

Caroline O'Neill

OBJ/170

From: Jim Collins
Sent: 12 May 2017 18:06
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Cc: Susan Palmer
Subject: RE: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Dear Caroline,

Addresses as requested:-

Jim Collins & Sue Palmer
[REDACTED]

Thomas Munro
[REDACTED]

Kind regards,
Jim Collins

From: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT [<mailto:TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT@dft.gsi.gov.uk>]
Sent: 12 May 2017 11:55
To: Jim Collins
Subject: RE: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your e-mail. Is it possible that you could provide a postal address please so that we can formally register you as an objector to this application.

Kind regards,
Caroline O'Neill

Caroline O'Neill | Miss, Transport and Works Act Orders Unit, Department for Transport
1/14-18, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 4DR | 020 7944 3196 |

From: Jim Collins [<mailto:jim@grenvilleconstruction.co.uk>]
Sent: 12 May 2017 09:12
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT <TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: Susan Palmer <sue@grenvilleconstruction.co.uk>
Subject: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport & Works Act Orders Unit
General Councils Office
Department for Transport
Zone 1/18, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London. SW1P 4DR

12th May 2017

Dear Minister,

Re: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

We are the joint owners of plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13 which are located on the route of the proposed new Right of Way. I object to the proposed closure of the Fullers End crossing and the proposed new Right of Way for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed new public Right of Way is unsafe because it is remote and users cannot be seen from adjacent properties on parts of the route. In the opinion of Uttlesford District Council the new route is "unsustainable". People in general will not use the new route, they will alternatively drive to the local shops and services. Please refer to UDC Planning Application reference UTT/14/0480/FUL for the adjacent Sawmill site.
2. The current foot level crossing at Fullers End is used approximately 75 times per day and with no accidents whatsoever in the last 20 years. It was regarded as "safe" by the Planning Inspector when granting Planning Permission for the adjacent Sawmill site at Fullers End. Please refer to Planning Inspectors Ref APP/C1570/A/14/2213855.
3. The Hamlet of Fullers End currently has 26 dwellings and Planning Consent for a further six new dwellings has been granted bringing the total number of dwellings in Fullers End to 32. All of these properties would currently be regarded as sustainable because there is an easy, well used access to shops and services at Fullers End pedestrian crossing. The closure of the level crossing will result in a convoluted alternative access route via an unsafe underpass. As already stated the new access route was regarded as unsafe by Uttlesford District Council when refusing Planning Consent for five dwellings at the Sawmill site. If this opinion is correct, which I believe it is, the effect of closing the level crossing at Fullers End will be to change the 32 dwellings in Fullers End from sustainable to unsustainable.
4. Uttlesford District Council have granted Planning Consent for at least two significant developments in close vicinity to the Fullers End crossing. In the case of the Hall Road development (UDC Ref UTT/13/0177/OP) Network Rail was not even consulted before Uttlesford District Council granted Planning Consent. In my opinion, Uttlesford District Council lost several opportunities to finance a safe alternative route by not demanding Planning Gain Contributions from the developers. A suggestion for an alternative would be a new underpass directly below the current level crossing. This would have the benefit of being usable by both able bodied and mobility impaired. Uttlesford District Council lost the opportunity to collect contributions from developers and now the local landowners are expected to pay the price at considerable inconvenience and loss of amenity.
5. From a personal point of view, the proposed location of the alternative Right of Way is not suitable as it is in the middle of a new road access to the residential development within the Sawmill site. If the Minister is minded to grant the order for the new Public Right of Way, the owners of the land to the south of the railway line would want the new Public Right of Way to be as far north as possible and immediately adjacent to and parallel to the south side of the Network Rail land and railway lines.
From the point of view of a future resident of the Sawmill site at Fullers End, Plot 09 on sheet 11 EO5-Fullers End Level Crossing Order drawing will be part of our front garden. We currently own a private garden with no public access whatsoever. Potentially, if the current residents of Fullers End and the future residents of the Hall Road development use the alternative route, we will be faced with 300-400 people movements per day across our front garden. This is an unacceptable invasion of our privacy.

I urge the Minister to listen to local residents, including myself, and dismiss the level crossing reduction order for EO5 Fullers End, Elsenham.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Collins
Thomas Munro
Susan Palmer

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>

Caroline O'Neill

From: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Sent: 12 May 2017 11:55
To: 'Jim Collins'
Subject: RE: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Categories: Egress Switch: Unencrypted

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your e-mail. Is it possible that you could provide a postal address please so that we can formally register you as an objector to this application.

Kind regards
Caroline O'Neill

Caroline O'Neill | Miss, Transport and Works Act Orders Unit, Department for Transport
1/14-18, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 4DR | 020 7944 3196 |

From: Jim Collins
Sent: 12 May 2017 09:12
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT <TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: Susan Palmer
Subject: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport & Works Act Orders Unit
General Councils Office
Department for Transport
Zone 1/18, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London. SW1P 4DR

12th May 2017

Dear Minister,

Re: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

We are the joint owners of plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13 which are located on the route of the proposed new Right of Way. I object to the proposed closure of the Fullers End crossing and the proposed new Right of Way for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed new public Right of Way is unsafe because it is remote and users cannot be seen from adjacent properties on parts of the route. In the opinion of Uttlesford District Council the new route is "unsustainable". People in general will not use the new route, they will alternatively drive to the local shops and services. Please refer to UDC Planning Application reference UTT/14/0480/FUL for the adjacent Sawmill site.
2. The current foot level crossing at Fullers End is used approximately 75 times per day and with no accidents whatsoever in the last 20 years. It was regarded as "safe" by the Planning Inspector when granting Planning

Permission for the adjacent Sawmill site at Fullers End. Please refer to Planning Inspectors Ref APP/C1570/A/14/2213855.

