

NETWORK RAIL  
(ESSEX AND OTHERS  
LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION ORDER)

ROBERT HUTLEY  
REBUTTAL OF PROOF OF EVIDENCE  
OF  
DANIEL FISK

P292 E48  
September 2016

It is claimed;

‘Wheatsheaf is one of the level crossings in the county of Essex.  
Network Rail’s level crossing risk assessments are supported by the use of All Level Crossing Risk Model (ALCRM)  
Wheatsheaf level crossing currently has an ALCRM score of D10.  
Key issues relate to sun glare.  
There were no incidents of misuse, no near misses and no accidents at this crossing between 2011 and 2015’

P189. ALCRM risk score D7.  
This suggests risk adjusted to justify closure.  
This footpath is only used by able bodied adults in good weather, due to the nature of the footpath and crossing and is safe for those users.

P292

It is claimed

‘Public consultation was undertaken in June on initial options for change at the level crossing. As part of the consultation process a wide range of statutory consultees, landowners and user groups were also consulted. The responses have been taken into account when determining the preferred option.’

The landowner was not consulted in June. User groups primarily affected were not consulted at all (equestrian users and owners of 2 residential properties adversely impacted)

Responses and legitimate concerns were summarily dismissed and were not taken into account by Network Rail.

Safety on Station Road was not properly assessed as traffic was not surveyed during harvest when large agricultural machinery is on the narrow lane. This coincides with the busiest walking period and is confirmed by Network Rail crossing data.  
The crossing was used by 27 people in 9 days in July, only 2 people in 18 days in September.  
The proposed diversion along station Road would put pedestrians at greater risk than using the existing footpath and crossing.

P414. Response to obj 085

‘Many public rights of way are shared between users including pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and agricultural and private vehicles. It is not considered that the provision of a public footpath precludes the land owner giving permission for equestrian activities. Further discussion could take place with the Highway Authority regarding creation of a bridleway at the location rather than a footpath.’

This footpath is not justified. It replaces a north-south route with an east -west route. It significantly increases road walking.

Horse riders will not be permitted by the land owner to use a public footpath.

Horse riders do not want a bridleway, they are not able to use the only bridleway in Wrabness as it is not safe to ride due to walkers.

The land owner knows and understands the village and this permitted facility benefits the public. The proposal does not.

The proposal closes a safe footpath and crossing, puts pedestrians at risk on Station Road and puts Horses on Wheatsheaf Lane/Church Road, creating increased risk to all road users.