OBJ/11

Caroline O'Neill

From: Graham Borgonon
Sent: 19 April 2017 09:50
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: Network Rail Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Order, Closure of CO 04 No. 20 in Parish of Meldreth
Attachments: GVB_C04_crossing_closer.doc

I attach my letter opposing this closure.
--
Best Regards,
Graham Borgonon.

18 April 2017

Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport and Works Act Orders Unit
General Counsel's Office, Department for Transport, Zone 1/18, Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR

Dear Secretary of State for Transport,

Network Rail Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Order
Closure of CO 04 No. 20 in Parish of Meldreth

I write as a regular user of all the footpaths in this parish and along with many other members of the local community, have made representations opposing the Network Rail Level Crossing Closure CO 04 No 20 at every stage of the Consultation process so far.

Network Rail's ameliorations to their original proposal are welcome to the extent that crossing a busy local road below the railway bridge would be eliminated and field-edge routing at the western end would avoid some of the industrial area which amongst others, is occupied by vehicle repair units servicing cars and heavier commercial & agricultural vehicles.

The major sticking points made in various earlier local representations however remain:

- the very hazardous safety issue of increased pedestrian traffic negotiating the rail bridge which carries constant heavy traffic through Meldreth and which has a narrow foot-way well less than standard minimum width. Attempts over the years to upgrade this foot-way and/or to introduce single-way traffic have stumbled due to expense. So a 19th century rail bridge continues to carry 21st century traffic without any improvements to safety for any users, particularly for pedestrians & cyclists needing to access key services like the secondary school and health centre in Melbourn.

- this Public Footpath currently facilitates pedestrian access to the Fieldgate retail outlets at its southern end without any engagement with road traffic, is shorter than the proposed re-routing and the local view holds that using the level crossing is considerably safer than using the rail bridge. (The sight lines are excellent at the crossing. If Network Rail were concerned about safety at the crossing it could be enhanced by use of warning lights as is the case with the footpath crossing immediately upline from Shepreth station.)

For these key reasons I remain opposed to this closure and urge rejection of Network Rail's Closure of C04 No 20 for the greater safety of local residents.

Yours faithfully,

G V Borgonon