

From: Thomas Hill QC
Sent: 02 May 2017 11:28
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: Re: Network Rail: Anglia Level Crossing Proposals - S04 Island - Bentley Parish

Dear Ms O'Neill

Thank you for your email.

Certainly. My full postal address is [REDACTED]

Kind regards

Thomas Hill QC

----- Original Message -----

From: "transportandworksact" <TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
To: "Thomas Hill QC"
Sent: Tuesday, 2 May, 2017 10:31:35
Subject: RE: Network Rail: Anglia Level Crossing Proposals - S04 Island - Bentley Parish

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your e-mail. Is it possible that you could provide a full postal address so that I can formally register you as an objector to these proposals.

Kind regards
Caroline O'Neill

Caroline O'Neill | Miss, Transport and Works Act Orders Unit, General Counsels Office, Department for Transport
1/14-18, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 4DR | 020 7944 3196 |

-----Original Message-----

From: Thomas Hill QC |
Sent: 02 May 2017 08:40
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT <TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject: Network Rail: Anglia Level Crossing Proposals - S04 Island - Bentley Parish

Dear Sir/Madam

I write with reference to Network Rail's Anglia Level Crossing Proposals, in particular in respect of S04 - Island (Bentley Parish).

I understand that formal consultation on these proposals runs until 5th May 2017.

I am resident of the northern part of Bentley Parish and occasional user of this crossing.

My position is as follows:

1. I support the principle of the diversion subject to the qualification expressed below. The reason for this is that the risks to human safety and rail passengers and staff are disproportionate to the level of inconvenience which would be experienced by users.

2. The extra part of the diversion alongside the roadway to "circumnavigate" the separately proposed "vehicle restraint barriers" is completely unnecessary and will make the diversion irritating. There has been no explanation or risk assessment to support these barriers. In particular, even if they were supported in principle, I can see no reason why these barriers should not be erected PARALLEL with the railway and the existing fenceline. This would also reinforce the separation between the new footpath and the railway line, which will run parallel with the railway on its diversions north and south. It would also reduce the impact on the adjoining farmer's fields.

3. In summary, therefore, I support the principle, but object to the detail of the proposed diversion where it meets the road way, variously called Capel Road and Church Road. I also make an alternative proposal for the diversion, which would need to be coordinated with a revision to the alignment of the proposed vehicle restraint barriers (if they are properly justified). This would avoid the circuitous route proposed and enable a more direct diversion to be offered.

I would be grateful to receive acknowledgment that you have received these representations and will keep me apprised of future stages in the process.

Yours faithfully

Thomas Hill QC

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

The information in this email may be confidential or otherwise protected by law. If you received it in error, please let us know by return e-mail and then delete it immediately, without printing or passing it on to anybody else. Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and for other lawful purposes.

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