

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

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

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

ANDREW KENNING

**REBUTTAL
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

-FOR-

S01 SEA WALL

Document Reference	NR/30/4/3
--------------------	-----------

I have reviewed Proofs of Evidence submitted on behalf of Suffolk County Council in support of their objection to the Order (Obj/29), and by others objecting to the proposal for S01 Sea Wall. I have the following comments on the evidence as presented:

Proof of Evidence of Annette Robinson (Obj/29/W3/S01) – S01 Sea Wall –

1. At paragraph 13 of her Proof, Ms Robinson states:

The Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Strategy “Designing for Maintenance”, section 6.5, notes that good asset management starts at the planning and design phase when decisions can be made that affect the amount of maintenance required, the ease with which the work can be done and the whole life cost of the asset. This practice is reinforced in the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan 2016 which requires all new structures to follow a technical approval process to ensure that these new assets are designed with durability and whole life costing taken into account. In preparing for the TWAO, NR has not ensured that good management of new assets has been designed in at the design and planning stage, despite repeated requests from SCC.

2. The method that Network Rail has adopted regarding design of the proposed footbridge structures, is to use (where supplied) highway authority typical designs. The footbridge designs in the Suffolk order are largely based on the typical details supplied by Suffolk highway authority. At this moment in time we are currently preparing the ‘Approval In Principle’ (AIP) documentation for the footbridge designs, following the guidance contained in BD 2/12 ‘Technical Approval of Highway Structures’, for submission to Suffolk County Council in their role as the Technical Approval Authority (TAA). The technical approval process ensures that any new assets meet the requirements of the County Council and are designed and detailed with durability and whole life costing taken into account. If the order is confirmed Network Rail will then undertake the Detailed Design of the structures in line with the AIP documents. It is at this point that the full detail of the Suffolk typical design requirements will be incorporated into the designs following which Design/Assessment/Check certificates will need to be approved by the TAA as required by BD2. As the approval process incorporates approval from Suffolk highway authority Network Rail believes that we are designing for maintenance.

3. At paragraph 7 of her Proof, Ms Robinson states:

‘SCC Rights of Way Officers were invited on the 14th September 2017 to accompany the NR bridge engineers on their site visits on the 19th and 20th September to assess the bridge works– only 2 working days’ notice. For proposals SO1 and SO2, the engineers relied on the knowledge of the Area Rights of Way Officer to estimate where the NR maps showed the location of the proposed alternative routes and the bridges on the ground. This shows a concerning lack of preparation and lack of real desire to involve the Highway Authority to achieve successful proposals, as well as a lack of communication and information provision to NR’s structural engineers who had to rely on the Area Rights of Way Officer to estimate where the routes and structures would be.’

4. The Network Rail Design Team (ICE) site team met with Martin Williams (a Suffolk Rights of Way officer) on both sites. The ICE site team had carried out the appropriate activities to enable them to survey the site marked for the structure (bridge/stairs proposal). The ICE team liaised with the Rights of Way officer and the land owners on both sites listening to and noting concerns and carried out non- intrusive (no ground was broken) topographical and photographic surveys of the proposed structures sites which were on the design freeze drawings. The site team took note of Mr Williams’s comments and concerns about the proposed route in the design freeze drawings and these were relayed to the project team. I wish to clarify that at no point did the site team rely on Mr Williams to estimate routes or structure locations

Witness declaration

I hereby declare as follows:

- (i) This proof of evidence includes all facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinions that I have expressed and that the Inquiry's attention has been drawn to any matter which would affect the validity of that opinion.
- (ii) I believe the facts that I have stated in this proof of evidence are true and that the opinions expressed are correct.
- (iii) I understand my duty to the Inquiry to help it with matters within my expertise and I have complied with that duty.