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## 1 Introduction

1.1 This Rebuttal Proof of Evidence has been prepared on behalf of Network Rail to respond to particular matters raised in the Proofs of Evidence submitted on behalf of the following parties which were received by Network Rail on 18 January 2018. These include the Proofs of Evidence of:
1.1.1 Suffolk County Council (OBJ/29)
a) Andrew Woodin
b) Abdul Razaq
1.1.2 Forest District Council (OBJ/27)
a) Sara Noonan
1.1.3 The Ramblers (OBJ/36)
a) Philip Prigg
1.1.4 The Suffolk Local Access Forum (OBJ/23)
a) Barry Hall
1.1.5 All Saints School (OBJ/84)
a) Rachel Ward
1.1.6 Newmarket Town Council (OBJ/03)
a) Roberta Bennett
b) Warwick Hirst
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 other witnesses for the Promoter; 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.
1.3 I believe the facts and opinions stated to be true and that my evidence conforms to the standards and requirements of my professional body.

## 2 S22 Weatherby

| 2.1 | Suitability of Diversion routes |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2.1.1 | At paragraph 9 of his Proof of Evidence (OBJ/29/W2), Andrew Woodin states that the use of <br> The Avenue would "involve gradients not present on the existing route" |
| 2.1.2 | At paragraph 21 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj27), Sara Noonan on behalf of Forest Heath <br> District Council states that "the proposed diversion using existing roads is considered neither <br> suitable nor convenient due to the length and steepness of the route" |
| 2t paragraph 9 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj36), Philip Prigg on behalf of The Ramblers states |  |
| that "this route would be less pedestrian-friendly, being entirely on roadside footways, with steep |  |
| gradients in both directions." |  |

2.1.8 The diversion route shown on the TWAO plans submitted with the order can be seen on the design freeze plan, drawing number MMD-367516-S22-GEN-005, in Appendix F of core document reference NR26.
2.1.9 With reference to this plan it can be seen that the diversion route uses Green Road north of the road bridge on New Cheveley Road/The Avenue. LIDAR level information indicates that there is a short section of Green Road which has an existing gradient of approximately $6.6 \%$ (1:15) over a 55 m length.
2.1.10 It is considered that at present there is good comparability between maximum gradients on both the existing routes that pedestrian must take via Cricket Field Road ( $5.8 \%$ over 60 m ) and on Green Road ( $6.6 \%$ over 55 m ) when using the diversion route. Both these roads, currently provided and deemed suitable for use by Suffolk County Council as adopted highway for all users, have gradients which exceed the recommended 5\% slope (1:20) for inclusive mobility but which are less than the maximum gradient of $8 \%(1: 12)$.
2.1.11 The existing gradient of the remaining part of Cricket Field Road derived from LIDAR data is approximately $2.9 \%$ (1:34.5). The gradient of New Cheveley Road from the junction of Cricket Field Road to Green Road is approximately $2.5 \%$ (1 in 40) over the first 150 m from Cricket Field

Road then becomes approximately 4.4\% (1 in 22.7) up to Green Road, a distance of approximately 300 m . The section of Granary Road is less than $2 \%$ ( 1 in 50 ). These roads, currently provided and deemed suitable for use by Suffolk County Council for all users, have gradients which are less than the $5 \%$ gradient (1:20) recommended for inclusive mobility.
2.1.12 It is noted that the level crossing itself is only a short section of any pedestrian routes using the railway crossing and is approximately 15 m in length. Thus all ongoing routes have to use the pedestrian friendly public footways with their associated features such as tactile paving, drop crossings, signage and road markings as deemed fit for purpose by Suffolk County Council. The proposed diversion route will also use such existing footways and facilities.
2.1.13 At paragraph $2 e$ of her Proof of Evidence (OBJ/O3), Roberta Bennett states that "there were vehicles parked on the pavement that would force pedestrians in to the road. In addition it is noted there is a fixed telegraph pole narrowing the pavement immediately north of the railway bridge"
2.1.14 In response, it is considered that the majority of properties that front onto the diversion route have driveways or other off street parking facilities reducing the need for on street parking. New Cheveley Road is wide enough to allow 2 vehicles to pass when vehicles are parked legally (without obstructing the highway). This assessment has been confirmed during the project team's site visits when there was no evidence of vehicles obstructing the footway. It is however acknowledged that the practice of parking cars on footways is unfortunately a common feature of the urban environment and this may occur at times on the diversion route. It is considered that the existing routes between the principally residential area to the south and the services to the north of the crossing are equally as likely to experience the issue. It is an offence to obstruct the footway or to a drive a vehicle on the footway if not accessing a private driveway.
2.1.15 Local narrowings of the public footway are permitted for such features as road signs, telegraph poles, litters bins, street lighting etc and are a normal feature of the street environment. We do not consider that items such as telegraph pole, located on a road already used by the general public, will present an issue for users diverting from the level crossing.
2.2 Community severance/lengths of diversion routes
2.2.1 At paragraph 8 of his Proof of Evidence (OBJ/29/W2), Andrew Woodin states that "the distance from the junction of New Cheveley Road and Cricket Field Road via the level crossing and along Park Lane to the Rookery Health Centre on Fred Archer Way, which is also near to the library, Newmarket Day Centre and the Forest Heath District Council offices is 1000 m . I have used this location as a likely destination for many users. At an average walking speed of 2.5 miles per hour (the pace used by Network Rail), this would take just under 15 minutes. In paragraph 9 it is stated that the level crossing closure would add an additional 6 minutes to journey time."
2.2.2 I have discussed the census data which was collected during the works feasibility stage in paragraphs 2.13.4 and 2.13.5 of my Proof of Evidence. The summary of the census survey has been supplied in NR25. To assist my assessment of the current use of the level crossing further I have used the full hourly survey of the nine day survey period, which can be found in Appendix $B$ to this rebuttal proof.
2.2.3 The data collected shows that a very small number of users of the level crossing are identified as elderly ( 6 users) or mobility impaired ( 17 users) who are likely to have a slower walking rate. In considering an appropriate walking speed it is recognised that there a variance to the speeds which people walk. However, given that the total number of unimpaired users comprises 3034
( $95 \%$ ) of the total number of adult users (3193) it is appropriate to consider that a walking speed of 3 mph is a suitable walking rate for the urban environment. I have noted this 2.13.11 of my paragraph Proof of Evidence.
2.2.4 To reach the junction of Fred Archer Way/Wellington Street in the vicinity of the destination suggested by Mr Woodin from the junction of New Cheveley Road/Cricket Field Road via the level crossing (via Park Lane and Sun Lane) would require the user to undertake a journey of approximately 950 m at present.
2.2.5 Upon the closure of the level crossing the users would be required undertake an equivalent journey of approximately 1270m (via The Avenue, High Street, Church lane and New Cut).
2.2.6 The resultant additional journey time for the extra 320 m , based on a rate of 3 mph , would be approximately 4 minutes with the journey time for 1270 m taking approximate 15 minutes.
2.2.7 paragraph 21 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj27), Sara Noonan on behalf of Forest Heath
District Council refers to a map of local community facilities which is provided in Appendix 7 of
her Proof of Evidence.
2.2.8 At paragraph 10 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj84), Dr Rachel Wood states that "parents with several small children may walk to and fro three times a day to drop off and pick up from both nursery and school; 6x10 minutes is one whole hour extra walking. Raazia Khan (a parent) takes 5 minutes to walk to school via the Weatherby Crossing - using the alternative route takes 15-20 minutes. Conversely, Newmarket Academy students who live south of the railway are already faced with a 30-minute walk twice a day. If the crossing was closed, they would be walking for 40 minutes each way".
2.2.9 At paragraph 10 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj84), Dr Rachel Wood expressed local concern that "closing the Weatherby Crossing would restrict access to key facilities"
2.2.10 In the section of his Proof entitled PARENTS WITH SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN on page 3 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj03), Warwick Hirst with regards to the diversion route states that parents going to school with children "do the full 3400 metres journey as they have to take and then later to collect their children to/from the School".
2.2.11 At paragraph $2 f$ of her Proof of Evidence(OBJ/O3), Roberta Bennett states that "Newmarket Town Council argues that this diversion is too long, adding over a mile in total on a return trip. This will take the average walker and additional 16 minutes of travel time in each direction. (Average walking speed of 2.5 mph or $1.115 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ )"
2.2.12 In response I have noted in paragraph 2.13.11 of my Proof of Evidence that the length of each diversion for individual users will vary depending on origin and destination. Users living closest to the level crossing will have to undertake the longest length of diversion which will vary again according to destination.
2.2.13 I have addressed the appropriate walking rate in 2.2.3 of this Rebuttal proof.
2.2.14 I have discussed the likely increased increase in journey time from the south of the level crossing to the community facilities in the vicinity of the Library north of the High Street in paragraph 2.3.5.
2.2.15 With reference to the community facilities in the vicinity of the Town Council Offices and Kings Theatre I would note that to reach the Town Hall from the junction of New Cheveley

