

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

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

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

ANDREW KENNING

**REBUTTAL OF
PROOFS OF EVIDENCE**

-FOR-

S02 – BRANTHAM HIGH BRIDGE

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

I have reviewed Proofs of Evidence submitted on behalf of Suffolk County Council in support of their objection to the Order (Obj/29) and of others objecting to the proposals in respect of S02 Brantham High Bridge. I have the following comments on the evidence as presented:

Proof of Evidence of Annette Robinson (Obj/29/W3/SO2) – S02 Brantham High Bridge

1. At paragraph 7 of her Proof, Ms Robinson raises the same concern as raised in paragraph 7 of her Proof regarding S01, namely:

‘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.’

2. I have responded to this in my rebuttal proof for S01 Sea Wall (NR/30/4-4). As I state in that rebuttal proof, 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 reiterate that at no point did the site team rely on Mr Williams to estimate routes or structure locations
3. I would add that whilst the design freeze drawings included a bridge at this site, when the ICE team visited the site in September 2017, they considered that the issue with levels, which had led to the inclusion of a bridge as a ‘worst case’ scenario in the design, could be overcome with steps instead of a bridge. This is discussed further in the rebuttal proof of Susan Tilbrook for S02 (NR/32/4-4).

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.