



Mr. Peter Brace and Mrs. Catherine Brace
Pheasants Mead
Barrells Road
Thurston
Bury St. Edmunds
IP31 3SF

Network Rail
James Forbes House
27 Great Suffolk St
London
SE1 0NS

1 May 2018

Ref: Obj/48/SUFF/R003

Dear Mr & Mrs Brace,

The Network Rail (Suffolk Level Crossing Reduction) Order

Following recent site meetings with you in March/April to discuss fencing to mitigate your concerns, we have recently met with your neighbour Mr Le Mar to discuss the provision of fencing on his land.

In getting to this point, from our earlier discussions and at our recent site meeting dated 16 April 2018, we offered to provide new fencing on your land. This consisted of 2m high panel fencing fixed either to existing fencing or fitted to new posts adjacent to existing fencing. At the meeting you confirmed that this was not acceptable for the following reasons:

- You did not want the fencing to be so close to the existing fencing.
- It would not deal with the problem of dogs being able to enter your site.
- There would still be a security risk to your equipment and Tac Room.
- When horses are being led about your site there would still be a chance of being startled by users of the proposed footpath.
- You want the fencing to be located on the western side of your access drive.

As you are a neighbouring landowner, Network Rail has carefully considered the concerns you have raised around segregation of your property from the new proposed footpath and security of your property. However we consider that our offer of fencing on your land to help screen and enclose both the ménage and the paddock at the front of your property was appropriate and in fact, in terms of height

of the fence, went beyond what would normally be specified. In delivery of this project, Network Rail is obliged to have regard to the use of public money in the ongoing costs of managing all level crossings.

We have now confirmed agreement with Mr Le Mar that, on creation of the proposed footpath, we will install 1.2m chainlink fencing located on Mr Le Mar's land on the eastern side of the footpath. We enclose a marked up plan to show the fencing agreed with Mr Le Mar. This would provide fencing away from your existing fence and on the western side of your access drive as you have requested. This would provide segregation of the footpath from your property and prevent dogs from entering your site from the footpath. It should also reduce your security concerns although we note that currently today there is little security on the western property boundary.

As discussed with Mr Le Mar we do not propose to install 2m fencing as this would sever his land. Whereas, the proposed 1.2m fence would provide a physical demarcation point but would mean that the landowner can still view and access the remainder of his land. We understand that this will not fully address your concerns over visibility of pedestrians /dogs on the proposed footpath and your concerns that this could startle your horses. However this must be considered in comparison to the current situation, where the front of your property (adjacent to the public road) is already very exposed to pedestrians and dogs on the public road.

We hope that the mitigation set out above goes someway to alleviate your concerns. In the meantime please contact us if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely



Bridgit Choo-Bennett

Anglia Level Crossing Reduction Team
Network Rail

Enc. Marked up plan of proposed fencing at S27 Barrels

FOR DETAIL - SEE INSET A

EMENT
RK No.2

P035

02

03

01

09

04

05

1.2m high galvanised steel chainlink fencing located to the east of the footpath as close to the existing tree line as possible. With steel frame 1.5m wide chainlink access gates located approximately 75m in from each end to enable access to fenced off land.

THURSTON

PATH NOT ON
DEFINITIVE MAP

10

P034

Pheasants
Mead

DRAWING CONTINUES ON SHEET 12

01	0
02	0
03	10
04	1
05	1

Powers
No. on

Powers
No. on
07

	(
	(
	7
(A)	↑

Individu
contrast

01	↑
	/
	f