3. The Hamlet of Fullers End currently has 26 dwellings and Planning Consent for a further six new dwellings has been granted bringing the total number of dwellings in Fullers End to 32. All of these properties would currently be regarded as sustainable because there is an easy, well used access to shops and services at Fullers End pedestrian crossing. The closure of the level crossing will result in a convoluted alternative access route via an unsafe underpass. As already stated the new access route was regarded as unsafe by Uttlesford District Council when refusing Planning Consent for five dwellings at the Sawmill site. If this opinion is correct, which I believe it is, the effect of closing the level crossing at Fullers End will be to change the 32 dwellings in Fullers End from sustainable to unsustainable.
4. Uttlesford District Council have granted Planning Consent for at least two significant developments in close vicinity to the Fullers End crossing. In the case of the Hall Road development (UDC Ref UTT/13/0177/OP) Network Rail was not even consulted before Uttlesford District Council granted Planning Consent. In my opinion, Uttlesford District Council lost several opportunities to finance a safe alternative route by not demanding Planning Gain Contributions from the developers. A suggestion for an alternative would be a new underpass directly below the current level crossing. This would have the benefit of being usable by both able bodied and mobility impaired. Uttlesford District Council lost the opportunity to collect contributions from developers and now the local landowners are expected to pay the price at considerable inconvenience and loss of amenity.
5. From a personal point of view, the proposed location of the alternative Right of Way is not suitable as it is in the middle of a new road access to the residential development within the Sawmill site. If the Minister is minded to grant the order for the new Public Right of Way, the owners of the land to the south of the railway line would want the new Public Right of Way to be as far north as possible and immediately adjacent to and parallel to the south side of the Network Rail land and railway lines.
From the point of view of a future resident of the Sawmill site at Fullers End, Plot 09 on sheet 11 EO5-Fullers End Level Crossing Order drawing will be part of our front garden. We currently own a private garden with no public access whatsoever. Potentially, if the current residents of Fullers End and the future residents of the Hall Road development use the alternative route, we will be faced with 300-400 people movements per day across our front garden. This is an unacceptable invasion of our privacy.

I urge the Minister to listen to local residents, including myself, and dismiss the level crossing reduction order for EO5 Fullers End, Elsenham.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Collins
Thomas Munro
Susan Palmer

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

From: Jim Collins
Sent: 12 May 2017 09:12
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Cc: Susan Palmer
Subject: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport & Works Act Orders Unit
General Councils Office
Department for Transport
Zone 1/18, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London. SW1P 4DR

12th May 2017

Dear Minister,

Re: Proposed Network Rail (Essex & Others Level Reduction) Order EO5 Fullers End – Plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13

We are the joint owners of plots 04, 08, 09, 10 and 13 which are located on the route of the proposed new Right of Way. I object to the proposed closure of the Fullers End crossing and the proposed new Right of Way for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed new public Right of Way is unsafe because it is remote and users cannot be seen from adjacent properties on parts of the route. In the opinion of Uttlesford District Council the new route is "unsustainable". People in general will not use the new route, they will alternatively drive to the local shops and services. Please refer to UDC Planning Application reference UTT/14/0480/FUL for the adjacent Sawmill site.
2. The current foot level crossing at Fullers End is used approximately 75 times per day and with no accidents whatsoever in the last 20 years. It was regarded as "safe" by the Planning Inspector when granting Planning Permission for the adjacent Sawmill site at Fullers End. Please refer to Planning Inspectors Ref APP/C1570/A/14/2213855.
3. The Hamlet of Fullers End currently has 26 dwellings and Planning Consent for a further six new dwellings has been granted bringing the total number of dwellings in Fullers End to 32. All of these properties would currently be regarded as sustainable because there is an easy, well used access to shops and services at Fullers End pedestrian crossing. The closure of the level crossing will result in a convoluted alternative access route via an unsafe underpass. As already stated the new access route was regarded as unsafe by Uttlesford District Council when refusing Planning Consent for five dwellings at the Sawmill site. If this opinion is correct, which I believe it is, the effect of closing the level crossing at Fullers End will be to change the 32 dwellings in Fullers End from sustainable to unsustainable.
4. Uttlesford District Council have granted Planning Consent for at least two significant developments in close vicinity to the Fullers End crossing. In the case of the Hall Road development (UDC Ref UTT/13/0177/OP) Network Rail was not even consulted before Uttlesford District Council granted Planning Consent. In my opinion, Uttlesford District Council lost several opportunities to finance a safe alternative route by not demanding Planning Gain Contributions from the developers. A suggestion for an alternative would be a new underpass directly below the current level crossing. This would have the benefit of being usable by both able bodied and mobility impaired. Uttlesford District Council lost the opportunity to collect

contributions from developers and now the local landowners are expected to pay the price at considerable inconvenience and loss of amenity.

5. From a personal point of view, the proposed location of the alternative Right of Way is not suitable as it is in the middle of a new road access to the residential development within the Sawmill site. If the Minister is minded to grant the order for the new Public Right of Way, the owners of the land to the south of the railway line would want the new Public Right of Way to be as far north as possible and immediately adjacent to and parallel to the south side of the Network Rail land and railway lines.

From the point of view of a future resident of the Sawmill site at Fullers End, Plot 09 on sheet 11 EO5-Fullers End Level Crossing Order drawing will be part of our front garden. We currently own a private garden with no public access whatsoever. Potentially, if the current residents of Fullers End and the future residents of the Hall Road development use the alternative route, we will be faced with 300-400 people movements per day across our front garden. This is an unacceptable invasion of our privacy.

I urge the Minister to listen to local residents, including myself, and dismiss the level crossing reduction order for EO5 Fullers End, Elsenham.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Collins
Thomas Munro
Susan Palmer

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