

Angela Foster

OBJ/45

From: Roger James
Sent: 24 April 2017 21:10
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: Objection to proposed closure - c04 - no. 20 - sg8 6jr
Attachments: to london.jpg; to cambridge.jpg; crash site.jpg; bridge ramp.jpg; hidden.jpg

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my objection to the Network rail proposal to close the foot crossing in South Meldreth (ref c04 - no. 20 - sg8 6jr).

My complaint against the proposed plans are threefold:-

- Increasing Risks to Pedestrian Safety (all alternative road routes are significantly more dangerous)
- Evidence for Closure (which is inadequate)
- The Notification Process (which is misleading & discriminatory)

Safety

The proposal removes the pedestrians from the safety of the fields and a clear crossing point on a straight length of track onto a busy and twisting busy road bridge with recent history of vehicle crash.

Track Safety: The proposal contains a vague statement of safety in the light of an increased speed cap for trains. This is specious as the crossing point is close to the Meldreth station: stopping trains will be slowed in any event and through trains will have to be slowed due to the narrow platforms on the station.

The crossing point offers excellent visibility up and down the line making pedestrian visibility from the train, and train visibility from the pedestrian, clean and unhampered [see the attached pictures to London and to Cambridge]

Road Danger: The proposal is to route the walkers across the adjacent railway bridge. Here the visibility is extremely limited, the road traffic heavy and the road twisting. This is not apparent from the Network rail survey but the attached photographs show the difficult nature of the road [bridge ramp]. There is also a photograph of the recent crash site on the bridge itself [crash site] where a commercial van ran off the road last month.

Evidence for Closure

Network Rail's own evidence documents a mere 8% of residents support closure with 85% against any change to the current crossing. It is overwhelming evidence to keep the track crossing open.

The subsequent 'evidence' that 54% supported the red route makes sense only as a proportion of the 8% supporting change. It is more accurately presented as 4% support the red route and 4% another route.


Notification Process

Separately I have complained on the inadequacy of communication on this round of appeal. All of the posted notices around the location have been pinned with the request for appeal and details of the objection process hidden from view and inaccessible to people with poor eyesight or disabilities. This alone means that this objection process should be re-run. [see hidden]

Please acknowledge receipt of this email,


Kind regards

Roger James



--

Roger James

Contact me on Google Cha 

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

