Caroline O'Neill	
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Jillroger 04 April 2017 10:27 TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT Network Rail Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Reduction Order
Mr & Mrs Roger Braham	
Re: Anglia Level Crossing Ten	anorary Proposal CO4
	iporary i roposar co-
Dear Sirs	
Having inspected your planne would like to object on the fo	ed temporary proposal for redirecting the footpath between points P141 & P147, we ollowing grounds.
Goods Vehicles, both in and c It is not the best place for a p	
2: Siting the proposed footpa closely in front of the comme due to the ongoing noisy car This is carried out both in and	ercial units (especially at point 02) puts the general public at an increased risk of injur and commercial vehicle servicing activity.
3: The general public would h	nave to cross Mr Burltons (neighbouring units) entrance to his site via the triangle.
4: As previously pointed out, Mr Burltons proposal of the copedestrian visibility to any tra	the general public have successfully and as far as the railway is concerned, safely used oncrete track (point 05) for decades and this has the advantage of increased ffic.
During a meeting on site with - 3 for traffic to or from Mr Bu heavy two way traffic.	your agents, it was pointed out that there was no access to the road in front of units orltons units, due to the serious risk of injury to our tenants and their clients, posed by
Taking these points into accou	unt, I would strongly urge you to reconsider your proposal.
Yours sincerely	
ROGER & JILL BRAHAM. Ow	ners of plot CO4
Sent from my iPad	

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

081/2

From Jillroger

Malyer L. Network Rail Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Reduction

Order

Date: 4 Apr 2017, 11:26:42

transportandworksact@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Mr & Mrs Roger Braham

RECEIVED ON
10 APR 2017
PRIVATE OFFICE

Re: Anglia Level Crossing Temporary Proposal CO4

Dear Sirs

Having inspected your planned temporary proposal for redirecting the footpath between points P141 & P147, we would like to object on the following grounds.

1: The entrance to the site (points 01 & 02) is a heavy traffic area, used constantly by cars, buses, farm and Heavy Goods Vehicles, both in and out of business hours.

It is not the best place for a pedestrian footpath to start.

Siting some steps slightly further along would be a safer option.

2: Siting the proposed footpath so closely in front of the commercial units (especially at point 02) puts the general public at an increased risk of injury due to the ongoing noisy car and commercial vehicle servicing activity. This is carried out both in and out of open buildings.

3: The general public would have to cross Mr Burltons (neighbouring units) entrance to his site via the triangle.

4: As previously pointed out, the general public have successfully and as far as the railway is concerned, safely used Mr Burltons proposal of the concrete track (point 05) for decades and this has the advantage of increased pedestrian visibility to any traffic.

During a meeting on site with your agents, it was pointed out that there was no access to the road in front of units 1 - 3 for traffic to or from Mr Burltons units, due to the serious risk of injury to our tenants and their clients, posed by heavy two way traffic.

Taking these points into account, I would strongly urge you to reconsider your proposal.

Yours sincerely

RAGER & III I BRAHAM, Owners of plot CO4

Sent from my iPad