

From: [E GALLEY](#)
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Transport and Works Act Order
Date: 27 August 2023 07:52:54

Re Closure of Micklefield/Peckfield Level Crossing

Dear sir/madam,

I object to this proposal. I do not agree with the need to close the crossing on safety grounds with trains running at their current speed. There have been no significant incidences at the crossing. The suggestion that speed should be increased is detrimental to the environment – increased speed results in increased fuel use and increased carbon dioxide emissions. The government cannot meet its net zero target if departments and companies introduce strategies that actively increase carbon dioxide emissions. I can see no references in the documentation that shows how this increase in emissions is mitigated or has been considered.

Our bedroom faces across the valley to to rail lines and we hear the trains all the time.

Increased speed will result in increased noise which is detrimental to our wellbeing.

Should the crossing be closed then a second flaw in the proposal relates to the survey of use of the crossing. What they have failed to take account of is that the public use of the crossing has declined because the onwards permissive path across the adjacent field to the allotments and on to the south of the village has been temporarily closed whilst house building takes place. Leeds Council Planning Dept. allowed this temporary closure for safety reasons during the construction phase with the understanding that it will be reopened (with a slight change of route) after construction is completed. This is about to happen. Use of the level crossing will soon increase.

Should the level crossing be closed then an alternative crossing at this place should be installed. 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 though 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.

It is also unsafe for horse riders. Running a bridleway within feet of a football pitch is a dangerous proposal. Horses are likely to be spooked by footballs which could lead to the death of horse and rider.

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.

Yours Faithfully
Mr E Galley

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

