

From: zac martin
Sent: 23 April 2017 15:50
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: Network Rail level-crossing closure Orders
Attachments: Map 1.docx; Pic 1.jpg; Pic 2.jpg; Pic 3.jpg; Pic 4.jpg
Importance: High

Dear Secretary of State for Transport,

Re: Changes to Public Right of Way, Ref: C11 - A Furlong Drove, Little Downham.

I am writing to formally lodge my objections to the proposed compulsory purchase of my land for the Right of Way changes raised in the above Order.

The proposed new route for the public Right of Way runs across a parcel of my land and alongside a watercourse.

Please find the following reasons for my objections;

1. The proposed footpath runs alongside a main water course needed for abstraction of water due to irrigation of crops at varying times of the year. Our irrigation piping and equipment is situated on this proposed land and would cross the footpath, therefore making it a health and safety risk to the public. (See Map 1 - Fig 1 Red Route)
2. This water course is a main route for drainage of the land to the pumping station and is regularly maintained by means of heavy machinery by the Internal Drainage Board, this meaning safe access is required.
3. The existing footpath uses the verge alongside the highway for the majority of the current route (See Map 1 - Fig 2 Orange Route) and I see no reason why the verge cannot safely be used continually alongside the highway around my land, as opposed to across it as this road has very little traffic. (See Map 1 - Fig 3) Being a popular equine route, horses will still have to use the highway.
4. Large farm machinery is used all year round on this field and we work to the edges of our fields, there would be a health and safety risk to the public in this instance.
4. During Public Consultations which I was not aware of, results showed 64% of responses preferred another route to this footpath proposed. On a 3 day census survey carried out by Network Rail, only 1 pedestrian on 1 day only, used the existing footpath. In light of the low footfall using this route, these figures do not justify the costs and effects to my business, when another route is available.

I feel Network Rail and their partners have dealt with correspondence in a very poor and underhanded manner. I was not contacted by any party, by any means, until after the public consultation periods had ended in January 2017. I have now been made aware that Network Rail claim to have begun engaging with Landowners in 2015 with a further 5 stages of contact to current day.

Please see enclosed pictures of current and proposed routes.

Pic 1: Relates to Fig 1 - proposed route of footpath and watercourse.

Pic 2: Relates to Fig 2 - Existing route alongside highway (Hereward Way)

Pic 3 & 4: Relates to fig 3 - Alternative route around my field/continuation of existing route alongside highway.

Yours Sincerely,

Zac Martin
Ivan Martin & Son

Contact:

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>







