

From: Ian and Jackie Andrewartha
Sent: 12 April 2017 16:44
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: Network Rail Anglia Level Crossing Reductions TWA Order

To: Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport & Works Act Orders Unit
General Counsels Office
Dept for Transport
Zone 1/18
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
LONDON SW1P 4DR

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object most strongly to the proposals.

My grounds for objection are as follows:

1) E52 - Golden Square

Closure of the level crossing would involve walkers having to use an unacceptably long and dangerous diversion, by using a long stretch of minor road with no footpath. This would undoubtedly expose walkers to a higher degree of danger from motor vehicles, than the miniscule degree of danger encountered by crossing the railway on the existing level crossing i.e. closing the level crossing would be a retrograde step in terms of safety.

2) E53 - Josselyns

Closure of the level crossing footpath would require an absurdly long, straight diversion in a northerly direction, then returning parallel in a southerly direction, the other side of the railway line. The quality and enjoyment of the walk would be greatly reduced.

The western end of the footpath leads close to the Thatchers Arms public house. By making the use of this footpath unfavourable and arduous with an unacceptable diversion, may reduce business for the pub, at a time when rural public houses are struggling.

The pleasure of seeing the beautiful countryside views from the stretch of public footpath near to the level crossing would be lost.

3) E54 - Bures

The current public footpath via the level crossing, gives residents from nearby housing easy access to surrounding countryside, for walks, and runs, for fitness, health and enjoyment. Closure of the level crossing would hinder this, making it more difficult for people to enjoy the surrounding countryside. Closure of the level crossing would make it more difficult to complete the round of delivery of The Connection, an important local community magazine.

4) General Objection To All Level Crossing Closures

The risks to pedestrians are miniscule.

Pedestrians encounter risks in crossing roads every day, all over the country, and are often injured or killed in doing so. However, there is no suggestion that roads should be closed.

Due to the nature of railways, they are either straight, or long open bends, with good views. Trains can be seen from a long way off, so the risk is very low.

Warning signs are used to reduce the risk.

There should be no level crossing closures, unless it can be shown that persons have been injured or killed. If, at any particular site, an accident occurs, no doubt the most intricate of inquiries will have been conducted, and if any action is required to remedy safety risks at that site, it can be taken. Meanwhile, surely Network Rail must visit, inspect, and risk-assess all the level crossings periodically, and if a particular site is subject to inordinately high risk, measures can be put in place to rectify the situation. To make a blanket closure of ALL level crossings, has too many negative effects to too many people, in an attempt to mitigate a microscopic risk.

Ian ANDREWARTHA

Keen Walker and Member of the Ramblers

Deliverer of The Connection Magazine in Bures Hamlet (private objection, not from The Connection Magazine)

Mount Bures Parish Council Footpath Maintenance Operative (private objection, not from Mount Bures Parish Council)

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