## PUBLIC INQUIRY

## APPLICATION BY NETWORK RAIL UNDER THE TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

## PROPOSED NETWORK RAIL (CAMBRIDGESHIRE LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION ORDER) 200X

## OBJ/12-CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

## JANET LOCKWOOD

## DISTRICT COUNCILLOR

## INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Janet Lockwood. My address is 31 High Street, Hauxton (CB22 5HW). I have lived there for 30 years since 1987.
2. I have been the South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for Harston and Hauxton from the period from 2000 to 2004, a period of 4 years and then again from 2006 to the present day, a period of 11 years. I have also been the Parish Counciltor for Hauxton for 17 years since 2000.
3. I am a retired consultant Radiologist. I retired from the Princess Alexandra Hospital, Harlow in 2014.
4. My role as a District Councillor is to make representations on behalf of the residents of Harston and Hauxton and to act as a conduit for them to air their concerns. I then make representations to the relevant bodies or people in this capacity. It is also to keep them informed about matters which may concern them, and attempt to influence Council policies in their interests.
5. I am also a member of the Licensing Committee and the Civic Affairs Committee for South Cambridgeshire.
6. Although I am a member of the opposition party, as a Liberal Democrat, I am still supporting Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC)'s position with regards to Network Rail (NR)'s Transport and Work Act Order (TWAO) Application.
7. My submission to the Inquiry is in my role as a District Councillor for the people of Harston and Hauxton. C07, No name no.37, Harston falls within my district and is the focus of my Proof of Evidence.

## GENERAL POINTS

8. In my view the provision of information and consultation by Network Rail (NR) throughout the process for their Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) Application has been insufficient.
9. District Councillors like myself were not provided with the proposed plans or updates directly, which made it difficult for us to be aware that they were there for comment. This has also made it difficult for Councillors and for local residents to be kept abreast of the most up to date plans.
10. I had a number of residents raising concerns with me about the proposals, and the lack of information has made my job difficult.
11.1 attended the public exhibition in June 2016 and I completed an online response form on 04/07/17 in which I made it known that I did not support NR's proposal for C07.
11. NR did not seem to take any notice of the points that I raised with them, and I made an objection, providing my Statement of Case to the Department of Transport on the $17^{\text {th }}$ June 2017. This is attached as Appendix 1 to my proof of evidence.
12. In their early consultation NR were keen to point out that their proposals were largely safety based. I also note that NR's Statement of Case mentions safety as a concem more than any other issue. Initially, I believed that it was being said that C07 was actually an unsafe crossing, and so I thought perhaps it should be
closed. However, it now seems that NR have backtracked from their initial safety argument as the main thrust and now seem to be basing it on their own asset reduction strategy. This being the case, and C07 seemingly not being a particularty dangerous crossing, I do not see why the residents of Harston should lose an important public right of way (PRoW) network to assist NR with their asset reduction exercise.

## USER OF ROUTE

14. I used to walk my dogs along the route from Donkey Lane, crossing London Road and then walking west along the informal footpath along the field-edge to the north of London Road towards Harston. I used this route perhaps twice a week from 2004 to 2010, a period of 6 years.
15. In addition, I am aware that the PRoW area in the vicinity is popular with pedestrians, cyclists, dog-wakers and joggers in increasing numbers, many of whom use Crossing C07 on a regular basis.

## CONCERNS WITH NR PROPOSALS

16. Safety: NR's proposals would place users along the London Road. I have long had reservations about London Road, as it is particularly dangerous, with traffic travelling too fast and poor sightlines at key areas, most notably at the crest of the bridge
17. Vehicles travelling along London Road travel too fast because they have a false perception that the way ahead of them is clearer than it really is. The camber on the hill as it leads to the bridge is sudden and vehicles travelling at high speeds struggle to see, and react to, pedestrians along the route.
18. There is no pavement along London Road. The verges to either side are rutted and dangerous and are not suitable for pedestrians.
19. I thought that the NR proposal would be an opportunity to provide for a utility link between the villages of Harston and Newton. However I recognise that a utility link would serve a different purpose than the current country path.
20. In addition, I don't think the proposal achieves the aim of a utility path either. Making people cross the road twice is less safe than the current rail crossing. In addition the steps would make it more difficult for people with pushchairs and other disabilities. Even a ramp would still be more difficult than the current crossing.
21. Connectivity: The route that passes over crossing C07 is important for the connectivity of villages in the area. It helps to connect the villages of Hauxton, Harston and Newton and I am concerned that the extinguishment of this PRoW will contribute to a severance of these rural communities.

Signed $\qquad$

Dated $\qquad$

