

Tab. 5 Local Highway Authority Meeting Minutes

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions											
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	CCC POSITION	CCC Actions	MM AMENDMENTS /COMMENTS	PREVIOUS ACTIONS	WORKSHOP 26-07-2016 & 02-08-16 post round 1 public consultation feedback (unless otherwise stated comments refer to Stage 1 consultation plans)	CURRENT ACTIONS post 26/7 & 2/8 workshop	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	COUNCILLOR WORKSHOP 09.08.2016
								NR - Dylan Corrigan, Andrew Kenning, Lisa Goodman Mott MacDonald - Jason Smith, Dan Weir, Nathan Huntley CCC - Camilla Rhodes & Bríd Cooney James Rigney - CCC Highways Manager Karen Champion - CCC PROW Lawrence Smith - CCC PROW (legal) Peter Gaskin - South Cambs PROW officer Gareth Martin - Fenland DC (planning) Sally Bonnett - East Cambs (asset management)			
								<p>General scheme questions</p> <p>CCC asked what the overall scheme objectives were and how they relate to the justification for the individual crossing proposals and needs case? MM directed CCC to the public consultation summary sheets as they list out the scheme objectives, adding that NR is developing a detailed Needs Case to justify the scheme.</p> <p>CCC asked what line speeds /capacity improvements will be generated by the project. MM replied that the Anglia Level Crossings Reduction Strategy does not include proposals for speed or capacity improvements, but that it will help enable other schemes which have these features and they will be subject to separate scrutiny.</p> <p>CCC noted that safety is not at issue at the majority of rural LXs. MM replied that safety was important and should always be considered.</p> <p>CCC asked what improvements / mitigation measures (eg mini lights, new gates, vegetation clearance) are going to be introduced at remaining crossings, particularly those where additional users are being diverted to? MM replied that the ALCRM safety score at crossings where users are to be diverted to would be at least as good if not better than the level crossing which they were diverted from. MM and NR are working to review facilities at crossings to which users are diverted and this will be better defined once we get to the single option stage in the Autumn.</p> <p>CCC considered there to be a poor response from NR on maintenance issues at existing LXs.</p> <p>CCC noted that the Census surveys are flawed as many existing LXs are poorly maintained and not up to legal requirements. See also letter from CCC re Census surveys - when will a response be received? MM advised that a response letter on the census methodology (in response to the CCC letter) would be issued w/c 8/8. NR asked that if CCC had any issues with LX maintenance this should be reported to level crossing managers in the usual way as this was a day to day operational matter.</p> <p>CCC asked for the weather conditions at the time of the user surveys to be reported.</p>	NR to provide details of LX crossing managers. MM to provide weather conditions at the time of the surveys.		
								<p>CCC need more advance notice of consultation and options to help with the process. Cllrs should be briefed. They suggested getting on the radio. NR advised that round 1 public consultation was on the radio and that they would welcome CCC using their social media outlets to help advertise the next round of events. MM noted that round 2 public consultation was pencilled in for 5th to 9th Sept 16.</p> <p>CCC asked for a breakdown of round 1 public consultation and the census surveys to be issued to them.</p> <p>CCC advised that Notices and signage at LXs need careful placement and level crossings should not appear closed or as if they may be closed in the immediate future. CCC noted that some existing LXs are closed or in poor state - undermining of trust - issues of existing signs and maintenance and obstruction. MM agreed to reconsider the wording of the public consultation event flyer and NR noted that many of the signs are required for legal and safety reasons and are not associated with this project.</p> <p>CCC asked that all rights of way should have a width of at least 3m to comply with their standards and allow maintenance access for a full size tractor.</p>	DC to provide details of Stage 2 ASAP and liaise with CCC to promote MM to provide round 1 consultation summary report		
C01	Chittering	Waterbeach FP18	Diversion north some 430m to Jack O'Tell level crossing	No objection at this stage on the proviso that a footpath link is provided between Chittering level crossing and Jack O'Tell level crossing to enhance the PROW network in the area in lieu of the level crossing at Chittering. Subject to public consultation.		Consider suggested footpath link between level crossings on the west side of the railway.		NO OBJECTIONS to the Blue route - would not support red route	MM to consider footpath link	4 responses. 3 objected. 2m footpath proposed. KC requested 3m for equipment. Could move crossing upon down but dependent upon private user result. CCC support blue route because of need to retain circular route for use by residents of future development in area. Do not support red route. SCDC's comments re new town development and policy on walking and cycling supporting importance of access to countryside noted.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C02	Nairns No. 117	Private Crossing	Extinguishment of the private rights at the level crossing	N/A				No comments due to private nature		This is one of 3 private crossings to be closed. The alternative would be Bannold Road. LO currently does not support but working together. Balance of public cost for compensation.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C03	West River Bridge	Little Thetford FP7	Diversion immediately north to the viaduct arch underneath the railway	No objection at this stage				CCC sought clarification sought on potential for flooding and need to consider surfacing material under the bridge. Subject to the above there are NO OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL	MM to investigate flooding frequency as part of the EIA & consider surfacing	PC strongly agree. No comments from EA. LO happy provided doesn't affect access road. CCC support solution subject to surface improvement (e.g. stone). Part of Fen Rivers Way long distance promoted route.	Cllr Hunt is chair of L Thetford. Has visited site. Agrees in principle with officer comments but would like to know in writing from NR what is being proposed in terms of infrastructure for each proposal, by parish. NR to follow up.
C04	No Name No 20	Meldreth FP10	Diversion north some 315m to the junction with Station Road via the existing (private) concrete road. Level crossing users would make use of the existing footways on Station Road to link up with Footpath Meldreth FP10.	CCC objected to the use of the footway on Station Road due to its narrow width which would not allow users to pass side-by-side without stepping into the carriageway particularly for wheelchair users.			Consider the Bury Lane byway connection and the farm shop. Bridge width needs to be considered & RSA carried out. Census to be undertaken at level crossing to ascertain usage and further footway usage survey to be undertaken on Station Road to determine current usage. CCC recommended liaising with Cambridgeshire Alliance who cover mobility issues regarding the proposal.	Near to a station so slow trains and CCC do not consider it to be dangerous. All previous CCC concerns remain re quality of route and safety on route. Long diversion Issue RSA to CCC. CCC to undertake their own RSA of the scheme. CCC want to see DIA when undertaken - scoping only at this stage CCC consider there to be a loss to the network and severing of links. Need to retain access to countryside for amenity and health reasons - CCC do not consider the diversion route is not attractive and will not encourage use. NR advised that the safety record of their crossings is available at http://www.networkrail.co.uk/transparency/level-crossings/ CLOSURE NOT SUPPORTED.	DW to provide spec and RSA to CCC DIA and EIA to be provided when ready - late 2016/ early 2017 MT to provide updated traffic counts - issued prior to the meeting but update required	13 responses. 8% disagree, 77% disagree alternative route floods; lengthy diversion; alternative route is concrete track shared with vehicles, unattractive. LO Mr Bowton objects on safety concerns of sharing route, particularly at the road). Clear desire line on existing route. MM's road safety team reviewed and determined that there was no safety concerns. Local economy of farm shop important. There is also a Diversity Impact Assessment. CCC requested copy of both. Public responses reflect CCC's opinions. Unsuitable for disabled users. Growth area so increased usage likely. CCC currently object. NR pointed out there has been deliberate misuse; CCC were unaware of this. Can anything be done to make crossing safer?	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C06	Barrington Road	Highway (Barrington Road) - Bridleway crossing	Diversion to Foxton level crossing via a new footway on Barrington Road and via the existing footway on the A10 Cambridge Road	Current gate obstructs use by equestrians, and CCC has had reports of gate being locked preventing use. CCC requested that the proposed diversion route be done at Bridleway status so it is equivalent to the existing route. Current cycle scheme proposals would make use of Barrington Road level crossing, NR not consulted upon proposals as a statutory requirement.	CCC to send through section detailing Bridleway provision on the highway CH to put NR in contact with Mike Davies, CCC Cycling Team.		A stage 1 RSA was undertaken and no road safety problems were identified. Census to be undertaken to determine usage at Barrington and Foxton level crossings.	CCC objects to proposals due to conflicts with cycle route, lengthy diversion, and requirement to cross the main road twice. Martin Dawson at NR has approved cycle route plans. Conflicts with CCC Strategic Plan CLOSURE NOT SUPPORTED.	NR to provide cycle scheme details to MM	98% object; dangerous to cross A10 twice, maintaining gate inexpensive relatively speaking; off road route safer; add traffic light to A10 to assist crossing. PC objected on similar grounds but also route is Barr-Fox cyclepath and Cam-Royston cyclepath; Cllr Kindersley objected on above cycle route grounds and proposed housing development in Barrington quarry for which Barr cycle path being created. Census data not yet received. CCC object on similar grounds relating to cyclepath but also bridleway access.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C07	No Name No. 37	Harston FP4	Diversion along a field boundary and access the B1368 London Road via the existing gated vehicular access	No objection in principle on the proviso that Public Footpath Harston 4 is upgraded to a Bridleway to enhance the PROW network in the area to mitigate the extinguishment of the level crossing. Concerned about additional maintenance liability if 'diverted' to road verge. Design standards would have to be met.		Consider upgrading the public footpath to a bridleway.		CCC would like equestrian routes and new / upgraded bridleways MM to consider new footpath route behind field hedge or new tarmac footway All agreed to consider routing the new footpath/ bridleway route behind hedge or along field margins to link with the BOAT. CCC to pull together evidence/ policy for their future bridleway aspiration and also consider on highway equestrian use in this area. CCC suggested that there could be some Section106 money available to improve this path NO OBJECTION subject to the road section between the new footpath and BOAT running within the adjacent field	CCC to provide further details on bridleway CCC to investigate whether any Section 106 money was available. MM to consider suggested changes	Didn't take forward BR upgrade because would take additional land. PG pointed out that it is an already wide track. CCC explained it is part of ambitions for improvements to network for Southern Fringe development wfor which there is s106 funding. DW to send RSA to CCC. CCC concerned about grips in verges which would need to be culverted and that verges are only cut twice a year. If verges are obstructed people walk in the road, which is less safe in this location. Need to talk to parish and find out where people's destinations are. 61% disagree because of road/verge. Some comments about better access to byway and access to village store. Byway popular dog walk. CCC suggest FP or ideally BR link on field-side of hedge north of road (or south side) linking directly to byway (Donkey Lane) = mitigation. Preferable to road option. MM to investigate. PG offered to consult the PCs. See PC responses 04.08.16 Harston and Hauxton both support this proposal; fieldside link to byway long been needed due to hazardous nature of speeding traffic along road. Business case provided to NR 08/08/16	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions											