Road/Cricket Field Road via the level crossing (via Park Lane and Kingston Passage) would require the user to undertake a journey of approximately 930 m .
2.2.16 Upon the closure of the level crossing the users would be required undertake an equivalent journey of approximately 995 m (via The Avenue).
2.2.17 The resultant additional journey time for the extra 65 m , based on a rate of 3 mph , would be less than one minute.
2.2.18 The catchment area for Ditton Lodge Primary School is south of the level crossing. In assessing whether the level crossing could be considered to provide a route to this school, I have considered further the data in the full hourly census survey. This shows that children only walk westbound, from the Cricket Field Road side of the level crossing to the Granary Road side. That is, they walk away from Ditton Lodge Primary School during morning period from 0700-0900 rather than using the level crossing as a route to school. I therefore consider that Ditton Lodge Primary School is unlikely to be affected by the closure of the level crossing.
2.2.19 Children's play areas are provided to the north and south of the level crossing and so upon the level crossing closure, access to either one of these would be retained for residents either side of the level crossing, as is the case at the moment.
2.2.20 I have indicated that the full census data has recorded the breakdown of users on an hourly basis. The census figures suggest that the level crossing is used by up to 16 children during the hours 0700-0900 which can be considered to be associated with All Saints CEVA Primary School. It is acknowledged that some children may be associated with other facilities such as the Newmarket Academy. The school capacity is 210 pupils with approximately 200 at school presently.
2.2.21 I would note that to reach the All Saints CEVA School from the junction of New Cheveley Road/Cricket Field Road via the level crossing (via Park Lane and Kingston Passage) would require the user to undertake a journey of approximately 580 m .
2.2.22 Upon the closure of the level crossing the users would be required undertake an equivalent journey of approximately 960m (via the road bridge, Green Road and Granby Street)
2.2.23 The resultant additional journey time for the extra 380 m , based on a walking rate of 3 mph , would be approximately 4.5 minutes and the 960 m would take approximately 11.5 minutes.
2.2.24 It is acknowledged that younger school age children may take longer to walk the route and assuming a rate of $0.85 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}(1.9 \mathrm{mph})$ this would increase the journey time over the additional distance for a percentage of school children by a further 3 minutes (approximately).
2.2.25 It can be seen that, for the majority of school parents making the round trip to All Saints School, the additional distance is 760 m .
2.2.26 Newmarket Academy lies approximately 1.5 km north of the level crossing and 1.7 km north of the junction of New Cheveley Road/Cricket Field Lane. The diversion route for any pupils walking to the Academy would be very similar to the route I have described in paragraph 2.2.5 ( 320 m ) and would add an additional 4 minutes approximately to the current journey time of about 20 minutes.
2.2.27 The main shopping facilities are located along the High Street and how they are accessed will vary depending on the users requirements. Generally the additional walking time to reach the High Street from the junction of New Cheveley Road/Cricket Field Lane. The diversion route for
any pupils walking to the Academy would be very similar to the route I have described in paragraph 2.2.5 ( 320 m ) and would add an additional 4 minutes to the current journey time.
2.2.28 It is acknowledged that residents of Willow Crescent will always have an additional 200 m additional walking to reach the junction of New Cheveley Road/Cricket Field Lane which would equate to approximately 2.5 minutes additional walking on the times I have quoted above.
2.2.29 To reach the allotment access and football fields on Cricket Field Lane south of the level crossing would require an additional walking distance of approximately 700 m from the north side of the level crossing on Granary Road. This would equate to an additional 7.5 minutes walking compared to the route at present.
2.2.30 In context of the location of the existing facilities it is acknowledged that there will be variable affect on the users but that an outright severance of facilities cannot be claimed to have occurred as a result of the level crossing closure and that users would experience an increase in walking journey time varying from less than one minute to approximately 7.5 minutes (assuming an average walking speed) which again depends on origin and destination.
2.2.31 As a matter of comparison it is noted that the hypothetical provision of bridge at this location would require a stepped and ramped footbridge to ensure full accessibility. The use of the ramps and landing areas would require a diversion along the ramps for those users with a preference to avoid steps (elderly, pushchairs, mobility impaired users) of approximately 300 m depending on detailed design parameters. This would entail negotiating a slope of 5\% (1 in 20) for the majoring of this length which would have the provision of landing areas to provide resting points.

