

From: Tim Watts
Sent: 11 May 2018 10:59
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: (Corrected) Rother Valley Railway extension and eventual joining with the KESR - Public comments

Sorry - I hit send instead of save-draft. Please accept this revised version of my email as final and to supersede my previous email this morning:

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: Rother Valley Railway extension and eventual joining with the KESR - Public comments
Date: Fri, 11 May 2018 10:41:35 +0100
From: Tim Watts
To: transportandworksact@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Dear sir,

I would like to register one objection, two comments and some support for the planned extension of the RVR at Robertsbridge, East Sussex:

1) Objection: I STRONGLY object to the compulsory purchase of any land which the landowner does not willingly wish to sell. CPOs should only be used sparingly and for projects which are absolutely essential.

I would not be at all happy if a 3rd party obtained a CPO to buy a 3 foot wide strip down my garden for say the provision of a new footpath, however convenient it may be. So I use the same logic when speaking up for the landowners faced with having a strip of their land purchased against their will.

2) Car parking: There is much concern over the problems which may be caused by inconsiderate parking by visitors to the new RVR attraction. I believe this problem is solvable IF provision is required of RVR to ensure free parking at or very near the Robertsbridge Junction Station.

An ideal scenario would be if they could do a deal with Southeastern Trains for use of the existing car park at weekends and bank holidays at no charge to the RVR users.

Currently, we have periodic problems with commuters using the mainline station at Robertsbridge, parking inconsiderately, so we have very valid reasons to be concerned about a significant increase in car borne visitors to the village.

3) Flooding: There is a lot of concern as to whether a new embankment across existing flood plains will increase the risk of catastrophic flooding to properties in the village.

Can the flood plans be thoroughly reviewed and *ample* provisions put in place to make sure the new railway has no practical impact on the flood risk faced by homeowners?

4) General support: Notwithstanding nor overriding the above points, I *generally* support the extension of the RVR railway and it's eventual joining up with KESR. I like heritage railways, I believe the extra tourism it brings will be of benefit to hospitality businesses in the village and it's a very exciting

project. BUT the objection (1) above cannot be trumped by any amount of general support I may have for the RVR project. Point (3) is paramount too.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,

Tim Watts

--

Tim Watts

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