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	CCC POSITION	CCC Actions	MM AMENDMENTS /COMMENTS	PREVIOUS ACTIONS	WORKSHOP 26-07-2016 & 02-08-16 post round 1 public consultation feedback (unless otherwise stated comments refer to Stage 1 consultation plans)	CURRENT ACTIONS post 26/7 & 2/8 workshop	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	COUNCILLOR WORKSHOP 09.08.2016
C08	Ely North Junction	Ely FP11	Diversion through the same field with a link to the B1382 Ely Road via a footway through a commercial estate.	CCC to hold an internal meeting regarding this proposal and adjacent proposals to the north and to provide feedback to NR. (See also C09 Second Drove, C23 Adelaide, C24 Cross Keys)			Footway improvements at the junction of the B1382 Ely Road and the private access to the commercial road. Meeting to be held local ward members once the proposals are more firmed up at the next design stage.	Ely railway junction - NR concerns re number of new vehicles using crossings from the proposed development - proposals for full barriers which will lead to increased delays - on 3 lines and potential for significant congestion. What is provision on road and at the road crossings associated with other development schemes Lots of development and growth - will significantly increase use of PROW CCC noted potential flooding issue and views to railway CCC considered that there would be a reduction in attractiveness of route Holding objection as CCC would like to better understand the wider context with ELY North proposals We note that this is a separate scheme and not part of the Anglia Level Crossing reduction strategy.	CCC to revert to MM with potential highway improvements associated with new housing development.	5 comments, 2 agree, 3 object; more unpleasant as part of FRW. Factory concerned 50 vehicle movements a day; want fenced off for safety. Further discussion. MM to feed back to CCC before decision made. Need to understand impact on Q Adelaide Road and improvements from Ely North. Holding objection from CCC pending getting further information about QA Road (CCC) and additional censuses on paths C09 and reopening of BR25 which were closed during census (MM). 09.08.16 No improvement to be made to Q Adelaide Rd except for new roundabout at junction with Prickwillow Rd - already in place. Traffic will increase along road. There is no pavement at entrance to factory - would need putting in. Otherwise there is a continuous pavement, albeit it crosses a number of accesses. CCC maintain holding objection pending second public consultation. Still concerned that alternative route not as pleasant as roadside whereas original is rural.	Cllr Bailey expressed significant concern at losing existing route as there are not many footpaths around Ely. This path is the only one leading north out from central Ely - a 'gateway' in to the ROW network. It is the one place that people can keep away from the built up area, and so she felt it was preferable to retain it. It also more direct than the alternative. It was felt that there would be more hazards for users being next to the B road and mixing with factory vehicles. This path was also looked at in conjunction with FP49 (C09, C23) and FP50 (C24) - see below.
C09	Second Drove	Ely FP49	Extinguishment of footpath Ely FP49 with the intention that level crossing users are diverted along the existing PROW network in the area	CCC to hold an internal meeting regarding this proposal and adjacent proposals to the north and to provide feedback to NR. (See also C09 Second Drove, C23 Adelaide, C24 Cross Keys)			Meeting to be held local ward members once the proposals are more firmed up at the next design stage.	Read comments on C23 & C24		8 responses Short attractive PROW would be lost; adds 3km. Bank home to cows which make route dangerous; C23 and 24 should be considered together. LO Did not like circular route because sister lives at cottage; would want compensation. Need to understand lengths of alternative routes. First proposed circular route could be a candidate for a claimed route. CCC to check records. If so then may be prudent to negotiate with LO over establishing rights. Ely North development will bring 1000s of new residents who need access to ROW network. Access to river is important and short circular routes. See ROWIP, Cambs Health & Wellbeing Strategy and ECDC planning comments 05/08/16. CCC would support closure of C09 if mitigating circular route put in place south to FP50 Second Drove and up west side of railway, subject to public consultation. CCC do not currently support closure of C23 or C24. MM to explore and revert to CCC.	Councillors present expressed extreme concern over proposals C09, C23 and C24. Cllr Hunt pointed out that the new Cambridge University boathouse is being constructed on the E side of the river opposite C23. People will want to watch the crews training, and there will be regattas, so the river paths will be popular and existing access options should be retained. They also had concerns about provision for residents of the new Ely North development - the proximity of the existing ROW network was part of the argument for the site in the planning process. Residents will be expecting this access and if crossings/paths are removed they will have been misled. Cllr Ambrose Smith uses route as dog walk 13 miles round from Littleport 6 times a year. the nearby BR crossing at Clayway is felt to be dangerous because it is on a bend. CR explained that officers have asked NR to review remaining crossings to put in place measures to make them safer where it is proposed to divert people to them as the alternative route. CR reiterated this request to NR. Cllr Bailey asked if plans for Ely North junction railway had been taken into account. AK said yes but only in terms of strategy when rationalisation has happened. It will be Phase 3 2021. Councillors pointed out that this makes it very difficult to make decisions now that commit communities forever, not knowing is Phase 3 would ever come forward and no details being available. It was agreed that the County Council and District Council would be willing to see C09 (FP49) crossing closed provided a replacement link was created from BR 25 crossing, but they could not accept closure of C23 Adelaide (FP49) or C24 Cross Keys (FP50). There is discussion about there being a new footbridge proposed over the river to the new country park. Cllr Rouse has confirmed that it concerns a replacement for the current Potter bridge which is in very poor condition and needs to be made more accessible (the bridge is the responsibility of the Potter group). This is FP13 which runs east from Ely Common to the footpath on the bank Q Adelaide Way; it forms a circular route with FP11 (C08). Crossing the railway at Kiln Lane is also difficult for walkers. Both problems need to be resolved to enable walkers to use the ancient path along Kiln Lane or Springhead Lane continuing on to Cuckoo Bridge.
C10	Coffue Drove	Downham BOAT 44	Downgraded to a bridleway and non-motorised users are diverted to the adjacent underline bridge	No objection in principle on the proviso that further consultation is undertaken with Byway users. CCC noted the height of the underpass is less than 2.4m - 2m too low for riders and cyclists; solutions required. BR would be minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway	Contact Details for British Driving Association (BDA) and Trail Riders Fellowship (TRF) to be forwarded to MM		Discussions need to take place with farmers here to establish what vehicles they use. Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	CCC Requested mounting blocks for horses which was accpeted by NR. Request from Trail riders to divert byway rather than downgrade to bridleway Drainage issues to be considered as part of the EIA but it is likely to be a localised issue that could be addressed as part of this scheme.	MM to consider restrictions for 4 wheeled motorised users but retain 2 wheeled motorised users through the underpass.	TRF object to loss of rights. Agreed ideally seek diversion of BOAT as BOAT but restricting width and possible 4x4 vehicles. Agreed mounting blocks, surface improvements and some mechanism of warning when trains were passing for horses. MM to talk to BHS. Whistle boards?	The Councillors present agreed with the latest proposal as set out in column J.
C11	Furlong Drove	Downham BOAT 33	Downgrade the byway to a Bridleway and motorised users are diverted to the parallel byway	No objection in principle on the proviso that further consultation is undertaken with Byway users. BR would be minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for extensive BOAT network in the area. Route is near population which is likely to expand and thus there will be greater demand for traffic-free routes for NMUs. Crossing could be made perpendicular, and lights could be installed.			Check Hereward Way run route Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	CCC issues with the quality of adjacent routes. Objection based on their view that there has been no mitigation for loss. Suggested potential footpath link on west side of railway. Only offering extinguishment - no mitigation in the view of CCC Potential to provide east west links to existing BOAT or upgrading existing footpath to a boat.	MM to consider options	86% disagree, 14% agree because of road safety concerns. NR suggest could upgrade FP8 to BOAT. CCC to check definitive line of FP8 - does it go outside or within the yard. CCC would wish to see BR as a minimum, and a link on the south side of the crossing to avoid the road. No mitigation at present; therefore CCC would object. MM will review options and come back to CCC.	Councillors welcomed the fact that MM/NR are looking at options and await the outcome for further discussion.