### 2.3 Accessibility Issues

2.3.1 At paragraph 26 of his Proof of Evidence (OBJ/29/W2), Andrew Woodin concludes his considerations on the DIA issues of the level crossing closure with a question as to whether a full DIA has been undertaken.
2.3.2 At paragraph 21 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj27), Sara Noonan on behalf of Forest Heath District Council states that the proposed diversion would "disadvantages those with disabilities, the elderly and parents of small children"
2.3.3 At paragraph 9 of his Proof of Evidence (Obj36), Philip Prigg on behalf of The Ramblers states that the diversion is "almost a kilometre longer than simply crossing the line, as at present. The town centre would then be less accessible, particularly to the elderly and disabled."
2.3.4 I have discussed the lengths of potential routes likely to be undertaken as a result of the level crossing closure in section 2.2 of this rebuttal within the context of community facilities.
2.3.5 In response I have noted in paragraph 2.13.13 of my Proof of Evidence that due cognisance has been taken to the users of the level crossing with protected characterises and that a full Diversity Impact Assessment was undertaken. I note that the DIA concluded that due to the availability of the alternative route in the local area to cross the railway, closure and redirection along the proposed diversion route is considered an appropriate solution. However, there were further points raised as potential actions for which consideration should be given which are also addressed in my Proof of Evidence paragraph 2.13.13.
2.3.6 I have appended the full DIA for $S 22$ in Appendix $C$ of this rebuttal proof.

| 2.3.7 | I note that page 7 of the DIA refers to a higher number of users of the level crossing which was based on preliminary census data correlation. I am satisfied that the final lower figure, as detailed in the census data NR25, would not change the recommendations made in the DIA |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.3 .8 | In paragraph 2.2.3 of this rebuttal I have highlighted that the level crossing census data records that the number of elderly and impaired using the level crossing is 6 and 17 respectively. For completeness it is noted that the census data recorded 5 mobility scooters and 1 wheelchair. |
| 2.3.9 | Children and pushchairs amounted to 523 uses of the level crossing. |
| 2.3.10 | The total users of the level crossing including the above users is 3597 |
| 2.4 | Air Quality |
| 2.4.1 | At paragraph 21 of her Proof of Evidence (Obj27), Sara Noonan on behalf of Forest Heath District Council states that an Air Quality Monitoring Area (AQMA) "remains in place on Old Station Road (see map Appendix 7). Increased car use for short trips on this road, will likely lead to increased traffic queues, increased engine idling and short trips with cold engines are more polluting". |
| 2.4 .2 | At paragraph 6b and 6c of her Proof of Evidence(OBJ/O3), Roberta Bennett states that "there is a high risk that the additional travel time will push people to use their cars rather than walk to access the retail and employment centres at the heart of Newmarket" and that "there is concern that this would have an impact on emissions in the centre of Newmarket" |
| 2.4 .3 | In response I note that the AQMA is on Old Station Road and I have attached documentation of this area which is available on the West Suffolk Planning website in Appendix D of this rebuttal. |
| 2.4 .4 | I note that the documentation states at paragraph 10.2 that "it is important to understand that the AQMA was retained along Old Station Road not due to exceedances of the annual mean objective, but due to lack of conclusive evidence that the AQMA could be revoked" and concludes that "we would therefore expect the AQMA to be revoked in 2019". There are no recorded actions in 10.4 which note a cause for concern regarding the use of private cars and a general desire to promote 'greener' measures is noted. |
| 2.4 .5 | The objections have been raised based on the speculation that an unspecified number of people will transfer to cars and that this will increase emissions in Newmarket, impinging on the AQMA in the vicinity of Old Station Road. From the evidence I have presented regarding usage and diversion distances I do not consider that the closure of the crossing would result in a move away from walking and cycling to car use at the scale suggested. |
| 2.5 | Visual Intrusion |
| 2.5.1 | In the section entitled S22-Weatherby of his Proof of Evidence (Obj23), Barry Hall on behalf of SLAF states that the proposed palisade fence will be a visual intrusion. |
| 2.5.2 | In response, I note that the proposed fencing was included within the scheme design when the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening was undertaken, the process of which is summarised in Tab 8 of my Proof of Evidence. The Secretary of State for Transportation has confirmed that a full EIA is not required. Mr Kenning sets out, in his rebuttal proof, why the proposed fencing is required, and whilst the exact details will be a matter for detailed design, I do not consider that the fencing will result in an unacceptable visual intrusion in this location. |
| 2.6 | Census Survey |


| 2.6.1 | In his section entitles PEDESTRIAN USAGE OF THE WETHERBY LEVEL CROSSING of his Proof of Evidence (Obj 03), Warwick Hirst states that the "the survey is incomplete. It states that 6 pedestrians were elderly. How was this defined" |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.6.2 | I have described the census survey process in section 1.8 of my Proof of Evidence (NR32/1). All census data collected by an approved subcontractor (Tracsis) was subject to their checking procedures which are compliant with ISO9001:2008 Quality Management System, which specifies requirements for a quality management system to consistently provide a product that meets customer and applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. Mott MacDonald undertook sample checks to verify the integrity of the supplied data, which involved watching clips of video surveys and counting users as well as undertaking verification checks of calculations included in Excel spreadsheets supplied by Tracsis. I am satisfied that the census survey is complete. |
| 2.6.3 | The working definition of 'Elderly' used in the collation of census data is - 'Any person who could be identifiable as being over 60. If not completely visible, identifiable by speed of walking or if they are struggling to cross. If they are using a walking stick or other apparatus they need to be counted as Impaired instead'. |
| 2.7 | Road Safety |
| 2.7.1 | At paragraph 2.13.17 of my Proof of Evidence NR32/1 it was stated that "accident data for the 5 year period 2011 to 2015 recorded 2 accidents of slight severity in the vicinity of the route and no pedestrians were involved." |
| 2.7.2 | I should note that this is incorrect and the second slight accident did involve a pedestrian. |
| 2.8 | Community Severance |
| 2.8.1 | At paragraph 6a of her Proof of Evidence(OBJ/03), Roberta Bennett states that: |
|  | The closure of the crossing would undermine the positive efforts that the Business Improvement District are working on with partners to improve dwell time, footfall and ultimately spend in Newmarket's town centre. |
| 2.8.2 | I response, it is recognised that the permissive use of the level crossing is regarded as a valued link by the community. However, I am advised that Local Authorities and the community have been aware of the desire by Network Rail to close the level crossing since this intention was placed in the public domain in 2012. |
| 2.8.3 | At paragraph 6b and 6d of her Proof of Evidence(OBJ/O3), Roberta Bennett states that "There is a high risk that the additional travel time will push people to use their cars rather than walk to access the retail and employment centres at the heart of Newmarket." and "there is additional concern that due to the existing parking pressures in Newmarket, shoppers may choose to travel to out-of-town shopping destinations or shop online." |
| 2.8.4 | From the evidence I have presented regarding usage and diversion distances I do not consider that the closure of the crossing would result in a material move away from walking and cycling to car use at the scale suggested. |
| 2.8.5 | At paragraph 6e of her Proof of Evidence(OBJ/O3), Roberta Bennett states that "Those shoppers that continue to walk will be affected by the addition 30 minutes travel time which will reduce their available leisure time within the town." |

2.8.6 In response, I have addressed the additional journey times for reasonable routes to local amenities in Newmarket town centre in Section 2.2 of this rebuttal. These are significantly less that the 30 minutes additional time suggested by Ms Bennett, and it is not considered that this additional journey time would significantly impact upon time available for leisure time within the town.

