

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

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

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

SUMMARY REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

-OF-

SUSAN TILBROOK

Document Reference	NR32/5
--------------------	--------

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	General Points	2
3	Crossing Specific Points	3

1 Introduction

- 1.1 My Rebuttal Proof of Evidence has been prepared on behalf of Network Rail to respond to particular matters raised in the Proofs of Evidence submitted by representatives from and on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum, the Ramblers Association, AL Lee and Roger James
- 1.2 It is not intended that this rebuttal proof should address matters that have already been addressed in my Proof of Evidence (NR32/1) or of the evidence of other witnesses for the Promoters; however, cross references to relevant parts of that evidence are given below, where appropriate. The fact that I have not expressly rebutted a point does not mean that it is accepted.

2 General Points

- 2.1 My rebuttal proof of evidence (NR32/4) responds to points raised in regard to the general topics set out below.
- 2.2 In section 2.1, I address points raised by Peter Taylor of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) with regard to the Road Safety Audit review carried out by the Council and I discuss the Road Safety Audit (RSA) process set out in HD 19/15. I also set out why I believe that an exception report is not required for the crossings that remain in the Order. Mr Taylor states concerns about the risk assessments carried out by Network Rail and I confirm that safety on the diversion routes has been assessed through the RSA process and no attempt has been made to compare these with the level crossing risk assessments.
- 2.3 In section 2.2, I address points raised by Roger Buisson of the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum with regard to his concerns about
- an increase in safety risk that arises from the diversion of routes onto roads;
 - alternatives that increase the length of the journey, which will he suggests may make access more difficult and/or a less attractive proposition for many people; and
 - an increase in the number of bridges, new flights of steps and diversions through culverts with a potential flood risk that he suggests may produce severe access problems for a range of users.
- 2.4 In section 2.3, I respond to points raised by Camilla Rhodes of Cambridgeshire County Council regarding the Book of Reference and I confirm that they do not affect the principle of the changes applied for.
- 2.5 I confirm that none of the general points raised by the objectors in their proofs of evidence change my views and conclusions as set out in my proof of evidence (NR32/1).

3 Crossing Specific Points

3.1 My rebuttal proof of evidence (NR32/4) makes specific reference and points to the following crossings:

- a) C04 No.20
 - CCC Road Safety Audit Review
 - Use of Station Road
 - Suitability of proposed Diversion
- b) C07 No.37
 - The need for a utility route
 - Steps on the diversion route
 - Use of London Road
 - CCC Road Safety Audit Review
- c) C11 Furlong Drove
 - Trail riders
 - Equestrian users
- d) C14 Eastrea Cross Drove
 - Suitability of the route
- e) C15 Brickyard Drove
 - Suitability of the route
- f) C20 Leonards
 - Suitability of diversion route
 - Consent issues
- g) C21 Newmarket Bridge
 - Flood zone
- h) C22 Wells Engine
 - Suitability of diversion route
 - Flood zone
- i) C24 Cross Keys
 - Suitability of diversion route
- j) C25 Clayway
 - Suitability of diversion route
- k) C26 Poplar Drove and C27 Willow Row Drove
 - Trail riders
- l) C29 Cassells
 - Use of Brinkley Road

3.2 I confirm that the crossing specific points raised by the objectors in their proofs of evidence do not change my views and conclusions as set out in my proof of evidence (NR32/1).

