

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES
PROCEDURE) RULES 2004**

**THE NETWORK RAIL
(ESSEX AND OTHERS
LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION)
ORDER**

SUSAN TILBROOK

**REBUTTAL OF
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

-OF-

CHRIS CAMP

Document Reference	NR32/4/6 (Crossing: E02)
--------------------	-----------------------------

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Response to matters raised in the proof of evidence of Mr Camp regarding E02 Camps Level Crossing	2

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared on behalf of Network Rail to respond to particular matters raised in the proof of evidence of Mr Chris Camp, which was received by Network Rail on 20 September 2017.
- 1.2 It is not intended that this rebuttal proof should cover matters that have already been addressed in my Proof of Evidence (NR32/1) or of other witnesses for the Promoter; however, cross references to relevant parts of that evidence are given below, where appropriate.
- 1.3 I believe the facts and opinions stated to be true and that my evidence conforms to the standards and requirements of my professional body.

2 Response to matters raised in the proof of evidence of Mr Camp regarding E02 Camps Level Crossing

- 2.1 *On page 1 of his Proof Mr Camp states that “regarding points of origin and destination of users, the only points of origin and destination to be considered are those at each end of the section of path to be extinguished. The proposed alternative route is approximately three times the length of the section of path to be extinguished. Therefore the existing users of the path to be extinguished will be significantly inconvenienced by the proposed new route”.*
- 2.2 I have addressed the existing public rights of way in the area in paragraph 2.2.10 of my Proof of Evidence **NR32/1**. There will be variations to the users’ origins and destinations which will affect the lengths to be walked. I have addressed diversion length in 2.2.8 of my Proof of Evidence.
- 2.3 *On page 1 of his Proof Mr Camp states “the proposed new public footpaths along field margins would greatly increase the highway authority’s maintenance liability, as they would require cutting and on-going maintenance of several new footbridges across existing ditches”.*
- 2.4 The matter of commuted sums (payment from Network Rail to Essex County Council) to cover ongoing maintenance costs has been raised with Essex County Council at 2 meetings during the development of the proposals as recorded in the meeting minutes appended to my Proof of Evidence in document NR32/2 at Tab 5. This demonstrates that Network Rail are willing to work with Essex CC to agree commuted sums and will enter into an agreement for the payment of the relevant sums.
- 2.5 *On page 2 of his Proof Mr Camp states that “under the alternative solution, the two options C-E-S-D or C-E-G-F are similar in length to the existing route which they replace, C-B-A-D. The only reduction in length of footpath would be the shortening of Footpath 74 by approximately 250m which does not represent a significant loss to the overall PRow network”.*
- 2.6 I address this issue at paragraph 2.2.15 of my Proof of Evidence **NR32/1**.