### 2.9 Health

2.9.1 At paragraph 2(I) of his Proof of Evidence (Obj29/W7), Abdul Razaq states that closure of the level crossing will lead "individuals, particularly older members of the community, becoming isolated from services within their local communities which could have a negative impact on their emotional wellbeing."
2.9.2 In response, I have discussed the existing use of the level crossing at paragraphs 2.13.5 and 2.13.6. of my proof NR32/1. With reference to the census survey shown in NR25, in the context of walking use, it can be seen that the survey was undertaken in term time and that the usage figures show 3597 pedestrians were recorded to use the crossing during the 9 day census period of whom 285 were accompanied children, 119 were unaccompanied children, six were elderly, 17 were impaired, one was in a wheelchair, 119 were in pushchairs or prams, five were on mobility scooters and the remainder were unimpaired adults.
2.9.3 I believe this evidence shows that the level crossing is not used to a significant degree by those users for whom Mr Razaq has expressed concern.

## Appendices

A. LIDAR level information ..... 11
B. Full pedestrian census survey ..... 12
C. Diversity Impact Assessment ..... 13
D. Old Station Road Air Quality documentation extract - West Suffolk Planning ..... 14

## A. LIDAR level information



B. Full pedestrian census survey
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| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| $3_{3}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
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## C. Diversity Impact Assessment

## Diversity Impact Assessment (DIA)

Guidance for completing each section is provided in the
Everyone Guide to Diversity Impact Assessments

Name of policy, programme or project: S22 Weatherby - Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy

| Your Name: TBC | Your Job Title: Scheme Project Manager |
| :--- | :--- |
| Your Email: TBC | Department: Level crossings |

Document Ref: TBC Version No: 1

## Step 1: Clarifying aims

Q1. What are the aims of this project/piece of work?


## Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy

Network Rail has committed to achieving a 25\% reduction in level crossing system risk nationally as part of a programme of works undertaken within Control Period 5 (CP5), which runs from 2014-19.

Network Rail has been working hard to better manage its level crossings and the risks they pose. It has developed proposals for the possible closure or change to public rights of way at around 130 level crossings within the counties of Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, and the unitary authorities of Thurrock, Havering, and Southend-on-Sea. This is referred to as the Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Strategy ('the Strategy'). Closing or modifying level crossings can help to bring about a number of benefits:

- Improve the safety of level crossing users;
- Deliver a more efficient and reliable railway, which is vital in supporting the regional and UK economy;
- Reduce the ongoing operating and maintenance cost of the railway;
- Reduce delays to trains, pedestrians and other highway users; and
- Improve journey time reliability for railway, highway and other rights of way users.


## S22 - Weatherby level crossing

The crossing has an All Level Crossing Risk Model (ALCRM - the system used to measure risk at crossings) score of D2. The individual risk rating for crossing users is ' $D$ ' (where ' $A$ ' is highest risk and ' $M$ ' is the lowest) and the collective risk rating for this crossing is ' 2 ' (where ' 1 ' is highest risk and ' 13 ' is lowest), making Weatherby a high risk crossing. Key issues at the crossing include the large numbers of users, sun glare, and deliberate user error. Between 2011 and 2015, eight near misses, one accident and no incidents of misuse were recorded at this crossing.
The crossing is on the single track Cambridge to Ipswich line and is located 400 m north east of Newmarket station. Approximately 34 trains use this part of the network daily at a line speed of 40 mph .

Weatherby level crossing is a 'Stop, Look and Listen' crossing, where the user determines whether it is safe to cross. The level crossing is not a public right of way; it is a private facility which is used by the public. The level crossing has a non-slip wooden deck with tarmac approaches and kissing gates on either side of the railway. Appendix A contains site photographs.
Network Rail aims to ensure the most viable option for continued access across the line based on the need to ensure public safety, meet local needs, and ensure compliance with its duties under the Equality Act 2010.

## Project location

Weatherby level crossing is located in the town of Newmarket, Suffolk. The level crossing is in a highly urbanised area with residential properties and local amenities located in close proximity to the railway line, on either side of the line.

The map below shows the location of the level crossing.


## Proposals for the project

Network Rail has conducted two rounds of public consultation; the first was to obtain feedback on its initial options for level crossings in the programme (in June 2016), and the second to obtain feedback on its preferred options (in September 2016). Following the receipt of feedback, consideration was given as to how any proposed closure of the level crossing and implementation of an alternative route might best be progressed and managed.

The Round 2 public consultation for this level crossing received 33 questionnaire responses, with 29 people disagreeing with the proposals and 4 people supporting the planned diversion.

The current preferred option for the site (following feedback received as part of Round 1 public consultation), is to close the level crossing to all users and divert pedestrians to an existing underpass on The Avenue/New Cheveley Road, 200m south west of the current crossing. Level crossing infrastructure would be removed and fencing installed to prevent trespass onto the railway.

This route would add a maximum additional 870 m in walking distance for those living on one side of the level crossing and wishing to access amenities on the other side. Practically, however, the diversion would not require users to walk the full 870 m in most cases. Stakeholders additionally raised concerns about the suitability of the proposed route, on account of the increased walking distances, steepness and poor lighting along the diversion route.

The drawing below shows the proposed diversion route (as shown during the Round 2 consultation). Plans shown at the first and second rounds of public consultation are available in Appendix B.


Q2. Could this work impact on people? If yes, briefly explain how (considering our duty to promote equality, tackle discrimination and foster good relations between groups).

Yes, the work could impact on people.
Without the closure of Weatherby level crossing, there is risk of a future incident at this location. The closure of the crossing will separate people from the railway line, thereby improving the safety of local residents and other users.

The proposal for Weatherby level crossing will impact on walking distances for all users. The diversion route will add a maximum of 870 m to the route for residents living on one side of the crossing and accessing amenities located immediately on the other side of the crossing.

The implementation of a permanent diversion via the underpass at The Avenue/ New Cheveley Road may disproportionately affect certain sections of the population who find walking long distances difficult and may struggle with the gradients along the diversion route.

## Step 2: The evidence base

Q3. Record here the data you have gathered about the diversity of the people potentially impacted by this work e.g. from the 2011 national census or from HR Shared Service. You should also include any research on the issues affecting inclusion in relation to your work.
Consider evidence in relation to all the protected characteristics:

- Disability including carers ${ }^{1}$
- Age
- Pregnancy/maternity
- Religion or belief
- Sexual orientation
- Gender reassignment
- Race
- Gender
- Marriage/Civil Partnership

This Diversity Impact Assessment is primarily concerned with ensuring fulfilment of Network Rail's duties under the Equality Act 2010.

Network Rail's responsibility is to identify any potential negative impacts on those people with protected characteristics and mitigate these wherever possible and practicable by reasonable adjustments.

## User profile

A nine-day census, carried out in June/July 2016, indicates that the level crossing was used by 3,730 people during the survey period - an average of 414 people per day. The survey results show that adult pedestrians constituted $85 \%(3178 / 3730)$ of level crossings users, six of whom were classified as older people. Of the 410 child users, 291 were accompanied by an adult and 119 were unaccompanied. 119 pushchairs/prams were also recorded using the crossing. In addition to this, 23 impaired users were recorded using the crossing, including one wheelchair and five scooter users.

