

---

**From:** Barnett, Ralph <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 23 July 2021 17:10  
**To:** Margoum, Naoual <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: PROPOSED DEREGISTRATION OF LAND ON WALTON COMMON AND TILBURY FORT COMMON (CL228) COM/3273818 [BURGES-WORK.FID9788227]

Dear Naoual

With regard to the above thank you for forwarding the applicants statement in response to the comments received by ourselves and other consultees. I can confirm that we wish to maintain our position with regard to the access to the replacement land and what we believe is the need to provide secure legal access onto the common from Tilbury, either by extending the area of common being made available in this location or via the creation of a Public Right of Way. The use of the word 'secured' to describe the permissive route as part of the DCO application is potentially misleading as the current proposal provides no security of access. We do however acknowledge the concerns of the landowners with regard to potential illegal and anti social use of the common although we feel control over the use of the land could be maintained by providing suitable structures such as bollards at this access point which would allow for access on foot and potentially on horseback but prevent vehicular access for fly tipping or other illegal use. The need for a bridge to cross the watercourse at this location is also likely to inhibit any vehicular use which could be a precursor to further anti social behaviour. The applicant refers to the reduced distances of travel such an access route in this location will provide (103 metres compared to 1802 metres) although having visited the site we believe that should the permissive access proposed be revoked at any time, the alternative route via the road to access the common from the eastern end is neither a practical or reasonable alternative. This is due to the lack of vegetation control in the road verges (which would result in people having to walk on a narrow and potentially busy road) and the lack of any clear or convenient access from the roadside into Parsonage Common. In effect, should the permissive route be revoked, the exchange land would to all practical intents and purposes as a resource for walkers and other recreational users become inaccessible. Something that would negate any benefit that could be obtained from the additional 1.5 ha of common land that will be made available.

With regard to the proposals for grassland replacement on the exchange land and future management we are grateful for the additional information that been supplied although we would continue to advocate for a more holistic plan which includes measures that also provides for the sites ongoing management for access and recreation.

Your sincerely



Ralph Barnett MSc Dip CM  
Natural England Senior Advisor – Commons and Access  
People Landscape Access & Nature Group