

**Shenaz Choudhary**

067/09

**From:** Angela Foster  
**Sent:** 01 May 2018 11:47  
**To:** Shenaz Choudhary  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to TWAO and CPO submitted by Rother Valley Railway Robertsbridge East Sussex

Result!

Mrs Angela Foster | TWA Case Officer, Transport and Works Act Orders Unit, Department for Transport  
1/14-18 | 020 7944 2474 |

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Phil Dreeling  
**Sent:** 01 May 2018 11:43  
**To:** Angela Foster <Angela.Foster@dft.gov.uk>; Colin Dunn <Colin.Dunn@dft.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to TWAO and CPO submitted by Rother Valley Railway Robertsbridge East Sussex

Hi,

Please see the attached TO which has not been logged on chapter as this is TWA enquiry.

Regards,

Phil

Phil Dreeling | Correspondence Manager, PO - Correspondence Team, Department for Transport  
5/11 GMH | 020 7944 4302 |

-----Original Message-----

**From:** TransportSecretary  
**Sent:** 01 May 2018 10:02  
**To:** POCorrespondence <POCorrespondence@dft.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to TWAO and CPO submitted by Rother Valley Railway Robertsbridge East Sussex

Nicolas Turner | Diary Manager and Assistant Private Secretary, Secretary of State for Transport, Department for Transport  
5/13 | 020 7944 4397 | 07966 512575

Please note that all e-mails and their attachments sent by a Private Secretary on behalf of a Minister relating to a decision or comment made by a Minister, or note of a Ministerial meeting, should be filed appropriately by the recipient. DfT Private Office does not keep official records of such e-mails or documents attached to, or forwarded with, them.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** GRAYLING, Chris [mailto:chris.grayling.mp@parliament.uk]  
**Sent:** 01 May 2018 09:57

To: TransportSecretary <TransportSecretary@dft.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Opposition to TWAO and CPO submitted by Rother Valley Railway Robertsbridge East Sussex

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaun

Sent: 30 April 2018 21:39

To: GRAYLING, Chris <chris.grayling.mp@parliament.uk>; RUDD, Amber <amber.rudd.mp@parliament.uk>;

MERRIMAN, Huw <huw.merriman.mp@parliament.uk>; cllr.keith.glazier@eastsussex.gov.uk;

jane.mccullough@rother.gov.uk; chairman@salehurst-pc.org.uk; clerk@salehurst-pc.org.uk

Subject: Opposition to TWAO and CPO submitted by Rother Valley Railway Robertsbridge East Sussex

30/4/18

Ref RR/2014/1608/P

Dear Mr Grayling MP and Associates ,

We are writing to you to express our strong objection to the proposed plan to extend the railway line between Bodiam and Robertsbridge in East Sussex.

We have lived in Robertsbridge and the surrounding area all of our lives and request a full enquiry into this proposal as we do not feel that the facts presented by RVR are accurate .

Our concerns relate to :

#### Compulsary Purchase Order

The approach of CPO for this purpose is in our opinion a non-essential tourist attraction that will destroy both the environment and livelihood of local farmers who are facing CPO's of their land to facilitate a rich mans pass time. We are led to believe that a CPO is only granted for essential infrastructure such as the Robertsbridge bypass. A steam railway line is NOT an essential infrastructure, it is solely a tourist attraction.

#### Environmental impact

The proposed route is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and is home to many native species, some endangered including Bats, great crested newts & Otters.

It is worth noting that the Sussex Wildlife Trust commented on the planning application RR/2014/1608R that they felt strongly that the ecological information submitted was insufficient to enable Rother DC to make an informed decision, and therefore suggest that the planning application is not granted until a full investigation is carried out. We also have concerns that with the burning of fossil fuels i.e. Coal & Diesel this would have an impact on CO2 emissions, especially when the Government is committed to reducing such emissions in order to reduce global warming.

#### Crossing A21

The proposal if approved would require a Level Crossing across the busy A21 which serves the South East of England. According to the Road Safety Foundation, the A21 is one of the most dangerous roads in the U.K. And this particular stretch is cited as the highest risk Road on England's Strategic Road Network. A Level crossing in our view would slow the traffic and cause greater risk, it is worth noting that this goes against the views of our local MP's Huw Merriman and Amber Rudd who have a clear ambition and I quote "to seek further dualling of the A21 to ensure they become safer and can support economic growth and housing needs for the future "

We believe that over £100 million pounds has recently been spent on the Tonbridge/Pembury stretch of the A21 to make such improvements so WHY would you want to put a Level Crossing further down the road to cause delays etc?

#### Parking

We live in which is very close to the mainline station and this road is used for commuter parking Monday to Friday making our driveway difficult to access at times. The weekends are better but if the proposed plan were to go ahead we have no doubt that our road and many surrounding roads would be used as a public car park as people will not pay to park in the station car park. Recent surveys suggest that the majority of visitors to this tourist attraction would travel by car rather than by rail as RVR have suggested. We have not seen a viable parking solution presented by RVR.

#### Closure of footpaths

We have recently seen around the village planning notification's to temporarily close some footpaths around Robertsbridge and Salehurst whilst plans go ahead and then possibly redirect some which have been here for many years. This would be a great inconvenience to dog walkers, ramblers, school children and many local residents.

#### Flooding impact

Having lived here all of our lives we have seen a number of devastating floods which have personally affected friends. For this reason a flood defence was built around the village. Whilst RVR have stated that flood levels will increase if the railway embankment is built the water will have to go somewhere and the flood defences were not built for this increase.

We are not convinced that the Environment Agency have the full facts to conduct a full assessment and would ask that you investigate this matter on our behalf.

Based on the above and as previously mentioned we do NOT support this project, we can't see any benefit to the local community. We feel that the proposal is morally wrong and will only benefit steam train enthusiasts at the expense of local residents and landowners.

An acknowledgment would be gratefully received, thank you

Yours sincerely,

Shaun and Sarah Whale

Sent from my iPad

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