Though cyclists are not a protected group under the Equality Act (and impacts on this group have therefore not been considered in this assessment), it is worth noting that 307 cyclists used this crossing during the survey period - highlighting the popularity of this route for various groups.

A breakdown of the census data can be found in Appendix C.

## Population profile

In order to gain a better insight into the local community and therefore other potential users of the level crossing, existing statistical data was reviewed to establish the composition of the local population - here taken as the district of Forest Heath. ${ }^{2}$ These are as follows:

[^0]- Children (under 16 years of age) make up 19\% of the Forest Heath population. This is equivalent to the national average.
- Younger people ( $16-24$ years old) make up $12 \%$ of the population of Forest Heath, which is also comparable to the national figure of $12 \%$.
- The proportion of older people (here described as people of retirement age - 65 and over) in Forest Heath is again the same as the national average (16\%).
- $15 \%$ of the Forest Heath population have a long-term illness or disability that limits their daily activities. This is slightly lower than the national average of $17 \%$.
- $23 \%$ of the population of Forest Heath is from Black, Asian or ethnic minority (BAME ${ }^{3}$ ) groups. This is slightly higher than the national figure of $20 \%$.
- Forest Heath has a low proportion of its populations belonging to minority faith groups (including Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and 'other' in national Census data) - 2\% compared with 9\% for England.

The above demographic analysis suggests that the populations of all of the protected characteristics (for which there are demographic data) are broadly in line with national proportions with the exception of the lower proportion of people from minority faith groups.
[The level crossing is also very close to the boundary with the Parish of Woodditton in East Cambs. District.]

## Local amenities

According to a review of local planning applications in November 2016, there are no development plans in the local area in the near future. ${ }^{4}$

The area around Weatherby level crossing is highly urbanised with a wide range of local facilities and residential properties on both sides of the line, creating desire lines for local people to use the crossing. It is understood that the level crossing forms part of a popular route used by the local community to access local facilities and resources.

An analysis of local amenities indicates that there are many amenities located in close proximity to the level crossing. These include two primary and nursery schools, five churches, and GP surgeries. A number of leisure facilities are also located nearby. It is likely that those people living on the opposite side of the line to local amenities may wish to use the crossing, particularly to access the church and GP surgery (both to the north of the crossing) or the leisure area to the south, as Weatherby level crossing provides a direct route. Alternative routes, which are available in the local area, are likely to significantly increase travel distance and provide a less direct route to some local amenities.

These presumed desire lines are based on the identified location of residential areas and community facilities within the immediate vicinity of the crossing. The development of a more substantive picture of local desire lines for the crossing and associated routes could be achieved through cordon survey interviews with users at fixed locations and times.

The map below shows local amenities.

[^1]
## Step 3: Impact

Q4. Given the evidence listed at step 2, what potentially negative impacts could this work have on people with protected characteristics?

The below table assesses the impact of the proposed work at Weatherby level crossing on the protected characteristic groups as outlined in the Equality Act 2010 (disability, age, pregnancy / maternity, race, religion / belief, gender, sexual orientation, marriage / civil partnership and gender reassignment).
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Protected } \\ \text { Characteristic }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Explain the potential negative impact } \\ \text { Disability } \\ \text { Y }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { The permanent closure of Weatherby level crossing will remove } \\ \text { pedestrian access at this point, potentially resulting in disproportionate } \\ \text { impacts on disabled people (including people with mobility, sensory } \\ \text { and respiratory conditions) compared to non-disabled people. } \\ \text { In total, 23 users with mobility and sensory impairments were recorded } \\ \text { using the level crossing during the nine-day census period, including } \\ \text { one wheelchair and five mobility scooter users. As such, the } \\ \text { permanent closure of the level crossing may reduce pedestrian } \\ \text { accessibility if the diversion route proposed is unsuitable - potentially } \\ \text { resulting in community severance. }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Potential impacts on pedestrian accessibility due to suitability of } \\ \text { diversion routes }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Even when routes are free from obstacles such as steps, as is the } \\ \text { case with the proposed underpass diversion, diversions involving } \\ \text { underpasses can act as a barrier for disabled people. Underpasses } \\ \text { can be difficult for people with mobility impairments to manage unless } \\ \text { they are designed with accessibility in mind. } 5\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { The Department for Transport (DfT) states that underpasses should be } \\ \text { as wide as possible to give sufficient room for disabled users, and } \\ \text { ensure a sense of security. The current underpass is approximately } \\ \text { 12m wide in total, with the footways being 1.56m and 2.30m on the } \\ \text { north and south sides respectively (subject to confirmation at detailed } \\ \text { design). The existing headroom for vehicles is 4.4m (as indicated by } \\ \text { signage on-site). The DfT recommends that to achieve inclusive } \\ \text { mobility for new or enhanced underpass infrastructure, designers } \\ \text { should aspire to a total width of at least 4.8m and a headroom of 3m, } \\ \text { or as close to these parameters as reasonably practicable/deliverable. } \\ \text { The underpass is also light and has a clear view from one side to the } \\ \text { other. Therefore, it is felt that the underpass currently adequately } \\ \text { complies with the DfT guidelines. }\end{array} \\ \text { During consultation stakeholders also raised concerns about the } \\ \text { steepness of the diversion route. Steep gradients can be challenging } \\ \text { to manage for those in wheelchairs or mobility scooters (six of whom } \\ \text { were recorded using Weatherby level crossing during the survey }\end{array}\right\}$

[^2]

[^3]|  | distances and many experience pain and discomfort in doing so. <br> Additionally, during consultation stakeholders raised concerns about <br> the additional length of the permanent diversion route and its <br> manageability for disabled people. <br> Studies have shown that of people with a disability who are able to <br> walk, around 30\% can walk no more than 50 metres without stopping <br> or experiencing severe discomfort and a further 20\% can only manage <br> between 50 and 200 metres. 9 |
| :--- | :--- |
| The proposed diversion route via The Avenue / New Cheveley <br> Road underpass adds a maximum 870m to the route. <br> This may disproportionately impact disabled people who would <br> struggle with the increased walking distance. Diversions should <br> therefore be well signposted and accompanied by measures, such as <br> widening of pavements and ensuring level surfaces, to support users <br> who may struggle to walk the additional distance. It is also noted that <br> not every user of the crossing would need to travel the full 870m due <br> to the availability of existing routes in the surrounding area. |  |
| Permanent improved user safety due to reduced interaction with <br> the railway |  |
| AgeSafety issues related to level crossings can disproportionately impact <br> disabled people. Crossing speeds are likely to be slower for people <br> with disabilities and level crossings often require users to negotiate <br> physical challenges related to structure, gradient and exposure to the <br> track. Pedestrians with sensory, physical or cognitive impairments may <br> also be less able to cross safely because of these factors. People with <br> visual or hearing impairments can also have difficulties crossing safely <br> due to not being able to pick up on the variety of visual and audible <br> warning messages at level crossings. ${ }^{10}$ |  |
| Ys Weatherby level crossing is used by some disabled users to access |  |$|$| Aslocal facilities, reduced interaction with the railway at this point may <br> potentially result in a reduced crossing risk for this group. |
| :--- |
| The permanent closure of Weatherby level crossing will remove <br> pedestrian access at this point, potentially having a disproportionate <br> impact on particular age groups - namely children and older people - <br> compared to the general population. <br> Children |
| Permanent improved user safety due to reduced interaction with <br> the railway |
| Weatherby level crossing is considered high risk primarily because of <br> the very large number of users it accommodates every day. The nine- <br> day census indicated that a large number of users - 410 of the total <br> 3,730 level crossing users (11\%) - were children, of which 119 (29\%) |

