

Cinnamond House,
Cassiobridge,
Watford, Herts
WD3 3RT

Tel : (01923) 235225

Fax : (01923) 229220

Web : www.cinnamond.co.uk

E-Mail : trevor@cinnamond.co.uk

Reg. No. 2340916 – England & Wales

Our Ref: THC/CC/CRL/tc/003

Yvonne Parker
Programme Officer
2 Priory Court
Burnley
Lancashire
BB1 3RH

8th October 2012

Dear Sir or Madam

**The Transport and Works Act 1992 – Proposed Croxley Rail Link Order
Cinnamond Limited – Cinnamond Plant Limited – Cinnamond Contracts Limited –
Cinnamond Reclamation Limited - Notices No. 11, 188
Kevin Patrick Cinnamond – Notices No. 96, 207**

Further to our letter dated 28th September 2012 and our subsequent meeting with the Croxley Rail Link Team on 5th October 2012, we wish to add to our previous objections with regard to the Croxley Rail Link.

On the 5th October 2012 we met with Tom Duckmanton (HCC), Keith Bailey (LUL), Martin Morris (SKM) and Rob Snell (LSH). The purpose of this meeting was to go through the points raised in our letter to the Public Enquiry dated 28th September 2012, in an attempt to resolve the issues we have before the Public Enquiry.

The meeting started with Mr. Morris giving a brief history on the different alignments proposed and why the Southern Alignment was now considered more favourably than the Northern Alignment, which was rejected based on operational/environmental issues. This was totally agreed and understood as we had realised at the time of the proposal that the Northern Alignment had major environmental issues with regard to the wheel squeal from the trains due to the curvature of the track.

We then discussed the proposed new entrance, which the CRL are looking to move further round the A412 roundabout, closer to the Baldwins Lane junction. Mr Morris explained that to minimise CRL costs they preferred the piers to be equidistant. He explained that if the piers were not equidistant the underside of the viaduct had to be strengthened and made deeper between certain piers, making the clearance over the A412 insufficient for highway specifications.

We discussed other options including our proposal to relocate our entrance away from the roundabout and site it off the Dual Carriageway where the existing Bus Stop currently is. This Bus Stop could be moved to another location on the Watford Road.



Our proposed new entrance was rejected by Mr. Duckmanton as he stated that HCC no longer approve new entrances on "A" Roads. If this is true, then the CRL proposed new entrance closer to Baldwins Lane should not be approved either as it is also on the A412.

After the meeting we gave Mr. Morris' comments some serious thought and after looking at the drawings of the piers we are of the opinion that the proposed pier to be located in our existing entrance can be moved 10 metres closer to the A412. There is sufficient room with the grass verges either side of the footpath to achieve this. This would allow us to keep our existing entrance. Any necessary adjustments to the piers and undersides of the viaduct could be made where it crosses our ground without affecting the clearance necessary for the A412 or our access. We do not see a problem with this, other than one based purely on the CRL's financial grounds. In our opinion, this is not a good enough reason to allow the CRL to gain powers to construct the Link in its present form.

We have severe concerns about the CRL's proposal of relocating our entrance closer to Baldwins Lane and suggest that accidents will happen, even after the latest redesign of the whole roundabout. For your information, the redesign was only considered after we raised some initial concerns to the CRL when we found out about the proposed relocated entrance. If the entrance was moved closer to Baldwins Lane we would put it into a position where we could see our staff, visitors to our offices and members of the public (including drivers entering the roundabout from Baldwins Lane and pedestrians walking past our entrance), having their lives and limbs put at unnecessary risk. At the meeting we asked, should the new entrance be relocated, as the CRL propose, would they accept responsibility for any accidents that take place? We also noted that not one accident had taken place, as a result of access to or egress from our property since we have owned it (from 1985). The answer from Mr. Duckmanton was "No", and that a safety audit has taken place (which we do not have the results of), and one accident (or death) would not make any difference and that it would take numerous incidents (or deaths) to take place before any action would be taken to redesign the roundabout/entrance once again. This is totally unacceptable and sounds like "Collateral Damage". In our view, one accident (or death) would be one too many. Mr. Duckmanton has promised, on behalf of the CRL, to re-look at the entrance issue.

