


From: [Dylan Brown](#)
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Transport and Works Act Order
Date: 23 August 2023 11:29:39

Re my previous email - I have amended the email subject wording to the required form. I am specifically objecting to the Peckfield Level Crossing Closure proposals.

Also, here is my postal address, though I prefer correspondence by email.



Regards,
Dylan Brown

On 23 Aug 2023, at 11:16, Dylan Brown  wrote:

Dear sir/madam,

I object to this proposal. Whilst I agree with the need to close the crossing on safety grounds, Network Rail's proposals for an alternative route are completely inadequate.

Let us be clear - they are proposing the closure of a Public Right Of Way (PROW) on safety grounds and the basis of their proposal not to install a replacement bridleway bridge is a survey of use. What they have failed to take account of is that the public use of the crossing has declined as railway line speed has increased precisely because of the safety issue. The PROW has been in place for many decades (probably before the railways came) but increases in train speeds and acceleration rates, along with an increased public awareness of risk, have put many people off using it.

A bridleway bridge should be installed to allow full use. Failing that, a footbridge should be installed.

Micklefield village has had many new houses built in the last two years and this PROW is an important north-south route for pedestrian traffic, which the government are supposed to be encouraging for local journeys.

Due to the new housing, there are many more vehicles on the village roads and this route allows pedestrians to walk safely away from them. I am certain that a safe route across the railway will result in many more people using it, particularly when Peckfield Business Park is fully developed.

Network Rail's proposals for a bridleway through the recreation ground are a nonsense. They have been put forward simply as an exercise in not reducing bridleway meterage. They make no sense logistically; the route starting and ending on the Great North Road and requiring riders to turn right across the GNR twice when travelling north to south. The lack of a bridleway bridge also requires them to make a third right turn across the GNR to access Pit Lane. These are unnecessary risky manoeuvres.

Forcing a bridleway through a Charitable Trust recreation ground, thus reducing the utility of many village residents, for spurious motives is not the way to go.

Thank you,

Dylan Brown

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