[^4]\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline & \begin{array}{l}\text { were not accompanied by an adult. This highlights the importance of } \\
\text { the route for children. } \\
\text { Safety issues related to level crossings are also disproportionately } \\
\text { likely to impact children. This is due to their potentially slower walking } \\
\text { speeds and because children and younger people can have difficulties } \\
\text { correctly processing the speed of oncoming vehicles. Research } \\
\text { conducted on behalf of the House of Commons Transport Select } \\
\text { Committee, showed that children tended to perceive vehicles moving } \\
\text { towards them at more than 20 mph as stationary. }\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{l}\text { As such, reduced interaction with the railway (due to the use of a safe } \\
\text { diversion as an alternative) is likely to lead to significantly reduced } \\
\text { crossing risk for this group. } \\
\begin{array}{l}\text { Ensuring the diversion route is safe and appropriate will be essential to } \\
\text { realising this positive impact. } \\
\text { Older people }\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{l}\text { Permanent increased walking distance due to length of diversion } \\
\text { Increases in walking distances, as a result of the closure of Weatherby } \\
\text { level crossing and the permanent use of a diversion route, are likely to } \\
\text { disproportionately impact older people compared to other sections of } \\
\text { the population. } \\
\text { The proposed diversion route via The Avenue / New Cheveley Road } \\
\text { underpass adds up to 870m to the route (though, in practice, it is }\end{array} \\
\text { likely to be less than this for trips starting or ending along the } \\
\text { diversionary route). Older people are more likely to experience } \\
\text { conditions such as arthritis or weak muscles, meaning that they } \\
\text { typically walk more slowly, tire more easily, and may struggle to climb } \\
\text { stairs. }{ }^{12} \\
\text { As such, increased walking distances could disproportionately impact } \\
\text { older people with mobility issues, as these people are more likely to } \\
\text { have difficulties walking long distances and experience pain or } \\
\text { discomfort in doing so. }{ }^{13}\end{array}
$$ <br>
Diversions should also be well signposted and accompanied by <br>
measures, such as widening of pavements and ensuring level <br>
surfaces, to support users who may struggle to walk the additional <br>
distance. <br>
Permanent reduced pedestrian accessibility due to nature of <br>

diversion routes\end{array}\right\}\)| Older people are more likely than other sections of the population to |
| :--- |
| have mobility impairments and therefore require an accessible |
| pedestrian environment and step-free infrastructure. ${ }^{14}$ |

[^5]\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline & \\
& \begin{array}{l}\text { As with disabled people, slopes and gradients in particular can act } \\
\text { as a barrier for older people, and can make routes more } \\
\text { challenging to manage for those who are frail (even when designed } \\
\text { to accessible standard specifications). } \\
\text { As the proposed diversion route makes use of the nearby underpass, it } \\
\text { could potentially reduce pedestrian accessibility on account of the } \\
\text { gradients along the routes. In order to comply with the Equality Act } \\
\text { 2010, a gradient of no more than 5\% (1 in 20) is required along the } \\
\text { route. } \\
\text { Stakeholders raised concerns about the steepness of the proposed } \\
\text { diversion route. There could be an impact if the gradient exceeds the } \\
\text { DfT's preferred maximum gradient of 5\%. However, assessment of } \\
\text { LIDAR data has shown that the existing gradient on the approach to } \\
\text { and departure from the underpass itself is approximately 1.0-1.5\%. } \\
\text { On the diversion route, the steepest section is to the north of the } \\
\text { underpass on Green Road, which is approximately 5\% - well within } \\
\text { the Dft's absolute maximum gradient of 8\%. It is also noted that the } \\
\text { pathways along all of the diversion route meet recommended width } \\
\text { standards (1.5m) - the pathways range in width from 1.5 - 2.3m. }\end{array}
$$ <br>
Consideration should be given to route improvement measures <br>
along the diversion route wherever practicable and appropriate to <br>
improve the safety of pedestrians. The diversion route however is, <br>

overall, safe, secure and accessible.\end{array}\right\}\)| Permanent improved user safety due to reduced interaction with |
| :--- |
| the railway |

[^6]$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline & & \begin{array}{l}\text { gradients can be difficult to access unless they are designed with } \\ \text { people with pushchairs, prams or buggies in mind. } \\ \text { Stakeholders raised concerns about the steepness of the diversion } \\ \text { route. As discussed previously, standards are in place to ensure that } \\ \text { gradients do not exceed inappropriate levels. Analysis of the current } \\ \text { underpass in relation to these standards highlighted that the } \\ \text { underpass adequately meets DfT guidelines. } \\ \text { Consideration should be given to route improvement measures along } \\ \text { the diversion route wherever practical and appropriate to improve the } \\ \text { safety of pedestrians. The diversion route however is, overall, safe, } \\ \text { secure and accessible. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Race } & \text { N } & \begin{array}{l}\text { No disproportionate impacts are anticipated for this protected } \\ \text { characteristic because of the project. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Religion or } \\ \text { belief }\end{array} & \text { N } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Although there are a number of churches in the local area, due to the } \\ \text { availability of alternative routes, it is not anticipated that any } \\ \text { disproportionate impacts will be felt by this protected characteristic } \\ \text { group. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Gender } & \text { Y } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Improved user safety due to reduced interaction with the railway } \\ \text { Safety issues related to level crossings can disproportionately impact }\end{array} \\ \text { men. Male pedestrians dominate accidents at level crossings, } \\ \text { associated with 70\% of all train strikes. Given that males represent } \\ \text { approximately 50\% of the population as a whole, this would suggest } \\ \text { male pedestrians are more at risk at level crossings than female } \\ \text { pedestrians.17 Reduced interaction with the railway (due to the } \\ \text { diversion onto the bridge) would lead to reduced crossing risk for men. }\end{array}\right\}$

Q5. What could you do to ensure your work has a positive impact on diversity and inclusion including by supporting delivery of the Everyone Strategy.

The project will support the delivery of Network Rail's Everyone Strategy, and in particular the following commitments:

- Commitment 1: Get everyone home safe every day.

Improving the safety of level crossings reduces the risk of crossing the railway for all users. The project will help to improve safety for rail users by reducing interaction with the railway through safe diversionary route.

