

**Angela Foster**

030/106

---

**From:** patricia curtis < >  
**Sent:** 05 September 2018 10:29  
**To:** TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT  
**Subject:** Re: Formal Objection to EWR Notice nos -0168, 0169.  
**Attachments:** EWR Transport Secretary.rtf; EWR Transport Secretary.wps

Dear Sirs,  
We have had trouble with the email address and are re sending our objection letter.  
Yours faithfully  
Mr. Curtis.

---

**From:** patricia curtis < >  
**Sent:** 05 September 2018 09:58  
**To:** transportandworksact@dft.gsi.gov.uk  
**Subject:** Formal Objection to EWR Notice nos -0168, 0169.

Dear Sirs,  
  
Please see the attached letter of objection.  
  
Mr and Mrs R.P.G. Curtis.

---

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

---

Little Horwood,  
Buckinghamshire.

4<sup>th</sup> September 2018

The Secretary Of State for Transport.  
Transport and Works Act Orders Unit,  
Dept for Transport, Zone 1/18  
Great Minster House,  
33 Horseferry Road,  
London  
SW1P 4DR.

Dear Sir,

**TWA Order, both Temporary and Permanent Acquisition of our Land.**

---

**Notice Nos. EWR - 0168 EWR - 0169**

We are writing to formally object to the latest planned implementation of the above scheme. Our land is within 50 metres of the new line. Our property is elevated on the same level as the proposed line which would impact us enormously as would our family and our grandchildren. We are not objecting to the concept of an East West Rail Train service, we object to certain aspects of the current scheme.

The original plan, that was electrified with Bi-Mode clean trains, offered us acoustic barriers and visual screening and was an acceptable scheme. This latest version will, in the long term, be vastly more expensive if the intention is to "build in the ability to electrify the line at a later date" as changing to an electrified line historically costs far more than the original scheme - proven on the GWR Line, now cancelled with only a third of the line completed and twice the budget needed to complete the remaining section.

Since the latest cost cutting scheme was announced for EWR phase 2 we note the acoustic barriers have been withdrawn and visual screening cut back. We are not satisfied with EWR engineers explanation that as the scheme has developed "acoustic barriers are not required". Heavier dirty diesel trains produce more noise therefore require more acoustic barriers, rather than none.

The mature trees we have on the land currently, would act as pollution capture if left in situ. These trees are due to be felled in this current scheme !

The use of dirty diesel trains in your latest scheme will cause 2.4 million new health issues for residents of the proposed 1 million new homes to be built along the line, let alone the 400,000 people already living in close proximity of the line and with the new Winslow Station sited next to a new Senior School, surely this is unacceptable and fool hardy to assume the pupils health will not be at risk. Diesel cars are being excluded from our cities yet diesel trains produce 8 times more pollutants and carry a far higher health warning, resulting in astronomical healthcare cost for the future.

We also object to the permanent land grab at 0694, sheet 26 of 136 and temporary land use on 0693 on the basis that for a similar height embankment to the east of us, along with our immediate neighbours, no extra land is required for 250 metres of embankment at 'Claire Farm'. Why is our land needed?

Surely this current scheme is so flawed with such a high risk to health that it cannot proceed in it's current form.

Yours sincerely

Mr. Robert P.G. Curtis and Mrs. Patricia A. Curtis