C12	Silt Drove	Public Highway (Silt Drove)	Extinguishment of the highway across the level crossing	CCC welcomed NR agreeing to retain this route as BR. BR would be minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for extensive BOAT network in the area Route is near population which is likely to expand and thus there will be greater demand for traffic-free routes for NMUs. Crossing could be made perpendicular, and lights could be installed.			Census surveys to be undertaken to quantify current usage Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	Discussion on future March by-pass and NR advised that at at grade railway crossing for a new major road was highly unlikely to be approved in accordance with current ORR standards. CCC support Blue Route as a restricted by-way as this gives the sasme rights to cyclists.		18% agree; 17% neutral; 60% disagree. Issues are extension to journey time; agricultural traffic having to use estate to get round which has double-parked vehicles; NMU access supported; request to consider link for cycle access along W side railway between crossings. LO Barry Short agreeable but would like passing places on Badgeney Road. Cllrs concerned about loss of private rights. FDC would object to loss of NMU access; lightly trafficked so have little concerns about vehicles. NR's current guidance is that if road were to be to developed east of March it would require a new road/bypass. FDC have asked for gates, red lights and a phone at each of the four crossings, retaining NMU rights. Question about status - BR or RB rights?	It was agreed that would be preferable to retain status as a BOAT with Traffic Regulation Order to enable motorbike use but prevent 4 wheeled vehicles - see TRF objection. AK confirmed that the existing telephone could be retained to enable safe passage of motorbikes. A discussion was held about whether bikers were safer on the bike than off. Cllr Ambrose Smith confirmed as a biker himself that they are safer on the bike. NR to consider best solution.
C13	Middle Drove	Public Highway Middle Drove	Downgrade the public road level crossing to footpath with registered users and other motorised level crossing users to make use of alternative public highway routes	CCC welcomed NR agreeing to retain this route as BR. BR will maintain NMU access and safeguard long term future use of network. BR would be minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for extensive BOAT network in the area.			Census surveys to be undertaken to quantify current usage Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	Need to provide mounting blocks and request to keep red & green light and telephone No objections to red route		LO concerns about passing places. 55% agree; 33% disagree. NR have agreed to grant private rights. NMU rights would be retained. Cyclists would be asked to dismount - have to go through gates anyway. RDA and TRF made no comment. CCC and FDC support proposal provided lights and phone remain, and bridlegate established adjacent to the locked private user gate.	Agricultural use in area will be far greater in this area than Silt Drove. Private rights will be retained. Councillors content with proposed approach in column J.
C14	Eastrea Cross Drove	Whittlesey FP50	Diversion along a field boundary (parallel) to the railway before emerging onto the Wype Road where the diversion would link up with Bridleway Whittlesey 60 and Byway Whittlesey 49	No objection at this stage				CCC would like a 'pop out' for more direct link from new path to the road No objections subeject to landowner agreement		FDC content provided pop out FP also provided at end of dyke. If scheme not possible then add lights and phone. NR say latter outside of scheme. Why - surely that could make safer if not possible to close? CCC support FDC's position and proposed solution. Scheme subject to LO consent. 3 responses, 2 in agreement, one disagree because of crop damage.	Councillors supported proposal on basis of officers' latest position (see column J).
C15	Brickyard Drove	Whittlesey FP48	extinguish footpath Whittlesey 48 with the intention that level crossing users are diverted along the existing public right of way network in the area	PG pointed out that farmer had discussed concerns about security due to usage, and had had maintenance report requests, which suggested that people do use the route. Concerned that diversion could be deemed 'not convenient' due to being 3 sides of rectangle. Public consultation required.			Census surveys to be undertaken to quantify current usage	CCC object as extinguishment with no mitigation Need to consider south side for miligation or link in to Eastrea Cross Drove LX CCC would support proposals if they included a southern connection to the south of the farm.	MM to consider options	No improvements proposed for road section. Current FP well maintained. FP41 not good surface. Outright extinguishment. 4 responses, 50% in favour, 50% object. CCC currently objects as extinguishment has not been mitigated. Link needed to maintain circular, useable route - see Cambs ROWIP and Health & Wellbeing Strategy. NR to explore option of creating FP link east which would mitigate extinguishment and remove CCC objection.	Councillors supported proposal on basis of officers' latest position (see column J). They would wish to see mitigating link in accordance with relevant policies to support Eastrea local community.
C16	Prickwillow 1	Ely FP17	Diversion via the adjacent Network Rail underline bridge (ETN 1579)	No objection at this stage. CCC Queried the absence of ramps, however the existing footpath route is not step free and it is proposed to provide a like-for-like provision.				Need 1.5 ramp for grass maintenance Need to consider how paths are currently maintained. MM to discuss access to maintain bund with EA and consider its suitability for CCC maintenance - must ensure CCC can get access> need 1.5m access ramp for CCC.		CCC content with steps in principle but CCC are having to take over maintenance from the EA. CCC would have to use ride-on mowers. Ramp would future-proof CCC for maintenance liability. 1.5m is sufficient. MM to investigate what the EA currently do and report back.	Not discussed as ran out of time.
C17	Prickwillow 2	Ely FP57	via the adjacent Network Rail underline bridge (ETN 1579B)	No objection at this stage. CCC Queried the absence of ramps to enable access for maintenance vehicles.		The existing footpath route is not step free and it is proposed to provide a like-for-like provision.		Need 1.5 ramp for grass maintenance Need to consider how paths are currently maintained. No objections		As above	Not discussed as ran out of time.
C18	Munceys	Fordham FP19	Diversion on the west side of the railway making use of a private track and the existing footways on Station Road to join up where Footpath Fordham 19 currently emerges onto Station Road	CCC object to the proposals on the diversion length and not situated on the desire line. CCC queried whether a bridge could be provided at this location.			Agreed census to be undertaken to quantify usage at the crossing.	CCC note that the diversion is too long and a less convenient and enjoyable route. CCC objection	MM to check alternative overbridge route to the south.	6 responses, 100% disagree because diversion route is long and inconvenient; road busy. East Cambs Ramblers object. LO Mr Gibson acknowledges that people use route from S up to railway with a small circular route. Objects to proposed diversion. CCC would object on basis of public objections which bear out tests not being met, and principles of ROWIP and Health & Wellbeing Strategy. User type is those who like and can use 6-7km. Important and only NMU connection between Burwell and Landbeach.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C19	Wicken Road	Soham FP106	Diversion south to Network Rail overline bridge (SOB2 2231)	CCC agreed that it was unsafe to cross users across the bridge on London Road as confirmed by RSA. Subject to consultation.		Circular Route proposed to the east of the railway in lieu of loss of railway crossing	Alternative sketch drawn up	Housing development in the area. CCC to consider position on this crossing - undecided at this time	CCC to provide comments on this crossing proposal	3 responses 100% disagree because new housing in Cherry Tree Lane area so routes into common and fen area should be encouraged for circular access (greater than proposed circular route). East Cambs Ramblers object. Census showed 14, 12, 4 users on Sat, Sun, Mon. CCC to consider position and revert to NR/MM.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C20	Leonards	Soham FP101	Diversion north to Mill Drove Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing	No objection at this stage but would want to see the outcome from public consultation.		MM and NR explored the use of adjacent underpass, but this was not viable.	A stage 1 RSA was undertaken on the proposed diversion route which did not identify any road safety issues.	Land owner suggested alternative route, which anecdotally is currently used by school children. Determine field use arable/pasture. CCC prefer land owner suggestion	MM to consider alternative	Underpass was considered but thought it was not suitable as it was more of a culvet. MM to find photo and report for CCC. 6 responses; 17% agreed; others didn't propose an alternative; didn't actually disagree. Sustrans raised issue of new development at Cherry Tree Lane - need to provide circular walks; students use path to go to school; there is a proposal to create a bridleway; landowner is saying children are using a different desire line. In principle CCC would prefer this option as provides sensible mitigation for community; if field is pasture then cross-field in accordance with desire line would be best. If arable then need to check with landowner as may want path to go round edge of field in long term. Could consider Permissive path agreement for cross-field which LO could remove at any time. CCC would prefer this to the currently proposed option. MM to explore option further and check LO position re alignment.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions											
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	CCC POSITION	CCC Actions	MM AMENDMENTS /COMMENTS	PREVIOUS ACTIONS	WORKSHOP 26-07-2016 & 02-08-16 post round 1 public consultation feedback (unless otherwise stated comments refer to Stage 1 consultation plans)	CURRENT ACTIONS post 26/7 & 2/8 workshop	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	COUNCILLOR WORKSHOP 09.08.2016
C21	Newmarket Bridge	Ely FP24	Diversion northwest to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct SOB2 2235) along an existing track	No objection at this stage				Support in principle subject to impact on route due to flooding. CCC enquired about temporary gates at the level crossing to be operated during flood events to maintain access. However this is likely to create uncertainty and potential trespass issues over whether the public could use the private user worked crossing during normal weather conditions. CCC are currently promoting the Ely Bypass Scheme which may offer an alternative unobstructed footpath during flood events. CCC would accept the diversion routes on the basis that the routes were open 80% to 90% of the time and only closed during exceptional events.	MM to establish flood events, frequency and potential impact on proposals. MM to consider links to Ely Bypass Scheme.	5 responses 80% agreed. Concerns about flooding of underpass. Request for public use of private crossing if public crossing impassable. Private crossing would be locked so wouldn't be possible. Concern about this as routes are popular tourist routes; problems for people coming long distance - they wouldn't know route was flooded. This would be the weak link. Needs mitigation. MM to investigate through EIA. CCC agrees in principle subject to appropriate mitigation of flooding such that users could use this the path the majority of the time - only not in exceptional circumstances.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C22	Wells Engine	Ely FP23	Diversion southeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct SOB2 2235)	No objection at this stage			Consultation with the EA to be held to ascertain their use of the crossing	See C21 above		7 responses; 71% agreed. As above. Path is part of long distance promoted path the Fen Rivers Way. Alternative path for times of flood mooted via new bypass. CCC to check alignment of Ely bypass - is there an option to connect to this instead? 09.08.16 No- there will be a new link over the new bypass bridge over the river but not over the railway, so there would still be the problem of getting over the railway. MM to investigate depending on whether sufficient mitigation can be put in place under railway bridge. Await outcome of EIA.	Not discussed as no representation from this ward.