- Commitment 2: Deliver reliable infrastructure.

The project will help to deliver more reliable infrastructure by reducing the assets along the network requiring maintenance and management.

- Commitment 6: Being a customer focused organisation.

[^7]The project will help to improve the safety of journeys for infrastructure users through, among other things, use of customer engagement and stakeholder involvements in the planning process.

- Commitment 9: A railway fit for the future.

The project helps to deliver an inclusive and accessible railway that links people to communities, education and jobs - ultimately delivering economic growth. The project helps to deliver required improvements and rationalisation to ensure network infrastructure is fit for future use.

## Step 4: Consultation

Q6. How has consultation with those who share a protected characteristic informed your work?

| List the groups you have consulted or reference previous relevant consultation? ${ }^{18}$ | What issues were raised in relation to one or many of the protected characteristics? |
| :---: | :---: |
| Public consultation - <br> Round 1 (August 2016) | Questionnaire responses received during the first round of public consultation included the following issues concerning Weatherby Road level crossing: <br> - Concerns were raised about the length of the diversion (stated as three times longer than the current route). <br> - Concerns were also raised over the steepness of the diversion route. <br> - Safety concerns over walking on and near busy roads were also seen as a potential problem. This will encourage more people to drive to the shops rather than walk, thus increasing the number of cars making short journeys around town and putting extra pressure on parking. <br> - This will impact on local businesses, as people will be more inclined to drive out of town to go shopping. <br> - Several requests were made for a footbridge. <br> - A request for better lighting, newer gates, a tidy up and potentially a flashing sign to inform when a train was approaching. <br> - A request for maglocks was made. <br> - Several suggestion of an underpass to be created at the current level crossing site. <br> - A request for self-locking gates and flashing lights instead of closure. <br> - Concerns raised over legal aspects of the proposed closure. <br> - Some dispute over how the scheme will achieve its objectives. |

[^8]| Public consultation Round 2 (September 2016) | Questionnaire responses received during the Round 2 public consultation identified the following issues (outlined below) regarding Weatherby level crossing: |
| :---: | :---: |
| Local Councillor | - There is not enough evidence to close the crossings. |
| Mid Anglia Rail Passengers Association (MARPA) Committee | - A request was made for a footbridge to be implemented as this would solve problems for the whole community, including commuters and school children. |
| Secretary of Newmarket Town Football Club | - The crossing is well used by staff and supporters of the club to access the stadium. <br> - The proposed diversion route is too long, especially for older people and young children. <br> - New Cheveley Road is a very busy road and is not suitable for pedestrians/cyclists. |
| Members of the public | - The proposed solution is cutting off the people living south of the railway from the town centre. <br> - The diversion is too long particularly for children and the elderly. <br> - The route is regularly used by people shopping, going to/from schools and accessing the other amenities of the town centre. |

Q7. Where relevant, record any consultation you have had with Network Rail teams who are delivering work that might overlap with yours. This will ensure that our solutions are joined up.

## N/A

## Step 5: Informed decision-making

Q8. In light of the assessment above, what is your decision?
Please tick one box and provide a rationale (for most DIAs this will be box 1 ).

| 1. Change the work to mitigate <br> against potential negative impacts <br> found |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Continue the work because no <br> potential negative impacts found |  |
| 3. Justify and continue the work <br> despite negative impacts (please <br> provide justification) | Because there are a number of alternative routes <br> available locally that would sufficiently service <br> those wishing to cross the line, the closure of <br> Weatherby level crossing will result in overall <br> improvements in user safety. |


|  | Diversions should be signed and accompanied by <br> measures to support users who may struggle to <br> walk the additional distances. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. Stop the work because <br> discrimination is unjustifiable and <br> no obvious ways to mitigate |  |

## Step 6: Action planning

Q9. What specific actions will be taken to deliver positive impacts and address any potentially negative impacts identified at step 3 or through consultation?

| Action | By when | By whom |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consideration should be given to developing a route <br> improvement strategy along the diversion routes to help <br> mitigate any negative impacts of increased walking <br> distances and steeper gradients, signage to support <br> wayfinding and ensuring level surfaces. This will <br> enhance the user experience for all groups and <br> increase a sense of safety. | Prior to <br> implementing <br> works | Network <br> Rail project <br> team |
| Develop a communication strategy to ensure that local <br> residents are kept abreast of developments, including <br> scheduling of works, details of enhancements and <br> improvements, and any other benefits of the scheme, <br> particularly focussing on user safety at the site for <br> children. | Ongoing | Network Rail <br> project team |
| Review the DIA at every future GRIP stage to ensure <br> equality of access is maintained for all. | Ongoing | Network <br> Rail project <br> team |

See Appendix D for Design Team responses to the proposed actions above.

## Step 7: Sign off

| Name | Position | Signed | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIA Owner <br> TBC | Scheme Project <br> Manager |  |  |
| $\underline{\text { Superuser }}^{19}$ | Liability <br> Negotiations Mgr | Star Cay | 29/01/2018 |
| Senior Manager $^{20}$ |  |  |  |

If you don't have a local superuser please send your DIA for quality assurance to DiversitylmpactAssessment@networkrail.co.uk
To help us respond more quickly please make sure you have;

1. Sent your DIA as a Word document not a PDF
2. Used this naming convention 'Name of project-Draft DIA'
3. Used the correct DIA form with no additional pages e.g. 'not for circulation cover-sheets'
4. Included any relevant maps / diagrams needed to understand your project
5. Completed all sections of the DIA in line with guidance and training

## Step 8: Publication

Send your final DIAs to DiversitylmpactAssessment@networkrail.co.uk. Customer related DIAs will be published on our website.

[^9]Appendix A: Site photographs
Existing level crossing:


## NetworkRail

Proposed alternative railway crossing (underpass on the B1103 New Cheveley Road)


## Appendix B: Site drawings

Round 1 consultation (June 2016) - Initial option for proposed diversion route


Round 2 consultation - Preferred option for diversion route, at September 2016)


## Appendix C: Nine-day pedestrian census data

## Summary

The survey was successfully completed in accordance with the Network Rail specification.
The data is summarised below:

| Pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Adult | Accompanied child | Unaccompanied child | Older person | Impaired user | Wheelchair user | Pushchair / pram | Total |
| 25th June | 406 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 443 |
| 26th June | 331 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 366 |
| 27th June | 447 | 39 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 505 |
| 28th June | 314 | 32 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 392 |
| 29th June | 268 | 27 | 23 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 338 |
| 30th June | 319 | 26 | 28 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 392 |
| 1st July | 331 | 47 | 26 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 429 |
| 2nd July | 429 | 36 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 484 |
| 3rd July | 327 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 376 |
|  | 3172 | 291 | 119 | 6 | 17 | 1 | 119 | 3725 |

