

**The Network Rail (Suffolk Level Crossing Reduction Order) Public Inquiry: Inspectors request for detail of alternate options to those laid out in the Draft Order**

Within the Inquiry the Inspector asked for any alternate solutions to be presented to him prior to the Inquiry reopening on 19<sup>th</sup> April . I was not certain that the submission of my proposed alternate solution for crossings S13 Fords Green and S69 Bacton, as laid out in my Proof of Evidence, was sufficient to meet this request. I therefore submit the attached annotations of NR8 Sheet 19 for clarification of my proposal compared to the draft order and the summary below.

Establishment and compensation for new field edge public footpath			S13 S69 NR TWO draft order	OBJ 26 Proposal
	Affected Party	NR8 Reference for plot	Meters/No.	Meters/No.
	OST/Baker	Sheet 19 plot11 P060-P064-P065	580	0
		Bacton FP20 Blue route	0	125
	Finbow	Bacton FP20 Blue route	0	455
		S13 to Hull Green route	130	0
	Hull	Sheet 19, 20 plot 17	425	0
	Bacton Football club	Sheet 20 P063 to plot 18	130	0
	Smith	Sheet 21 P072-P073	170	0
	Gooderham	Sheet 21 P071-P072	55	0
Total Public Footpath Creation for Option			1490	580
Extinguishment of public footpath				
	OST/Baker	Bacton FP14 red section	0	240
		Bacton FP20 yellow route	0	220
	Finbow	Bacton FP20 yellow route	0	470
	Gooderham	Sheet 20 P066-P067	75	0
Total Public Footpath extinguishment for Option			75	930
Culverts or bridge				
	OST/Baker	Sheet 19 Near P060	1	0
	OST/ Baker/Finbow	SE S13 Blue route	0	1
	Finbow/Hull	between plot 14 & 17	1	0
	Smith/ Gooderham	Plot 35 Sheet 21	1	0
New culverts or Bridges			3	1
Tree clearance				
	Finbow/OST	S13 Blue route	0	1
	Smith/ Gooderham	Plot 35 Sheet 21	1	0
Cost of establishing footway				
	SCC	Sheet 20 plots 37/38/39	1	0
Cost of retention of crossing				
	Network Rail	Bacton S 69	0	1

My proposal diverts Bacton FP20 (East of Cow creek and S13 crossings) from current yellow route on attached plan to proposed Blue route. Rather than NR's proposed new public footpath(plot11 to west of railway) linking S13 and cow Creek particularly as an alternate route already exists.

My proposal also retains S69 as NR's suggested diversion does not appear to be suitable or convenient to anyone other than NR. This negates the cost of any works detailed on NR8 Sheet 20 and 21 and the linked concerns of impact on our business and others. It removes need for new rights of way on Messrs Hull, Smith, Gooderham, Finbow and Football club land and costs of major works for the S69 Diversions. (If S69 is closed diversion should use existing route "Bracknell" footway rather than new path on Smith's land.)

The cost of the proposal is difficult for me to break down as the detailed costs for the draft order are not laid out.

However my proposal only creates 580m rather than 1490m of new public footpath reducing cost of rights will be need to be acquired due to shorter length and as proposal is supported by affected rights holders.

Public Footpath extinguishment is 930m rather than 75m and extinguishment of cross field paths would likely bear no differential cost and again is supported by affected rights holders.

My proposal only requires one bridge/culvert where FP20 Bacton blue diversion crosses from OST to Finbow land ownership compared to the draft order that requires 3 and is minor compared to the works at Sheet 21 Inset A Works 3.

A coppice stool will be required to be removed at this point It appears on site that there is no drainage from the railway at this point. If this is confirmed by NR it would be possible to realign ditch to remove the need for any bridge or culvert at this point. I can highlight this if requested by the Inspector on the accompanied site visit.

Signage, detail design, definitive map administrative costs along with SCC commuted sum will be significantly reduced by retaining S69.

I hope this clarifies my proposal and an indication reduced cost compared to the draft TWO works to be set against NR's cost of retaining S69 Bacton.

I again state my dismay to the Inspector at the difficulty and limited opportunities given to establish common ground solutions:- Particularly the acknowledgement that incorrect information was given by NR's agents to stakeholders prior to the order being made. This has wasted time, made objections and representation at the Inquiry unavoidable.

Best regards

Paul Baker

Obj/26

Messrs E Hudson Baker