C23	Adelaide	Ely FP49	Diversion northeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct BGK 1738)	No objection in principle, all options considered together Adelaide, Cross Keys and Second Drove. CCC welcomed that proposal includes circular route now as benefit. (See also C09 Second Drove, C23 Adelaide, C24 Cross Keys)			Meeting to be held local ward members once the proposals are more firmed up at the next design stage.	Combined scheme with C09 Second Drove Census data not valid as crossings were obstructed / temporary closed. River is key destination - local and tourist route - CCC would like to keep one crossing open to river and ideally both C23 & C24 Check Fen Rivers Association was consulted CCC considered that alternative with circular route is better, but still not a riverwalk. All river walks become very long. CCC would be minded to accept closure of Second Drove if C23 & C24 kept open. Improvements required at Clayway CCC asked what are lengths of diversion routes - legal test on diversion length - substantially convenient. CCC would like to see circular route to north as well NR to check deposit on track to the north (between road and river) as there may be public use and a potential claim Consider link to Ely Road to the south CCC would object as there is no circular route.but may not if they are provided to north and south	MM to report back on preferences and census.	5 responses 80% disagree See comments for C09_FP49 Ely	See C09 above. Councillors object to proposed closure.
C24	Cross Keys	Ely FP50	Diversion northeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct BGK 1738)							8 responses 100% disagree See comments for C09_FP49 Ely	See C09 above. Councillors object to proposed closure.
C25	Clayway	Littleport FP11	Diversion north along the highway to Sandhill Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing	No Objections but stated that a previous closure scheme had failed at a PI as road crossing considered more dangerous.			NR to review previous proposal material	CCC would place a holding objection on this proposal following objections from Groups (Ramblers and Heartbeat Group) Feedback from public consultation suggested use of the track parallel to the railway behind the back of the houses. However CCC stated that this is an unclassified road and users can already do this.Therefore this is effectively an extinguishment only. CCC would like to see some mitigation in place of the loss this crossing.		Comments - some about path being ill-defined; that path is well used; previous application failed at public inquiry as less convenient and no more safe. Path used by weekly Heartbeat group who expressed objection - prefer direct route to river path. NR proposing to improve road route by moving fence at road crossing back to create more room; would keep path on south side. 19 users on Saturday, 15 on Sunday, 10 Monday. CCC suggested bridge at later stage of the project. MM explained would have to balance environmental concerns and intrusion to the neighbouring residences. CCC acknowledge that some mitigation would be put in place, however CCC would still object because it is a well-used path and users have objected on clear grounds of enjoyment. The alternative would simply be an extinguishment; therefore there is no mitigation in real terms that would support Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-17 or the ROWIP.	District Cllr David Ambrose Smith agrees with proposal as a dog walker himself because stile makes it is difficult to use and deposits one right next to the track. Littleport PC agree as well. CR explained that CCC had received a lot of objections (see left). CR said this might be a proposal that would have to be left to the Inspector to decide.
C26	Poplar Drove No. 30	Public Highway (Poplar Drove)	Extinguishment of the crossing rights. Users make use of Ten Mile Bank, the A10 and Horsley Hale	CCC have confirmed that public highway rights do exist here (unclassified road). Extinguishment with Willow Row Drove would result in loss of one of the few safe off-road circular routes in area away from A10 for peds, equestrians and horse+carriage drivers. This would be against CCC's adopted ROW Improvement Plan policy. Therefore request maintain BR rights as a minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for BOAT/UCR network. This view was supported by users (equestrians) independently at the local exhibitions.			Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	It is noted that CCC and NR disagree regarding the status of the level crossing (i.e. public or private). Therefore the level crossing is being treated as an alleged public right of way with legal advice being sought to establish its status. However options were discussed (in principle) for closures and downgrading of C26 and C27. Various permutations were discussed, resulting in a potential option to treat Poplar Drove as a private user worked crossing with bridleway or restricted byway status with restrictions to permit dismounted powered 2 wheelers. Mitigation provided in the form of a link between C26 and C27 on the east side of the railway to maintain a circular route in the area. CCC in principle would support this proposed alternative.	NR to confirm position on allowing P2W to use the level crossing when mounted or MM to consider mitigation and circular walks. Status of level crossing to be determined.	Status dispute recognised; MM have spoken to parliamentary agents; ongoing. Consultation raised concerns about diverting to A10 busy, unsafe. Most people use by foot bicycle or horse. Landowner concerned about closure devaluing land. 6 responses; 67% disagree. CR noted that the consultation showed this as a private road and therefore people may not have responded as they would had they realised it was public. TRF and East Cambs Ramblers object.	Not discussed as ran out of time.
C27	Willow Row Drove	Littleport BOAT 31	Downgrade the byway to a bridleway	CCC requested that the byway be downgraded to a bridleway as a minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for BOAT/UCR network in the area. Extinguishment with Willow Row Drove would result in loss of one of the few safe off-road circular routes in the area away from A10 for peds, equestrians and horse+carriage drivers. This would be against CCC's adopted			Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	See C26 above		Comments: Muddy route; few use by car. Should be downgraded to bridleway 6 responses; 100% disagree. TRF and East Cambs Ramblers object. CCC would in principle support retaining Poplar Drove to byway status with a TRO preventing 4 wheeled vehicles; close Willow Row Drove crossing but mitigate with a BR link on E side of railway; subject to second public consultation. Would need to show Poplar Drove as public. NR/MM to consider.	Not discussed as ran out of time.
C28	Black Horse Drove	Public Highway (Black Horse Drove)	Extinguishment of the adopted highway on the level crossing and beyond the railway to the west. To become an occupation level crossing	No objection at this stage on the proviso that no rights provide links to further afield. Road to west of crossing would have to be extinguished as CCC could not have an island of highway; would not be prepared to maintain.			Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	CCC do not object to the proposal on the basis that the adopted highway is stopped to the east of the railway with no maintenance liability for the council. DW confirmed that Norfolk County Council do not object to the proposals.	Maintenance liability of the track to be discussed with land owners.	6 responses; 80 undecided; 20% disagreed. Alternative routes for farm vehicles impractical - private rights to be maintained. CCC do not object to closure provided that all highway over and to W of crossing is stopped up and there is no maintenance liability for the County Council.	Not discussed as ran out of time.
C29	Cassells	Brinkley FP1	Diversion east along Brinkley Road to Brinkley Road Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing before joining up with Footpath Brinkley 10	Objected to pedestrians route on-road (Westley Bottom Road) but welcomed the provision of a footway on one side of the carriageway to overcome this issue.			RSA raised issue of routing peds on-road for this proposal.	CCC requested footway to conform to their design standards. CCC's design standards available on the council's website. CCC support in principle subject to highway approval of proposed footway.	MM to develop footway design for CCC to review and approve.	2 responses; 1 disagreed; 1 neutral. Support provided that there is a suitable pedestrian route. No users on the first 3 days. Seeking to provide a footway on the south side. CCC support in principle subject to approval of Highway Development Management - would encourage early consultation as if cannot approve then another solution will need to be found. MM to follow up.	Cllr Alan Sharp happy provided there is sufficient mitigation for footway provision on road.
C30	Westley Road	Public Highway (Westley Road)	Downgrade the byway crossing to a footpath with registered vehicle users and other motorised users to make use of alternative public highway routes	CCC requested that this level crossing to be retained as a bridleway as a minimum; would prefer Restricted Byway to maintain connectivity for extensive BOAT/bridleway network in the area. If stopping up the highway, CCC would request turning heads to be provided. Consider diverting as BR and putting in bridge over nearby cutting.			Access for farmers to be retained. Include consultation with TRF and BDA on all BOAT proposals.	CCC queried response from the Horse Society, BDA and TRF but none received to date. CCC main concern is with about horse and carriage users having to use the A1034 as an alternative route. Residents on the BOAT on the west side of the railway requested turning heads at the level crossing to allow large delivery vehicles to turn around. CCC have previously requested turning provisions at the level crossing.	MM to check consultation responses from HS, BDA and TRF and feedback comments to CCC. MM to consider routes for Horse and Carriage users MM to confirm previous discussion with land owner regarding the use of the private underpass nearby.	12 responses; 17% agreed; 17% neutral; 67% disagreed. Adds 6 miles to journey; 2 commuters; 10 leisure. Crossing to A1308 in poor condition; difficult for HGVs to service 3 houses next to crossing. Request for turning circle; 3 houses may become isolated from Westley Waterless parish so request for private user rights. Alternative road and crossing at Six Mile Bottom very unpleasant for NMUs esp equestrians - road is fast, crosses A1304 near junction with A11. Objection from TRF. Adjacent landowner is a stud; MM haven't discussed use of underpass. MM to investigate. Would NR consider permissive access for carriage drivers with a key? Or the same as Poplar Drove - TRO restricting 4 wheeled traffic. CCC have made many similar TROs on byways to manage their network effectively. User groups are familiar with this. MM to following up investigations - underpass or retaining access at the existing crossing.	Cllr Sharp happy with what was proposed at 02.0816 workshop (see left) and currently investigated.
C31	Littleport Station		Divert non motorised users to the underpass					Network Rail 8 car scheme sponsor set out the rationale for closing this crossing. Propose to light the underpass NR has designs for a ramped and stepped solution. Additional car parking will be provided on the triangle of land for mobility impaired users as well as a ticket machine. Underpass may flood at times - this is to be reviewed. A 9 day traffic survey is being undertaken by NR. Underbridge is CCC liability, introducing passengers into the highway may require NR to consider joint liability & NR will hold talks with CCC on this. 170 incidents of misuse in 15 months and history of previous bridge strikes. No objection to principle but require details of impact on highway capacity in the vicinity		Raised walkway proposed to mitigate drainage. Headroom 2.5m. ECDC concerns over disability access. NR considering parking for mobility access on triangle adjacent to road; ticket machine on east platform. 120 passengers a day. Other concerns raised were lighting and waiting times at crossing. Census data sought. - agreed needs to cover all use types. Can only look at rail benefits versus capital cost. NR would consider a lifted overbridge if developer funding was available. Discussion required to agree how liability for introducing passengers into CCC's highway would be. Consider retaining cycletrack. Discussion also needed over traffic management for diversion routes. Meeting held with CCC Highways 08.08.16. Three options discussed; favoured option is to retain traffic on a give way basis adding a raised walkway to cater for times of flood.	Cllr David Smith said that local meeting had asked for a bridge to avoid the Ely situation. Also that town is growing with 1000 new houses and 3 new schools. Littleport is a corporate priority for East Cambs. NR pointed out that it isn't the same as Ely as it would be one-way. Bridge would cost £4m and be very large. Work needs to be done on the solutions. Officers have requested traffic and flood surveys and further discussions will take place once received.
