

**From:** Roy Penfold  
**Sent:** 09 May 2018 17:33  
**To:** TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT  
**Subject:** Re: RVR Level Crossing plans for A21

Dear Ms Choudhary,

Many apologies! Postal address is;

regards

Roy Penfold

On Wed, 2018-05-09 at 13:09 +0000, TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT wrote:

> Dear Mr Penfold,

>

> Thank you for your e-mail, In order to formally register your

> objection we require a postal address.

>

> Many thanks

> Shenaz Choudhary

>

> Ms Shenaz Choudhary | Transport Works Act Order, Department for

> Transport

> 1/14 | 020 7944 6848 |

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Roy Penfold

> Sent: 07 May 2018 17:18

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

> Subject: RVR Level Crossing plans for A21

>

> Dear Sir,

>

> I wish to register my complaint against the proposal for extending the

> RVR to Robertsbridge for the following reasons;

>

> 1. Disruption to traffic on the only strategic route from

> London

> to

> Hastings and the effect on local businesses on the South Coast;

> Hastings is a deprived area and poorly connected to the Capital by a

> single carriageway, the A21. This, whilst mainly dualled from London

> to Pembury provides a smooth, free-flowing journey to this point

> suffers greatly from bottlenecks caused where it reverts to Single

> Carriageway.  
> By way of example, it is easier for traffic to get from London to  
> Eastbourne whereby most (if not all) of the route is free-flowing dual  
> carriageway. A level crossing causing tail-backs potentially past a  
> roundabout which is known to struggle with traffic flows even outside  
> of peak travel times would further discommode Hastings. This is even  
> before taking into account the potential for accidents/collisions  
> which are more likely to occur if trains are only running sporadically  
> through the crossing.

>  
> 2. Flooding, the whole area around the Rother Valley is known  
> as  
> a flood plain and extending the track bed this far would increase the  
> risk of either the trackbed or road being washed out during heavy  
> rainfalls.

>  
> 3. This is not a re-instatement, but a new railway link - the  
> track was removed over 50 years ago and the area and highways  
> (including usage) have changed dramatically in the intervening period.  
> Would you describe replacing a building demolished over 50 years ago  
> with portions of the site since re-developed in the intervening period  
> as a re-instatement or new build?

>  
> 4. Little consideration has been given to the environmental  
> impact both to the 'green corridor' that has established over the last  
> 50+ years, nor has much beyond lip-service been paid to the potential  
> for exhaust fumes caused by traffic held up by the crossing, and  
> knock-on effects into the surrounding area.

>  
> 5. There is no commercial benefit to Robertsbridge - a quaint  
> village which will be bi-sected by the development for the sake of  
> hobbyists to play with a train set that will, whilst increasing foot-  
> fall at Robertsbridge station, take it away again immediately.

>  
> For the reasons given above, I feel that the proposal should at least  
> be heard at a full public enquiry and not just pushed through for the  
> sake of nostalgia and reminiscences for a few. I am not opposed to  
> heritage railways, in fact enjoying the 'living history' but they  
> should not be permitted to disadvantage many for the sake of a few.

>  
> With kind regards

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Roy Penfold

>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_

> \_  
> This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud  
> service.

> For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

> \*

- > The information in this email may be confidential or otherwise
- > protected by law. If you received it in error, please let us know by
- > return e-mail and then delete it immediately, without printing or
- > passing it on to anybody else.
- > Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for
- > compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and
- > for other lawful purposes.

---

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

---

