

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: RE: Objection: Meldreth Road Level Crossing (C3R) Changes
Date: 27 September 2022 00:00:08
Attachments: [030B84B033F54487B69019CD9CCBDDF3.png](#)

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Sent: 26 September 2022 15:29
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Objection: Meldreth Road Level Crossing (C3R) Changes

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your email citing your objection. In order to register your objection, we require a postal address?

Kind regards
Shenaz Choudhary

**Ms Shenaz Choudhary | Planning Casework Officer, Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit,
Department for Transport
1/14 | 07971 146036 |**

From: Roger James [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 September 2022 14:15
To: CambridgeC3R@networkrail.co.uk; TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE
<TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE@dft.gov.uk>
Cc: Anthony Browne MP <anthony.browne.mp@parliament.uk>; Peter McDonald Cllr
<Peter.McDonald@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection: Meldreth Road Level Crossing (C3R) Changes

Dear Sir,

I as a resident of Meldreth to express my objections to the recently announced detailed C3R plans for the level crossing at Meldreth Road, Shepreth.

As an individual I participated in the earlier consultation on the development proposals and note that at the time there was no data provided on the impact of the changes on local traffic [ref: ANON-66ZE-7M3C-5]. In my response under 'other' I specifically raised the issue on the disruption to all forms of transport in Meldreth.

Your brochure on C3R arrived today, just 24 hours before your deadline, and my vote for support is now formally withdrawn in the event of you being honest about your intentions – the paltry response of 109 should be reduced by 1.

The level crossing on Meldreth Road, Shepreth manages the main and only practical route for car drivers, farm & business vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians to go between Meldreth and our

major town of Cambridge for shops, hospitals.

The limited data made available on the impact on traffic comes from a presentation prepared by Network Rail which they were due to present to our Rail User Group meeting (Meldreth Shepreth & Foxton). In the event no representative from Network Rail was available but their PowerPoint presentation was provided in which two items stood out:-

1. In a table discussing the increased delays to those using the crossing it provided data from the peak time 8am to 9am identifying 12 crossing closures with a duration of 69 seconds for the current barrier increasing to 169 seconds [Note: the current average for closure is 50 seconds]
2. In the commentary it suggested this difference was 'not considered significant' As a resident I do not view it as 'not considered significant'! In the peak hour for me (going to work, going to school) the anticipated delays, i.e. road closures, would increase from approximately 12 minutes per hour to 36 minutes per hour. This is a strangulation of a major village thoroughfare and right of way which for more than half the time has the barriers shut.

Shepreth residents have already seen the impact on their other crossing, adjacent to the station, with peak hour transit (delay) times measured at 18 minutes. In the case of the Meldreth Road crossing when I might choose to visit Barrington, and vice versa, there is a double peril in traversing both crossings – who in C3R considers a 36 minute delay 'not significant'? Personally I doubt your claim that C3R "improves efficiency and reliability". To me it is a narrow and undisguised 'amenity grab' by Network Rail to enforce your interests above those of the local residents and road users for whom this thoroughfare pre-dates the railway itself. If the changes were indeed an 'improvement' to signalling and safety there would be no significant change to the barrier down times.

Of course I understand the safety motives and the need to reduce risk wherever possible. Analysis from Shepreth Parish Council suggests that accurate data is lacking but the specific question – what improvements would a full barrier provide than a half barrier does not? – remains to be answered. There can be no reduction of risk to, say, a car stalling on the crossing between the full and half barrier options. A thorough and complete safety evaluation which includes the nature of the proposed changes which impose significant delays and queues at peak hours would predict a negative effect of safety; regrettably but inevitably making 'the mad dash' to get through the barrier much more likely.

I object strongly to the proposals as currently presented and demand that those designing the scheme rethink their work and maintain the average barrier down times of 69 seconds per event which, surely, can only be the purpose of the better communication and signalling provided by this expenditure of public money.

With regards

Professor Roger James

I would appreciate an acknowledgement and follow-up to the points made in this email, my earlier observations were clearly ignored.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.

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 originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