C33	Jack O'Tell (Adam's Crossing)							Private rights crossing only			
C34	Fysons							Private rights crossing only			
C35	Ballast Pit							Private rights crossing only			

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
					<p>JAS expalined current programme milestones.</p> <p>CCC raised principle over widths. CCC has requested 3m width for FPs to ensure that min 2m is not obstructed by future boundary fencing/vegetation, and to enable access by maintenance vehicles. AK explained they wished to present a consistent message to the public across the three counties. However, the detailed design would be able to take account of wider widths negotiated in individual circumstances.</p> <p>CCC to send through a note on maintenance requirements.</p> <p>CCC to provide general specs for construction.</p> <p>MM to reference CCC developer guidance. CCC explained they request steel beams for bridges as longer lasting. MM to contact Gareth Guest, CCC bridge engineer, re specification for bridges. BC to provide contact details.</p> <p>MM to send through list of new surveys; CR to check for specific locations and revert.</p> <p>Structures principle - CCC explained that stiles were not acceptable as are the most restrictive option. BS states that least restrictive option should be taken where possible - gap, or gate. MM agreed to review all proposals and amend accordingly.</p>	<p>Mott MacDonald - Nathan Huntley, Sue Tilbrook, Sandeep Patel, Jason Smith.</p> <p>Network Rail - Natasha Davison</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council - Camilla Rhodes, Peter Gaskin, James Rigney (District Highways Manager) , Brid Cooney, Ian Green), Karen Champion</p> <p>Fenland District Council - Gareth Martin</p> <p>CCC has current Issues with trackside maintenance and struggles to contact the relevant people in NR. <i>Project team highlighted that this was a separate issue to the level crossing programme, but accepted that day to day issues didn't help.</i></p> <p>CCC - some sighting issues are due to lack of NR maintenance.</p> <p>NR/MM need to consult all relevant people in CCC - eg Flood Risk Management - Brian Heffanan(?)</p> <p>CCC manage local small watercourses.</p> <p>Issue of risks stated at crossings - eg sun glare. How is ALCRM score calculated? What is maintenance inspection schedule. CCC want to know more about this process.</p> <p>CCC - Lots of concern from key stakeholders that there are no safety issues at many level crossings and this is all about asset disposable.</p> <p>CCC- Programme is so tight and lead in times for formal reports are very long - draft report in Sept for Dec meeting for example. This makes getting a formal Council response difficult.</p>	<p>CCC to forward on any site specific maintenance issues that have to NR who will in turn forward to the relevant Route Managers.</p> <p>NR to provide ALCRM score process and inspection regime.</p>
						<p>CCC / FDC queried whether local authority vehicles would have private user rights over certain crossings.</p> <p><i>Post meeting MM/NR response:</i> <i>It is expected that private user rights will be limited to those with land interests in close vicinity on both sides of the railway to restrict the number of users and maintain control. It would not be the norm to provide the local authority with access rights for maintenance or regular activities such as refuse collection unless it could be demonstrated that no other convenient and appropriate route is available.</i></p>	
C01	Chittering	Waterbeach FP18	Diversion north some 430m to Jack O'Tell level crossing	4 responses. 3 objected. 2m footpath proposed. KC requested 3m for equipment. Could move crossing upon down but dependent upon private user result. CCC support blue route because of need to retain circular route for use by residents of future development in area. Do not support red route. SCDC's comments re new town development and policy on walking and cycling supporting importance of access to countryside noted.	CCC support red route on new plan. Bridge designs - supports need to be steel due to longer term longevity	Post meeting MM/NR response:	NR to confirm Private User rights process
C02	Nairns No. 117	Private Crossing	Extinguishment of the private rights at the level crossing	This is one of 3 private crossings to be closed. The alternative would be Bannold Road. LO currently does not support but working together. Balance of public cost for compensation.	N/A	<p>This crossing forms part of the group including C033, 34 & 35 - see comments for C033. Therefore concerns relating to additional farm traffic on local roads and safety on Newmarket Road.</p> <p>HOLDING OBJECTION</p>	

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C03	West River Bridge	Little Thetford FP7	Diversion immediately north to the viaduct arch underneath the railway.	PC strongly agree. No comments from EA. LO happy provided doesn't affect access road. CCC support solution subject to surface improvement (e.g. stone). Part of Fen Rivers Way long distance promoted route.	No change - CCC support provided works are achieved as previously discussed. NR to keep Cllr Hunt informed.	<p>CCC comments:</p> <p>Needs gate and fencing</p> <p>Need flooding details - need details to make decision</p> <p>Need to agree surface materials - should be designed so that not washed away during flood periods</p> <p>Potential for security issues - lighting, flooding risk</p> <p>Warning mechanisms for walkers in times of flood - how is the risk managed.</p> <p>Potential for small wall and surfaced path to raise path subject to headroom and EA approval</p> <p>HOLDING OBJECTION until more information on flooding frequencies, severities and mitigation measures is provided.</p>	NR/MM to provide further details on flooding issues.
C04	No Name No 20	Meldreth FP10	Diversion north some 315m to the junction with Station Road via the existing (private) concrete road. Level crossing users would make use of the existing footways on Station Road to link up with Footpath Meldreth FP10.	13 responses. 8% disagree, 77% disagree alternative route floods; lengthy diversion; alternative route is concrete track shared with vehicles, unattractive. LO Mr Bowton objects on safety concerns of sharing route, particularly at the road). Clear desire line on existing route. MM's road safety team reviewed and determined that there was no safety concerns. Local economy of farm shop important. There is also a Diversity Impact Assessment. CCC requested copy of both. Public responses reflect CCC's opinions. Unsuitable for disabled users. Growth area so increased usage likely. CCC currently object. NR pointed out there has been deliberate misuse; CCC were unaware of this. Can anything be done to make crossing safer?	CCC acknowledge that MM have explored other alternatives. However public, county councillor and parish councillor are objecting due to loss of amenity. CCC contend that alternatives can't substitute the amenity value of current route. CCC likely to object.	<p>Public behaviour - users want like for like alternative - ie not on busy roads.</p> <p>Issue of footway width on Station Road - not enough space to pass.</p> <p>Large residential growth area - use of the footpath and crossing will grow.</p> <p>Provision of new footpath in field boundaries adjacent to Station Road welcomed but not adequate mitigation.</p> <p>CCC will OBJECT to the proposals as they stand - a bridge is required at this location to or the level crossing retained.</p>	NR/MM to consider position
C05	Flambards		Proposal removed from the scheme				
C06	Barrington Road	Highway (Barrington Road) - Bridleway crossing	Diversion to Foxton level crossing via a new footway on Barrington Road and via the existing footway on the A10 Cambridge Road	98% object; dangerous to cross A10 twice, maintaining gate inexpensive relatively speaking; off-road route safer; add traffic light to A10 to assist crossing. PC objected on similar grounds but also route is Barr-Fox cyclepath and Cam-Royston cyclepath; Cllr Kindersley objected on above cycle route grounds and proposed housing development in Barrington quarry for which Barr cycle path being created. Census data not yet received. CCC object on similar grounds relating to cyclepath but also bridleway access.	As proposal currently stands, CCC will object. NR looking at alternatives following site visit 20.09.16 e.g. providing footway- cycleway along west side of crossing, and cutting across grass area E-W. NR to provide more information at next workshop.	<p>MM reported on options for new footpath / cycle track through wooded area to reduce diversion length.</p> <p>Any new route through the crossing would need to cater for two-way cycle use (2.5m with 0.5m strip) shared use.</p> <p>Need to discuss any proposals with highways, transportation and cycling teams. may be able to provide as built plans and topo information.</p> <p>CCC need to understand longer term solutions in terms - bypass and getting rid of junction.</p> <p>Need to understand in context of ThamesLink proposals - lack of funding currently but CCC don't want to prejudice the larger scheme.</p> <p>MM need to provide design for CCC to comment on. This should be deferred to the next phase of the crossing programme.</p> <p>CCC will OBJECT to the proposals as they stand.</p>	MM to work up design mitigation and come back to CCC.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C07	No Name No. 37	Harston FP4	Diversion along a field boundary and access the B1368 London Road via the existing gated vehicular access	<p>Didn't take forward BR upgrade because would take additional land. PG pointed out that it is an already wide track. CCC explained it is part of ambitions for improvements to network for Southern Fringe development wfor which there is s106 funding.</p> <p>DW to send RSA to CCC.</p> <p>CCC concerned about grips in verges which would need to be culverted and that verges are only cut twice a year. If verges are obstructed people walk in the road, which is less safe in this location.</p> <p>Need to talk to parish and find out where people's destinations are.</p> <p>61% disagree because of road/verge.</p> <p>Some comments about better access to byway and access to village store. Byway popular dog walk.</p> <p>CCC suggest FP or ideally BR link on field-side of hedge north of road (or south side) linking directly to byway (Donkey Lane) = mitigation. Preferable to road option. MM to investigate.</p> <p>PG offered to consult the PCs. See PC responses 04.08.16 Harston and Hauxton both support this proposal; fieldside link to byway long been needed due to hazardous nature of speeding traffic along road.</p> <p>Business case provided to NR 08/08/16</p>	<p>CCC previously sent information (business case) on connectivity aspirations. CCC's proposal not taken up. CCC, Hauxton and Harston parish councils and County Councillor object until suitably mitigated between village and current exit of FP and link to Hoggin path. CCC believe that the road is not suitable for horses due to the traffic speed and road geometry and would like a multi user route to continue.</p> <p>MM to review. MM preference is to see what they can do within the highway boundary although the highway bridge is a pinch point. LOs oppose BR where currently only FP as more than original liability.</p> <p>NR have agreed to do an ATC on the B road.</p> <p>CCC to provide specification used for Newton road verge path.</p>	<p>In order for the proposal to be acceptable CCC require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must link Shelford Road with Byway 3 with a combination of verge and field margins paths. Ideally this should be multiuser / bridleway although the constraint of a narrowing verge and steps at the railway bridge was accepted. - The proposed link between Byway 3 and the new footpath (to the east of Station Road) should run behind the hedge in field margins adjacent to Station Road and be a bridleway <p>CCC believe that the new PROW to the west of Station Road should be a bridleway and not a footpath. NR/MM raised the limitations of what can be delivered through the TWAO but will discuss with landowner.</p> <p>HOLDING OBJECTION until the design changes requested are provided.</p>	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.
