing with witnesses in support of the allegations of hybridity.

Peter Bottomley House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA