

Maria McLauchlan - GT EPE

From: Elizabeth Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2021 23:55
To: Oddy, Yvonne
Subject: ROW/3201659

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mrs Oddy,

I attempted to telephone you this afternoon, having been reminded that "the Village" expects me/us to present in person the objections set out in the submissions sent to you (a) on 6th December 2019 by ourselves as local residents and dog walkers and (b) 8th December 2019 Otford and District Historical Society.

I was hoping to confirm with you our interpretation of the 'statement of case' that it will be acceptable to elaborate, if necessary, on aspects of the initial submissions not available for our original submissions.

The Network Rail Statement was not at that time available to us, and some aspects of this document have arisen.

Section 11 notably lack of appreciation of Otford being an unlit village.

Section 12 the unreasonable alternatives, given the hilly nature of the locality and the narrow single footways.

Section 13 Incident History: c. 1.5 incidents p. a. whilst regrettable, and unsettling to Drivers, the majority of the reported incidents involved "youths". In the same period about the same number of previously stolen vehicles (cars, m/cs and even a wheelchair) had been deliberately set alight in the adjacent

Oxenhill

Woods, a public open space.

If youths are hellbent on trespassing on railway property, they will continue to do so, and not just to have

pennies flattened by a train!

Section 16 Alternative Routes: Otford is an unlit village, but vide 16.4 and 16.6 !

16.9 is inaccurate and the distances travelled make no sense.

Section 18 Totally ignores the not inconsiderable number of Kemsing residents who walk to Otford via Footpath ,49

to use Otford Post Office, etc.

Section 19 Conclusions are challenged, in particular the increase in line speed - with only 2% of trains NOT stopping at

Otford station (80 m distant).

Maidstone The tight bends between Bat and Ball and Sevenoaks Stations (c2350 m) and the junction with the

line render high speeds unrealistic (1,000 m.

More concerning is the speed, which could be achieved north of Otford and the future of the Park Lane/Shoreham Road crossing, also valued by walkers, and residents of north Otford to avoid the inadequate on A225. 19.5 The conclusion "A perfectly safe and commodious alternative pedestrian route for all classes of public use within the local area." is not justified by the foregoing arguments.

Yours sincerely, Cliff Ward.

--
Elizabeth Ward
[REDACTED]