C08	Ely North Junction	Ely FP11	Diversion through the same field with a link to the B1382 Ely Road via a footway through a commercial estate.	<p>5 comments, 2 agree, 3 object; more unpleasant as part of FRW. Factory concerned 50 vehicle movements a day; want fenced off for safety. Further discussion. MM to feed back to CCC before decision made.</p> <p>Need to understand impact on Q Adelaide Road and improvements from Ely North.</p> <p>Holding objection from CCC pending getting further information about QA Road (CCC) and additional censuses on paths C09 and reopening of BR25 which were closed during census (MM).</p> <p>09.08 16 No improvement to be made to Q Adelaide Rd except for new roundabout at junction with Prickwillow Rd - already in place. Traffic will increase along road.</p> <p>There is no pavement at entrance to factory - would need putting in. Otherwise there is a continuous pavement, albeit it crosses a number of accesses. CCC maintain holding objection pending second public consultation. Still concerned that alternative route not as pleasant as roadside whereas original is rural.</p>	<p>CCC maintain holding objection following councillor objection and pending second public consultation. Still concerned over loss of amenity represented by this gateway path. MM to investigate fencing and secure compount at the factory.</p>	<p>A local Councillor workshop has been held (attended by NR) with objections raised due to the footpath being a 'gateway to local countryside', loss of amenity, walking alongside roads, and no safety case. The area is one of residential growth and the path is needed to encourage people into the countryside</p> <p>CCC OBJECTION as currently proposed.</p>	NR/MM to consider position

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C09	Second Drove	Ely FP49	Extinguishment of footpath Ely FP49 with the intention that level crossing users are diverted along the existing PROW network in the area	<p>8 responses</p> <p>Short attractive PROW would be lost; adds 3km. Bank home to cows which make route dangerous; C23 and 24 should be considered together.</p> <p>LO Did not like circular route because sister lives at cottage; would want compensation. Need to understand lengths of alternative routes.</p> <p>First proposed circular route could be a candidate for a claimed route. CCC to check records. If so then may be prudent to negotiate with LO over establishing rights. Ely North development will bring 1000s of new residents who need access to ROW network. Access to river is important and short circular routes. See ROWIP, Cambs Health & Wellbeing Strategy and ECDC planning comments 05/08/16.</p> <p>CCC would support closure of C09 if mitigating circular route put in place south to FP50 Second Drove and up west side of railway, subject to public consultation. CCC do not currently support closure of C23 or C24. MM to explore and revert to CCC.</p>	<p>CCC and councillors welcomed proposed diversion to Clayway bridleway crossing in conjunction with retaining C23 Adelaide. This retains the important circular route most local to Ely.</p> <p>Clayway crossing needs to be improved as currently poor - as previously raised. Field gate difficult to use, no room for horses to wait, consider second gate. Greater usage from diverted pedestrians. AK to arrange separate meeting.</p> <p>CCC need to see outcome of public consultation, but are likely to be able to withdraw objection. Review at next workshop.</p>	<p>See also C24 Cross Keys.</p> <p>CCC supported the suggestions raised by the Ramblers and several other members of the public that a new footpath link between footpaths 50 and 49 to the west of the railway would, in conjunction with the new footpath at Second Drove reprovide for short circular walks in the area.</p> <p><i>Post meeting Camilla Rhodes provided further correspondence from local Councillors confirming the above position.</i></p> <p>CCC reiterated the need for improvements at Clayway crossing - see previous comments.</p> <p>NO OBJECTIONS M28to R2 consultation plans subject to the new footpath link between FP 50 and 49 and improvements at Clayway LX.</p>	MM to discuss further with landowners and confirm amended plan.
C10	Coffue Drove	Downham BOAT 44	Downgraded to a bridleway and non-motorised users are diverted to the adjacent underline bridge	<p>TRF object to loss of rights. Agreed ideally seek diversion of BOAT as BOAT but restricting width and possible 4x4 vehicles. Agreed mounting blocks, surface improvements and some mechanism of warning when trains were passing for horses. MM to talk to BHS. Whistle boards?</p>	<p>Diversion proposed now acceptable; MM are talking to EA about drainage; MM yet to speak to BHS about warning signs. Will ensure include mounting block.</p> <p>Will need to include TRO to prohibit 4x4s.</p>	<p>Diversion proposed now acceptable; MM are talking to EA about drainage; MM yet to speak to BHS about warning signs. Will ensure include mounting block.</p> <p>Will need to include TRO to prohibit 4x4s.</p> <p>NO OBJECTION subject to resolving the above.</p>	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C11	Furlong Drove	Downham BOAT 33	Downgrade the byway to a Bridleway and motorised users are diverted to the parallel byway	86% disagree, 14% agree because of road safety concerns. NR suggest could upgrade FP8 to BOAT. CCC to check definitive line of FP8 - does it go outside or within the yard. CCC would wish to see BR as a minimum, and a link on the south side of the crossing to avoid the road. No mitigation at present; therefore CCC would object. MM will review options and come back to CCC.	MM advised that landowners were vehemently against any more links to west; MM consider upgrade FP8 to BR will be achievable. Why not create proposed FP as BR? MM explained that it would take more land; riders can use road. Difficult for CCC to call - riders still not happy with proposal as opportunity to gallop reduced if lose crossing - can't gallop on road/verge. CCC will revert to MM on whether they would like the southern section of Furlong Drove extinguished but need to consider use as access to land. Agreed to review outcome of consultation at next workshop. MM to check if have discussed retention of private rights fo Ash Tree Farm. CCC to consider if want to retain S section under	MM to look at bridleway at the SW corner rather than footpath - requires further discussion with landowner. CCC preference would be formalise existing position and downgrade BOAT LX to a bridleway. Only four consultation responses were received (75% disagree or strongly disagree and 25% undecided) CCC to consider further and provide response.	CCC to provide view on Round 2 consultation proposals. Consultation feedback was received stating that for large vehicles our diversion route would not be usable in winter. This is due to Cambridgeshire County Council having recently restricted motor traffic on Byway 45 and parts of Byway 44 such that between 1st October and 30th April the shortest alternative route for large motor vehicles would be via Byways 48 and 47, the B4111, Cowbridge Hall Road, and Beild Drove. Can CCC to confirm whether this is correct?
C12	Silt Drove	Public Highway (Silt Drove, March)	Extinguishment of the highway across the level crossing	18% agree; 17% neutral; 60% disagree. Issues are extension to journey time; agricultural traffic having to use estate to get round which has double-parked vehicles; NMU access supported; request to consider link for cycle access along W side railway between crossings. LO Barry Short agreeable but would like passing places on Badgeney Road. Cllrs concerned about loss of private rights. FDC would object to loss of NMU access; lightly trafficked so have little concerns about vehicles. NR's current guidance is that if road were to be developed east of March it would require a new road/bypass. FDC have asked for gates, red lights and a phone at each of the four crossings, retaining NMU rights. Question about status - BR or RB rights?	Proposal now acceptable - -though TRF may still object.	CCC need to understand in detail the exact geometry of where the adopted highway finishes and bridleway starts as they will need to amend their legal orders. MM confirmed that TWAO plans will be made available in CAD or GIS format at the appropriate stage. Turning heads are likely to be required - need to determine size, surfacing and location. <i>Post meeting note: Email on 24th October from CCC to MML Pete Wall suggested turning heads for refuge vehicles would be required on both sides of the level crossing.</i> Will Fenland and CCC vehicles be registered users - Pete Walls is the FDC for refuse collection. What is process for emergency vehicles - have they been consulted? NO OBJECTIONS subject to clarifications on the above.	MM to consider need for, size and location of turning heads.