We therefore request that the Public Enquiry Inspector, Mr Pykett, instruct the CRL Team to redesign the piers to ensure that our entrance stays where it is, and makes a note of this in his formal report.

The next concern we then discussed was the heavy handed approach that LUL are taking on the CPO of our land. We proposed that we retain ownership of our own land and offered LUL all necessary rights of access over our land. The response of Mr. Bailey was that it was LUL policy to own all the land under their property including in this case, the viaduct. Our response was that we no longer enter into leases, as a direct result of the bad experience we suffered at Metropolitan Station Approach, where we used to have our Plant and Haulage Depot in the late 70's to the 90's on a lease with LUL.

Mr Bailey expressed surprise that we had been offered a 125 year lease and that he expected 99 years to be offered. We responded that we expected to have a 999 year lease. It should be noted that Mr Bailey then stated that this would not be impossible as he already knew of properties within the M25 that had 2000 and or similar year leases.

If LUL are willing to grant a lease, (subject to our agreement as to the terms and conditions) for 999 years we would for our part, consider an agreement which would normally be against our corporate policy.



It should also be noted that LUL have agreed to a Deed of Grant concerning the access/entrance to our land under the proposed viaduct, which would be in perpetuity. This would be acceptable to us as long as the entrance is not moved nearer to Baldwins Lane, which is the position we have already stated above and to the CRL Team on many occasions.

We would also request that the Inspector makes a specific record of this in his formal report.

Our next discussion concerned whether the CRL had received a reply from Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) regarding the use of our land to the east of our offices. A request had been made by us that we needed to use this land to store materials, equipment and plant etc. normally stored in that part of our yard which will be unavailable to us during the construction phase. Mr Duckmanton had said that TRDC were in theory agreeable but they would need to make a planning application once the CRL had secured powers for the project. We are agreeable to this as long as it suits our requirements with regard to the construction of the hard standing, drainage, security, etc. and any other permission's that we currently have and may acquire before the construction phase. We have previously told the CRL that we cannot have our storage yard/depot in a different location due to logistical and operational constraints.

We then discussed our concerns with regard to the noise levels, vibration and damage to our property during the construction phase. These fears have now been allayed by CRL Team, as they have assured us that the successful contractor will enter into agreement with the CRL, HCC and TRDC with regard to these issues.

Also the CRL have assured us that once that the scheme has been completed, the noise from the trains, but sadly not the visual impact of the viaduct, will not be worse than we currently experience with the noise from the trains going to and from Watford Metropolitan Station. This was a concern as during working hours, many of our employees, including myself, have windows open during the day and additional noise would be detrimental to the everyday running of our business.

We realise that this is a late addition to the objections we have to the CRL project but they arise as a direct result of the meeting we had with the CRL Team on Friday 5th October 2012 in an attempt to alleviate some of our previously recorded concerns.

In conclusion please accept this additional letter as formal notice, of our objection to the CPO.

At this time we wish to reserve our position on having our objections considered at the inquiry and to make representations should it be necessary.

We also would like to thank the CRL team that we met on Friday, and assure them that we are grateful for their time and the attempt to alleviate some of our concerns.

We would be grateful if you would confirm safe receipt of this letter and direct future correspondence in connection with the CRL to the undersigned on behalf of Cinnamond Ltd, Cinnamond Plant Limited, Cinnamond Contracts Limited and Cinnamond Reclamation Limited and others and Mr K P Cinnamond.

Yours faithfully,

For and on behalf of

CINNAMOND CONTRACTS LIMITED & others

**TREVOR CINNAMOND
DIRECTOR**