

06/1772

From: Wendy Hopwood [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2018 19:12
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT; huw.merriman.mp@parliament.uk;
amber.rudd.mp@parliament.uk; chairman@salehurst-pc.org.uk
Cc: Tim Hopwood
Subject: Rother valley Railway (Bodiam to Robertsbridge Junction) order

Dear sirs

I am writing to you to object to the above mentioned order for the following reasons:

I live opposite the proposed route of the railway, the field opposite is a flood plain and in the five years since we have lived here the field has been flooded on more than 8 occasions. I believe that the proposals put forward by Rother Valley Railway (RVR) do not address the risk posed by potential floods. If the plan were to go ahead who would be held responsible for the increased risk of flooding to property in Robertsbridge. If planning was approved who would ensure that the flood defences put in place were adequate to ensure the safety of our properties.

RVR have stated that there would be an economic advantage to Robertsbridge however we have very few businesses that would benefit from an influx of visitors unlike Tenterden and no historic sites of interest unlike Bodiam therefore stopping and alighting at Robertsbridge would be of no interest to the majority of users of the railway.

At the present time there is a serious traffic problem in Robertsbridge with narrow streets and inadequate parking there is no proposal from RVR to address this by making additional parking available and in fact there is no area allocated near to Robertsbridge Junction which allows parking for the number of visitors RVR anticipate will arrive.

The A21 is a very busy main route to Hastings. The road at the moment is the national speed limit, 70 mph, and there is the potential for serious accidents as cars either divert through the village or try to jump the barriers to avoid waiting whilst the barriers are closed. The proposed level crossing is close to the roundabout for Salehurst, this would cause major disruption to cars wanting to leave or enter Salehurst as no doubt the roundabout would be blocked each time the level crossing was closed on the A21 and Northbridge Street. The emergency services use the A21 as the main and in fact one of the only routes for getting to and from an emergency in this part of East Sussex. The minor B roads, in the majority of cases, are inadequate for fast travelling ambulances, fire and police vehicles and this would have a detrimental effect on those people who may rely on them in an emergency.

I do not believe that the original intention of Compulsory Purchase Orders was to buy land merely to be used for a tourist attraction.

The area around the proposed route is an area of natural beauty with many species of wild life and the railway line would have a detrimental effect on this.


What precautions would be taken if a fire from the sparks of the trains on the line were to set the fields alight. Is there a proposal to run a road alongside the railway for use in emergencies.

I believe from reading the proposals of RVR that they have exaggerated the benefit the railway will have on our community and that some of the data they have provided, including the number of trains, the amount of times the crossing would be used, the number of passengers who would arrive by train, the number of cars entering the village is both out of date and incorrect.

I also believe that RVR have acted in bad faith and have not addressed any of the concerns put forward by the village. There is no good business plan for building a new railway extension for a mere 3-5 miles and the cost of this would far outweigh any benefits provided to the people of Robertsbridge and Salehurst.

Yours faithfully

Mr and Mrs Hopwood



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