

Cllr Liddy

[Signature]

At the core of this Inquiry lies a dilemma that has bedevilled railways since their inception nearly 200 years ago. While they reduce travelling time between communities and thereby bring them closer together, they also intersect intermediate, and usually smaller communities, and divide them. This was one of the earliest objections from farmers and not without some validity.

However, the presence of some many vehicular and pedestrian level crossings through out both the countryside and in urban settlements suggests a typically British compromise between two conflicting, but equally valid needs.

Network Rail in promoting this draft order seeks to un-stitch that compromise by using its considerable resources to impose its goals on local communities. During these hearings it has continued to demonstrate a tin ear to objections from local communities, despite its protestations to the contrary.

I am reluctant to criticise people have a job to do and do it to the best of their ability. However, Mr. Kenning's answers yesterday were both instructive and revealing. He had no difficulty in seeing danger when getting out of bed in the morning, when compared to the dangers of

exposure to road traffic on the High St bridge, but not when it came the perceived risks at the Paget Rd crossing. An interesting contradiction.

Again, Mrs. Tillbrook's replies to questioning at the reopening of the inquiry were equally illuminating in that the safety for an alternative road route is measured on data taken within the previous 5 years, whereas level crossing safety data has no such time limits attached to it.

S 5(6) (a) of the TWA requires "an alternative right of way". Custom and practice has inserted the word "suitable". However, suitability is a subjective concept, that cannot be measured. What NR consider to be suitable for Wivenhoe is not the same as what the residents and Town Council consider suitable.

So it is with the proposed alterations to the traffic flow on the High St bridge. The area between the railway line and the river, Lower Wivenhoe, is quite densely populated. I estimate there are approximately 1000 dwellings there, housing some 2,500 to 3,500 people. On that basis, I estimate an ownership of 1000 vehicles.

My community will have to live with the consequences of this ill thought out scheme for many years after this Inquiry has packed up and its report submitted to the Secretary of State. Essex County Council's road traffic

schemes in Colchester have a notoriously short shelf life. Changes are introduced after nugatory consultations, at considerable cost and disruption, only to be scrapped some 10 to 20 years later and replaced with either the original configuration or another scheme in its place.

Experience tells me that the same mistakes are about to be repeated. In addition losing to Paget Rd we will also have the only vehicular access to the lower village reduced to one lane. A traffic contra flow system on the on the bridge was introduced some ten years ago, despite the same arguments against it, but was eventually scrapped for those very reasons.

Really the bridge should be replaced, but it is clear from the correspondence that NR has neither the will nor the resources to do that.

All our objections are based on our passion for our community.

Connectivity is an important component of community, without it there is no community. *Ann Clark* Wivenhoe is intersected by the Colchester to Clacton railway line. It has five crossing points, Anglesea Rd bridge, the High St bridge, the Station footbridge, a muddy cattle duct and Paget Rd. To lose Paget Rd would not destroy our community, but would weaken it at a time when governments, fearful of increasing social isolation and dislocation, are anxious to foster and encourage communities to develop greater resilience within themselves, in all sorts of ways most notably in

terms of health, housing, sport and planning. NR's approach to railway safety contradicts that approach. We have heard much about NR's resilience in various forms. I want to protect my community's resilience.

We are proud to live in a healthy and safe community of the sort that the NPPF seeks to promote. ^{Ann Clark} Interestingly, the NPPF para 92 (c) places an obligation on planning authorities "To provide..." I would argue that Paget Rd falls precisely into that category and should be removed from the draft order.