C13	Middle Drove	Public Highway Middle Drove (March)	Downgrade the public road level crossing to footpath with registered users and other motorised level crossing users to make use of alternative public highway routes	LO concerns about passing places. 55% agree; 33% disagree. NR have agreed to grant private rights. NMU rights would be retained. Cyclists would be asked to dismount - have to go through gates anyway. RDA and TRF made no comment. CCC and FDC support proposal provided lights and phone remain, and bridlegate established adjacent to the locked private user gate.	Proposal acceptable	Same as comments for C12 CCC questioned whether if Whitemoor Drove were to be temporarily closed would NR allow usage over Middle Drove. BR confirmed that any reasonable requests from the Highway Authority would be considered through the normal channels. It would be expected that normal maintenance processes would not require the full closure of a road level crossing. <i>Post meeting note: Email on 24th October from CCC to MML Pete Wall suggested that CCC would like a key to access this location as the alternative route would add significant time to negotiate</i> NO OBJECTIONS	
C14	Eastrea Cross Drove	Whittlesey FP50	Diversion along a field boundary (parallel) to the railway before emerging onto the Wype Road where the diversion would link up with Bridleway Whittlesey 60 and Byway Whittlesey 49	FDC content provided pop out FP also provided at end of dyke. If scheme not possible then add lights and phone. NR say latter outside of scheme. Why - surely that could make safer if not possible to close? CCC support FDC's position and proposed solution. Scheme subject to LO consent. 3 responses, 2 in agreement, one disagree because of crop damage.	FDC and CCC's position is that provided NR deliver proposals as now presented, they would not object.	No objections subject to infrastructure being in place to an appropriate standard before closure of the Level Crossing. CCC comment that the verge may not suitable for walking on. <i>Post meeting note: It is assumed that this comment applies to all crossing and proposed mitigation work. A form of words will be written into the TWAO schedule to reflect this.</i> NO OBJECTIONS	

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C15	Brickyard Drove	Whittlesey FP48	extinguish footpath Whittlesey 48 with the intention that level crossing users are diverted along the existing public right of way network in the area	No improvements proposed for road section. Current FP well maintained. FP41 not good surface. Outright extinguishment. 4 responses, 50% in favour, 50% object. CCC currently objects as extinguishment has not been mitigated. Link needed to maintain circular, useable route - see Cambs ROWIP and Health & Wellbeing Strategy. NR to explore option of creating FP link east which would mitigate extinguishment and remove CCC objection.	FDC and CCC's position is that provided NR deliver proposals as now presented, they would not object.	Comments as C14. NO OBJECTIONS	
C16	Prickwillow 1	Ely FP17	Diversion via the adjacent Network Rail underline bridge (ETN 1579)	CCC content with steps in principle but CCC are having to take over maintenance from the EA. CCC would have to use ride-on mowers. Ramp would future-proof CCC for maintenance liability. 1.5m is sufficient. MM to investigate what the EA currently do and report back.	CCC does not object provided suitable alternatives are put in place. Note Open Space Society press statement on this and lack of steps.	See 28.9.16 response NO OBJECTIONS CCC note that the crossing has closed by NR and there is an urgent need to provide temporary diversion routes.	NR to progress temporary diversion routes at the crossing.
C17	Prickwillow 2	Ely FP57	via the adjacent Network Rail underline bridge (ETN 1579B)	As above	CCC does not object provided suitable alternatives are put in place.	See 28.9.16 response NO OBJECTIONS CCC note that the crossing has closed by NR and there is an urgent need to provide temporary diversion routes.	NR to progress temporary diversion routes at the crossing.
C18	Munceys	Fordham FP19	Diversion on the west side of the railway making use of a private track and the existing footways on Station Road to join up where Footpath Fordham 19 currently emerges onto Station Road	6 responses, 100% disagree because diversion route is long and inconvenient; road busy. East Cambs Ramblers object. LO Mr Gibson acknowledges that people use route from S up to railway with a small circular route. Objects to proposed diversion. CCC would object on basis of public objections which bear out tests not being met, and principles of ROWIP and Health & Wellbeing Strategy. User type is those who like and can use 6-7km. Important and only NMU connection between Burwell and Landbeach.	Proposal C18B is better, and CCC appreciates that comments have been taken on board. This proposal would retain more of the original route, and be more direct than initial proposal. MM will undertake an ATC and RSA for the Landwade Road. CCC need to look at proposal on ground and review with ROW Officer. There is another building between railway and factory buildings shown on aerial photo - need to ensure adequate width and effect on 'enjoyment'. Need to review comments from consultation at next workshop 11.10.16	C18B - route to west of railway looks ok, but road walk includes blind bend, narrow bridge with 0.5m verge. CCC view is that it is unlikely to be supported by road safety. Route past the industrial unit will be uninviting with large security fences Lots of vegetation clearance. C18A - same objections and comments as previously stated. CCC would OBJECT to the current proposals	MM to consult with Suffolk County Council on proposals and consider maintaining a circular route.
C19	Wicken Road	Soham FP106	Diversion south to Network Rail overline bridge (SOB2 2231)	3 responses 100% disagree because new housing in Cherry Tree Lane area so routes into common and fen area should be encouraged for circular access (greater than proposed circular route). East Cambs Ramblers object. Census showed 14, 12, 4 users on Sat, Sun, Mon. CCC to consider position and revert to NR/MM.	Weight of feedback is objection because of loss of circular walks into Horse Fen common land and ROW network e.g. by Ramblers' Association; needs to be retained for well-being of new community growth as well as existing. In addition, Horse Fen alternative route is a road - less pleasant. CCC suggested that if were to divert to private crossing 20 then would probably be viewed more favourably, because people would still be able to do circular walks into Horse Fen common land and ROW network. This would still reduce the crossings in the area from 3 to 2. MM to review.	CCC would like to open up Hitches LX for public use or retain Wicken Road. CCC agree with consultation results regarding circular walks and access to the common land to the west of the railway. Lots of new local housing being proposed. CCC would OBJECT to the current proposals	MM / NR to consider position.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C20	Leonards	Soham FP101	Diversion north to Mill Drove Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing	Underpass was considered but thought it was not suitable as it was more of a culvet. MM to find photo and report for CCC. 6 responses; 17% agreed; others didn't propose an alternative; didn't actually disagree. Sustrans raised issue of new development at Cherry Tree Lane - need to provide circular walks; students use path to go to school; there is a proposal to create a bridleway; landowner is saying children are using a different desire line. In principle CCC would prefer this option as provides sensible mitigation for community; if field is pasture then cross-field in accordance with desire line would be best. If arable then need to check with landowner as may want path to go round edge of field in long term. Could consider Permissive path agreement for cross-field which LO could remove at any time. CCC would prefer this to the currently proposed option. MM to explore option further and check LO position re alignment.	Pros and cons for route - some people objecting because like to go south to access Horse Fen common land and etwork or paths. Diversion would require them to go back on themselves considerable. CCC suggested providing a pop out at road crossing, as would cut out a significant section. MM to investigate and revert at next workshop.	MM confirmed there is a mistake in the R2 consultation plan - should show walked route straight across the field rather than as shown. Pop out is required to Middle Drove. Need to go back to consultation respondees with correct route Potential option to reinstate FP114 with diversion to rear and north of farm buildings - would remove any objections. HOLDING OBJECTION subject to confirming the final scheme proposals and targeted consultation.	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.
C21	Newmarket Bridge	Ely FP24	Diversion northwest to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct SOB2 2235) along an existing track	5 responses 80% agreed. Concerns about flooding of underpass. Request for public use of private crossing if public crossing impassable. Private crossing would be locked so wouldn't be possible. Concern about this as routes are popular tourist routes; problems for people coming long distance - they wouldn't know route was flooded. This would be the weak link. Needs mitigation. MM to investigate through EIA. CCC agrees in principle subject to appropriate mitigation of flooding such that users could use this the path the majority of the time - only not in exceptional circumstances.	CCC position dependent upon outcome of EIA flood data, still awaited.	CCC position dependent upon outcome of EIA flood data, still awaited. Issue of trespass onto the railway if the river is in flood Would NR allow use of the Private User crossing if the underpass is impassable? Has the increase in footpath level been considered HOLDING OBJECTION subject to confirming the final scheme proposals and discussions with the EA	NR to confirm position in regard to use of Private User crossing if the underpass is flooded. MM to report back on EA discussions.
C22	Wells Engine	Ely FP23	Diversion southeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct SOB2 2235)	7 responses; 71% agreed. As above. Path is part of long distance promoted path the Fen Rivers Way. Alternative path for times of flood mooted via new bypass. CCC to check alignment of Ely bypass - is there an option to connect to this instead? 09.08.16 No- there will be a new link over the new bypass bridge over the river but not over the railway, so there would still be the problem of getting over the railway. MM to investigate depending on whether sufficient mitigation can be put in place under railway bridge. Await outcome of EIA.	CCC position dependent upon outcome of EIA flood data, still awaited.	CCC position dependent upon outcome of EIA flood data, still awaited. Issue of trespass onto the railway if the river is in flood Would NR allow use of the Private User crossing if the underpass is impassable? Has the increase in footpath level been considered HOLDING OBJECTION subject to confirming the final scheme proposals and discussions with the EA	NR to confirm position in regard to use of Private User crossing if the underpass is flooded. MM to report back on EA discussions.
C23	Adelaide	Ely FP49	Diversion northeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct BGK 1738)	5 responses 80% disagree See comments for C09_FP49 Ely	CCC and councillors welcome removal of proposal from scheme as, in conjunction with diversion of FP49 to Clayway bridleway crossing, this retains the important circular route most local to Ely. Clayway crossing needs to be improved as currently poor - as previously raised. Field gate difficult to use, no room for horses to wait. Greater usage from diverted pedestrians. AK to arrange separate meeting.	Crossing now removed from the project.	