## Appendix D: DIA Design Team Responses to Action Planning

| Action | By when | By who | Design Team comment | NR Response | Design Team Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As the diversion route incorporates an underpass, measures should be considered to ensure the safety and usability of the route. The DfT states that where underpasses are provided, they should be as wide as possible to give a sense of security. Within the underpass, handrails set at 1000 mm above the walking surface should be provided on both sides. There should be a clear view from one end to the other and a good level of lighting. | Detailed design | Network <br> Rail <br> project <br> team | The underbridge is an existing road bridge with footways to both sides which meet recommended width requirements. Lighting should be provided by the local highway authorities (SCC and CCC) to the appropriate standard. <br> Guardrailing is already provided beneath the underbridge on the east side of the road which is associated with the diversion route (due to a level difference between footway and carriageway). <br> However further handrails could be installed with the agreement of the highway authorities. <br> The route through the underbridge is short and straight with good forward visibility. <br> It is noted that SCC have not requested any improvements at this location. <br> No further mitigation or improvement works are considered necessary | No handrails are needed as the diversionary route under the bridge already has them. | Agreed |


| Consider measures along the diversion route to help mitigate any negative impacts of increased walking distance and steeper gradients, including: the widening of pavements; signage to support way finding; and ensuring level surfaces including dropped kerbs and tactile paving. This will enhance the user experience for all groups and increase a sense of safety. |  |  | Footways are present for the full length of the diversion route and are of reasonable width for their current and proposed usage. <br> Permanent and temporary signing after the LC closure will be discussed in further detail with the highway authorities at the detailed design stage. This can be incorporated within the adopted highway with the agreement of the highway authorities. <br> Dropped kerbs and tactile paving already exist at the junction of Green Road and New Cheveley Road. The provision of new dropped kerbs and tactile paving could be provided at the junction of Cricketfield Road and New Cheveley Road and should be discussed further with the highway authority. This can be incorporated within the adopted highway with the agreement of the highway authority. | No new dropped kerbs needed at junction of Green Road and New Cheveley Road, as at present there isn't an accessible dropped kerb route to use the current crossing. We aren't making it any worse | Agreed but it may be something that the local authority may still want to discuss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Develop a communication strategy <br> to ensure that local residents are <br> kept abreast of developments, <br> including scheduling of works, <br> details of enhancements and <br> improvements, and any other <br> benefits of the scheme, particularly <br> focussing on user safety at the site <br> for children. |  | Network <br> Rail <br> project <br> team | NR to undertake at detailed design <br> /implementation stage. | Agreed <br> appropriate <br> actions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Review the DIA at every future <br> GRIP stage to ensure equality of <br> access is maintained for all. | Ongoing | Network <br> Rail <br> project <br> team | NR to undertake at detailed design <br> / implementation stage. | Yes, but this is not to <br> 'ensure equality of <br> access is maintained for <br> all' it is to ensure that <br> any changes to the <br> design do not worsen <br> the access and they | NR to take <br> appropriate <br> actions <br> approve where |

# D. Old Station Road Air Quality documentation extract - West Suffolk Planning 

## 10. Details of measures to combat air quality in Newmarket

10.1 The designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Newmarket was amended in April 2017 following data analysis by council officers.

10.2 This amended area (see map above) is significantly smaller than the previous AQMA footprint. It is important to understand that the AQMA was retained along Old Station Road not due to exceedances of the annual mean objective, but due to lack of conclusive evidence that the AQMA could be revoked. We are in the process of collecting this additional evidence, which is being reported in our Annual Status Reports. Defra requires a minimum of three years monitoring data showing compliance with the annual mean objective and officers expect to have this data by the end of 2018 . We would therefore expect the AQMA to be revoked in 2019.
10.3 As the AQMA was recently amended, the action plan is currently being revised, and is due for completion by December 2017.
10.4 The air quality actions that we are currently undertaking in relation to Newmarket include:

- Taxi drivers anti-idling campaign - several notifications have been received of taxi drivers leaving their engines running whilst waiting for a fare. Officers have been in contact with all local taxi drivers to encourage them to switch their engines off.
- Office for Low Emissions Vehicles Funding (OLEV) - a funding bid is prepared to OLEV to install street side Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in roads with little or no off street parking. All Saints Roads in Newmarket is included within this funding bid. This will enable and encourage the uptake of Ultra Low Emission Vehicles for residents in Newmarket.
- Rapid EV charging points - a council owned car park in Newmarket has been identified as a suitable location for an electric vehicle rapid charge
point. UK Power Networks have confirmed the nearby substation has sufficient capacity to host the charge point and a business case is now being prepared.
- The installation of home EV charging infrastructure is being requested by Air Quality Officers in all major developments across the district.
- Business Fleet Efficiency - Promotion of grants available to SMEs to Newmarket businesses to improve local business fleet efficiency.
- Air Quality Awareness Campaign - Campaign to highlight the importance of clean air in Newmarket using local press.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including those with physical, mental and hidden impairments as well as carers who provide unpaid care for a friend or family member who due to illness, disability, or a mental health issue cannot cope without their support
    ${ }^{2}$ Source: ONS Population estimates taken from nomis. Available at: https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157240/report.aspx?pc=cb8 8bt

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Including white Irish, Gypsy and Irish travellers and other white ethnic populations.
    ${ }^{4}$ Newmarket Town Council: http://www.newmarket.gov.uk/meetings/committees/development-andplanning/.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Highways England: ‘Design Manual for Roads and Bridges - Assessment and Preparation of Road Schemes'

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Department for Transport (2005): 'Inclusive mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure'.
    ${ }^{7}$ Transport Scotland (2013): 'Roads for All: Good Practice Guide for Roads'.
    ${ }^{8}$ Transport Scotland (2013): 'Roads for All: Good Practice Guide for Roads'.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Department for Transport (2005): 'Inclusive mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure'
    ${ }^{10}$ Rail Safety and Standards Board (2011): 'Research Programme: Operations and Management Improving safety and accessibility at level crossings for disabled pedestrians'

[^5]:    ${ }^{11}$ House of Commons Transport Committee (2014): ‘Safety at level crossings: Eleventh Report of Session 2013-14'
    ${ }^{12}$ NHS (2014): 'Safe, compassionate care for frail older people using an integrated care pathway'
    ${ }^{13}$ Department for Transport (2005): 'Inclusive mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure’
    ${ }^{14}$ Highways Agency : ‘Design Manual for Roads and Bridges - Assessment and Preparation of Road Schemes'

[^6]:    $151.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ is the speed assumed in the programming of pedestrian level crossings on the road network, and is generally taken to be the mean walking speed.
    ${ }^{16}$ House of Commons Transport Committee (2014): ‘Safety at level crossings: Eleventh Report of Session 2013-14'

[^7]:    ${ }^{17}$ Rail Safety and Standards Board (2011): 'Research Programme: Operations and Management Improving safety and accessibility at level crossings for disabled pedestrians'

[^8]:    ${ }^{18}$ This could include our staff networks, the Built Environment Access Panel, local faith leaders etc.

[^9]:    ${ }^{19}$ Quality assurance check.
    ${ }^{20}$ Sign-off should be by someone who can approve policy, programme or budget changes.

