

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES
PROCEDURE) RULES 2004**

**THE NETWORK RAIL
(CAMBRIDGESHIRE LEVEL CROSSING
REDUCTION)
ORDER**

SUMMARY

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

-OF-

ANDREW KENNING

Document Reference	NR/30/3
--------------------	---------

1. My name is Andrew Kenning, I work for Network Rail in a central team called the Level Crossing Development Team (the project team). I have spent 29 years working in the rail industry and for the last 9 years I have worked at Network Rail. Whilst working for Network Rail I have spent a large amount of time working on level crossings, either through projects or directly managing the active level crossing assets.
2. I have been involved with this project from its very beginning, and have been continuously involved in the project to the present day. I was involved in the original meetings & workshops that ultimately lead to the creation of a phased approach to level crossing management, the Strategy. The Strategy was intended to be a means of managing the Anglia Routes level crossing portfolio. The principle was to have a phased approach to reducing the numbers of level crossings. I was tasked with writing the strategy and the project specification that got the project up and running.
3. The phasing was intended to identify where opportunities were and target efficient use of funds to achieve level crossing closures. This was by targeting the low cost simple solutions first and working through to the higher more complex interventions later in the Strategy. The Strategy was split into 5 phases to allow the level crossings to be grouped according to the levels of intervention required. Whilst phases 1 & 2 were run as an inclusive project, later phases were seen as likely to be either targeted sites or embedded into wider projects. This was due to the higher funding required to deliver the interventions and the business case justification for that level of funding. The thought process being that level crossings that had not been allocated to a phase were unlikely to be closed without significant 3rd party external developments happening in the area, due to there being currently no feasible options available to achieve closure.
4. The whole Anglia Route was assessed as a desktop exercise to identify where the alternative crossing points existed. The thought process applied at this point was that if there was a nearby structure, it would be cost effective to utilise this rather than provide any other provision. Where alternative level crossings were to be proposed as a diversionary route, the alternative level crossing was to be either an active level crossing (providing positive indication to the user of approaching trains) or on the best alignment (in terms of the right of way) for the remaining level crossing. The desire lines of footpaths were considered as part of this exercise as this allowed some crossing points to be further away from the current level crossing point and still be on the desire line.
5. The phase 1 & 2 level crossings were selected for inclusion in the project on the basis of there being an alternative structure or level crossing to be diverted to. In some cases, where there were existing parallel routes or where the right of way had been severed, no alternative was proposed and the project looked at extinguishment only. It was not the intention of the Strategy phases 1 & 2 to provide new structures to cross the railway.
6. It was originally suggested that where possible Network Rail land would be used to provide the diversionary route to reduce the impact of the changes on third parties. However it was found that the ecological impact of clearing the Network Rail land was high compared with use of third party land (mainly clear of excessive vegetation). It was also found that the amenity of a 'there-and-back' diversion was low and requests for better alignments were received.

7. Complexity of the railway infrastructure was also considered in the assessment of level crossings. For instance providing technology at level crossings close to stations is known to be complex and expensive due the varying speeds that trains would approach the level crossing. In these instances there was a positive view that nothing should be diverted to the level crossings as ultimately they would be removed from the network if at all possible.
8. Based on this assessment the project was started in early 2015. Not all the alternative structures were found to be suitable and in these instances that particular level crossing was removed from the project and 'bumped' into a later phase for further assessment. The reasons why alternative structures were not suitable ranged from physical features, such as reduced head room, to the extent of alterations required to the structure. In some instances it was demonstrated through consultation that the proposed alternative was not suitable and that there were genuine reasons why the crossing point of the railway needed to remain at (or very close to) its current location. In these cases the level crossing was removed from the project and deferred into a later phase for further assessment.
9. Phases 1 & 2 of the Strategy are being progressed in the Order.
10. Throughout the project there have been open discussions with the highway authorities affected by the project. These discussions have been a two way process of each understanding the needs of the other and the limitations / constraints that both were working too.
11. There have been discussions with Local Access Forums.
12. There has been discussions with MPs and councillors.
13. There have been 2 rounds of informal public consultations where material was made available to both attendees and on Network Rail's web page showing what the proposals were. I attended almost all the events. The events were well attended and generated much discussion, and input into the project.
14. Land owners that are affected by the project were contacted with details of the project and wherever possible we have taken on their suggestions of routing of the new routes through their land. Unfortunately it has not always been possible to take on every suggestion as it is a balancing of needs between the land owners, the users and the highway authorities.
15. I have been involved in the Order documentation and objection responses, providing detail of the projects position on these matters.
16. With regards to the individual level crossings, I refer you to my detailed proof of evidence as follows:

Code	Name	Section
C01	Chittering	5
C02	Nairns (No 117)	6
C03	West River Bridge	7
C04	No Name No 20	8
C07	No Name No 37	9
C08	Ely North Junction	10
C09	Second Drove	11
C10	Coffue Drove	12
C11	Furlong Drove	13
C12	Silt Drove	14
C13	Middle Drove	15
C14	Eastrea Cross Drove	16
C15	Brickyard Drove	17

Code	Name	Section
C16	Prickwillow 1	18
C17	Prickwillow 2	19
C20	Leonards	20
C21	Newmarket Bridge	21
C22	Wells Engine	22
C24	Cross Keys	23
C25	Clayway	24
C26	Poplar Drove	25
C27	Willow Row	26
C28	Black Horse Drove	27
C29	Cassells	28
C30	Westley Road	29
C31	Littleport Station Barrow Crossing	30
C33	Jack O'Tell	31
C34	Fysons	32
C35	Ballast Pit	33