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C24	Cross Keys	Ely FP50	Diversion northeast to Network Rail underline bridge (viaduct BGK 1738)	8 responses 100% disagree See comments for C09_FP49 Ely	This proposal is significantly ameliorated by the removal of the C23 proposal. CCC may be able to withdraw objection provided this is supported by the public consultation responses, and also on the basis that problems with the Clayway bridleway crossing are improved, as previously raised (see C09 above). Field gate difficult to use, no room for horses to wait. Greater usage from diverted pedestrians. AK to arrange separate meeting.	See also C09 Second Drove. CCC supported the suggestions raised by the Ramblers and several other members of the public that a new footpath link between footpaths 50 and 49 to the west of the railway would, in conjunction with the new footpath at Second Drove reprovide for short circular walks in the area. Post meeting Camilla Rhodes provided further correspondence from local Councillors confirming the above position. CCC reiterated the need for improvements at Clayway crossing - see previous comments. NO OBJECTIONS to the R2 consultation plans subject to the new footpath link between FP 50 and 49 and improvements at Clayway LX.	
C25	Clayway	Littleport FP11	Diversion north along the highway to Sandhill Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing	Comments - some about path being ill-defined; that path is well used; previous application failed at public inquiry as less convenient and no more safe. Path used by weekly Heartbeat group who expressed objection - prefer direct route to river path. NR proposing to improve road route by moving fence at road crossing back to create more room; would keep path on south side. 19 users on Saturday, 15 on Sunday, 10 Monday. CCC suggested bridge at later stage of the project. MM explained would have to balance environmental concerns and intrusion to the neighbouring residences. CCC acknowledge that some mitigation would be put in place, however CCC would still object because it is a well-used path and users have objected on clear grounds of enjoyment. The alternative would simply be an extinguishment.	No change - CCC likely to object as a lot of public objection, because alternative route does not mitigate loss of 'enjoyment' of off-road route to river.	No change - CCC likely to OBJECT as a lot of public objection, because alternative route does not mitigate loss of 'enjoyment' of off-road route to river.	MM to consider 2005 Public Inquiry decision notice at this location.
C26	Poplar Drove No. 30	Public Highway (Poplar Drove)	Extinguishment of the crossing rights. Users make use of Ten Mile Bank, the A10 and Horsley Hale	Status dispute recognised; MM have spoken to parliamentary agents; ongoing. Consultation raised concerns about diverting to A10 busy, unsafe. Most people use by foot bicycle or horse. Landowner concerned about closure devaluing land. 6 responses; 67% disagree. CR noted that the consultation showed this as a private road and therefore people may not have responded as they would had they realised it was public. TRF and East Cambs Ramblers object.	CR explained proposal agreed in outline with Steve Day: Agreed to focus on desired outcome. CCC would prefer to retain Poplar Drove as UCR, as is tarmac and thus better for cyclists and motorbikes. However, willing to see TRO width restriction and prohibition of 4 wheeled vehicles. This would mitigate TRF's objection to this proposal and that of C27 Willow Row Drove. To mitigate loss of access for NMUs, CCC propose a BR link along eastern side of railway between the two crossings. This would enable circular use for local community. However CCC aware of problems with BOAT 31 alternative access for landowner being very soft. CCC would consider retaining WRD as byway with restricted width provided that surface is improved to enable cycle use, and BR link to Poplar Drove is provided. MM to have discussions with landowner re access and revert to CCC.	MM explained that the CCC proposals at C26 & C27 require further dialogue with the landowners, but that from a Project Team perspective there was no reason why Poplar Drove could not be retained for public use (with TRO to restrict 4 wheeled vehicles) and private user rights. HOLDING OBJECTION subject to new proposals after landowner discussions	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C27	Willow Row Drove	Littleport BOAT 31 FP30	Downgrade the byway to a footpath	Comments: Muddy route; few use by car. Should be downgraded to bridleway 6 responses; 100% disagree. TRF and East Cambs Ramblers object. CCC would in principle support retaining Poplar Drove to byway status with a TRO preventing 4 wheeled vehicles; close Willow Row Drove crossing but mitigate with a BR link on E side of railway; subject to second public consultation. Would need to show Poplar Drove as public. NR/MM to consider.	See above	MM explained that the CCC proposals at C26 & C27 require further dialogue with the landowners. The Project Team preference would be to completely shut Willow Road. CCC would require that if Willow Road is shut or downgraded that the BOAT status on the western approach is also extinguished or downgraded HOLDING OBJECTION subject to new proposals after landowner discussions	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.
C28	Black Horse Drove	Public Highway (Black Horse Drove)	Extinguishment of the adopted highway on the level crossing and beyond the railway to the west. To become an occupation level crossing	5 responses; 80 undecided; 20% disagreed. Alternative routes for farm vehicles impractical - private rights to be maintained. CCC do not object to closure provided that all highway over and to W of crossing is stopped up and there is no maintenance liability for the County Council.	No objection provided CCC has no maintenance liability west of crossing.	no further comments and NO OBJECTIONS	
C29	Cassells	Brinkley FP1	Diversion east along Brinkley Road to Brinkley Road Public Highway Automatic Half Barrier level crossing before joining up with Footpath Brinkley 10	2 responses; 1 disagreed; 1 neutral. Support provided that there is a suitable pedestrian route. No users on the first 3 days. Seeking to provide a footway on the south side. CCC support in principle subject to approval of Highway Development Management - would encourage early consultation as if cannot approve then another solution will need to be found. MM to follow up.	MM still need to consult CCC Highways Development Management (Sue Reynolds). Until the issue of a safe footway is resolved, cannot consider option of retaining cul-de-sac. Latter would not satisfy Ramblers.	Position still needs approval of CCC highways No OBJECTION subject to Highway approval <i>Post meeting note: CCC have undertaken a site visit and have the following comments - There may be some engineering problems to solve as the verge is narrow with a 600mm slope down from the field height and the width goes down 400mm through the level crossing. They identified three pieces of street furniture, including a Telegraph pole, that will need to be moved.</i>	MM to progress design and report back to CCC.
C30	Westley Road	Public Highway (Westley Road, Westley Waterless Road)	Downgrade the byway crossing to a footpath with registered vehicle users and other motorised users to make use of alternative public highway routes	12 responses; 17% agreed; 17% neutral; 67% disagreed. Adds 6 miles to journey; 2 commuters; 10 leisure. Crossing to A1308 in poor condition; difficult for HGVs to service 3 houses next to crossing. Request for turning circle; 3 houses may become isolated from Westley Waterless parish so request for private user rights. Alternative road and crossing at Six Mile Bottom very unpleasant for NMUs esp equestrians - road is fast, crosses A1304 near junction with A11. Objection from TRF. Adjacent landowner is a stud; MM haven't discussed use of underpass. MM to investigate. Would NR consider permissive access for carriage drivers with a key? Or the same as Poplar Drove - TRO restricting 4 wheeled traffic. CCC have made many similar TROs on byways to manage their network effectively. User groups are familiar with this. MM to following up investigations - underpass or retaining access at the existing crossing.	CCC concerned that carriage drivers and motorbikes are not catered for (TRF have objected). Unfortunately landowner not amenable to diversion at RB status. Await outcome of consultation and review at workshop.	CC raised same comments as per other crossings in regard to private user rights and District / County Council vehicles, emergency vehicles, post etc CCC concerned with safety record on Brinkley Road / London Road and questioned why the use of a private underpass to at Westley Lodge Farm is not being used. CCC asked about potential for retaining P2W access HOLDING OBJECTION subject to resolving the above points	MM to consider comments and progress design and report back to CCC

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy - Summary of Cambridge County Council Meetings Comments and Actions							
MM REF	Name	FP REF	GRIP 0 PROPOSAL	WORKSHOP 25/08/16 AND 02/08/16 following outcome of Public Consultation	INTERIM TELECONFERENCE 28.09.16	Workshop 11.10.16	ACTIONS from 11.10.16 workshop
C31	Littleport station		traffic	<p>Raised walkway proposed to mitigate drainage. Headroom 2.5m. ECDC concerns over disability access. NR considering parking for mobility access on triangle adjacent to road; ticket machine on east platform. 120 passengers a day. Other concerns raised were lighting and waiting times at crossing. Census data sought. - agreed needs to cover all use types. Can only look at rail benefits versus capital cost. NR would consider a lifted overbridge if developer funding was available.</p> <p>Discussion required to agree how liability for introducing passengers into CCC's highway would be. Consider retaining cycletrack.</p> <p>Discussion also needed over traffic management for diversion routes.</p> <p>Meeting held with CCC Highways 08.08.16. Three options discussed; favoured option is to retain traffic on a give way basis adding a raised walkway to cater for times of flood.</p>	BC to ask James Rigney for update	<p>MM confirmed that traffic surveys are due to start. These will inform traffic analysis.</p> <p>CCC have NO OBJECTIONS to the Round 2 proposals subject to no adverse issue arising out of the traffic analysis</p>	
C33	Jack O'Tell	Private Crossing	Close and divert to Bannold Road LX (footpath crossing to remain unaffected)		<p>Concerns raised by CCC Highways regarding additional agricultural vehicles on adopted roads, byways and PROW tracks. Some of these roads / tracks are liable to subsidence. MM to contact Evan Loughlin to discuss further</p>	<p>CCC have concerns in regard to: Farm vehicles on footpaths (peat soil in this area). Long Drove - single track, poor sub base, edging onto soft verges, intensification of use Issues with PROW condition and damage to unsuitable routes Bridge structures on PROW not suitable for vehicles</p> <p>CCC queried whether the local authority would have private user rights (not valid at this crossing)</p> <p>MM to meet with CCC Highways / PROW</p> <p>HA can restrict vehicles via weight restrictions or Highways Act powers to chase for damages. The preference to keep these vehicles off the PROW network and adopted highway via use of the private level crossings</p> <p>HOLDING OBJECTION until issues can be resolved</p>	MM to meet with CCC highways and further assess and consider impacts on the PROW and highway network and any mitigation measures required.
C34	Fysons	Private Crossing	Close and divert to Bannold Road LX		See C33	see C33	
C35	Ballast Pit	Private Crossing	Close and divert to Bannold Road LX		See C33	see C33	