

OBJ/182

Angela Foster

TWAO unit

Department for Transport

Zone 1/14

Great Minster House

33 Horseferry Road

London

SW1P 4DR

Cranfield Court

Wood End Road

Cranfield

MK43 0EB

18/10/2018

Dear Angela Foster,

I wish to serve a Statement of Case on the Secretary of State for the Transport and Works Act 1992: Application for the proposed network rail improvements (East West Rail Bicester to Bedford improvement order.

My Statement of Case comprises my objection letter, which I would like to be treated as my statement of case, and an email from Mrs Jean Peall, resident of Lidlington village, who describes the recent effect of a weekend closure of the crossing on Station Road.

Both documents are enclosed

Yours sincerely,

Sue Clark

Central Beds ward councillor for the Cranfield and Marston ward.

Secretary of State for Transport
c/o Transport and Works Act Orders Unit
General Counsel's Office
Department for Transport
Zone 1/18
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

Cranfield Court
Wood End Road
Cranfield
MK43 0EB

7 September 2018

Response from Councillor Sue Clark Central Bedfordshire (CBC) Councillor for the Cranfield and Marston Ward to the East-West Rail Western Section Phase 2 Transport and Works Act Order. I am responding to this TWAO in my role as Ward Councillor.

As a Ward Councillor for the Central Bedfordshire Ward of Cranfield and Marston a significant section of the Bedford to Bletchley (Marston Vale Line) runs through my ward from Ridgmont in the west to Green Lane, Stewartby in the East. A number of the proposed crossing closures, diversions and construction works therefore affect my ward, and particularly affect residents in my ward.

Whilst I am supportive of the East West Rail scheme as a whole, I wish to make an objection to the making of the Draft Order for the reasons outlined below. I hope that further technical work by NWR will address my concerns.

1. The Draft Order and the EIA need to take account of the strategic developments proposed in my ward in the Draft CBC Local Plan. The Marston Vale is the site of a strategic housing allocation of 5,000 houses, and this should be considered as a reasonably foreseeable future project. The CBC Local Plan is well developed. It has been submitted for examination, which will take place this autumn, and an outline planning application for the strategic site has been submitted to CBC for determination. In fact the allocation in the Marston Vale was partially predicated on the East West Rail project. It therefore seems quite wrong not to take the allocation into account. Such large scale housing development will have a significant impact on the existing rural road network and the level crossings, as well as increasing demand on existing footpath/cycleway/bridleway crossings. It will increase the need for connectivity across the rail line, which is in contrast to current proposals which reduce connectivity by closing footpaths. It will increase waiting times at barriers with more users on the roads.
2. The Strategic allocation at Marston Gate for 35Ha of B8 warehousing which is located next to Ridgmont Station should also be taken into account as a reasonably foreseeable project.

3. I am still very concerned about the impact of the proposed closure of 2 footpaths and the diversion onto Station Road in Lidlington. Lidlington is divided by the railway line and the 'School Crossing' is heavily used. I do appreciate the great effort NWR have gone to to carry out further survey work in this location to understand the origin and destination of the footpath users, and I do appreciate that there does not seem to be a reasonable alternative to the closure and diversion of this footpath available at present. However, the consequences for the village in terms of loss of connectivity and increased severance remain. We need to understand further and be satisfied by the mitigation that is proposed to protect pedestrians at the Station Road crossing.
4. The closure of the South Pilling Farm footpath also contributes to reducing the connectivity in Lidlington village, where 4 crossing points will be reduced to 2. Again, whilst I understand the need to close the individual crossing, the combined effect of closing 2 of the 4 crossing points in the village will create a real problem of severance. It seems extremely counter intuitive to be reducing the crossing points and the connectivity especially when much of the proposed strategic housing growth in the Marston Vale will be in close proximity to Lidlington.
5. The closure and redesign of the Marston Road crossing will also severely impact the village of Lidlington during the extremely long construction phase. It will close off one of the routes in and out of the village for a whole year, further reducing connectivity, and forcing vehicles to use the Bury Ware exit onto the A507, which has very poor visibility. The proposed access for construction vehicles along Bury Ware from the A507 will take HGVs through the village on an entirely unsuitable steep and narrow country lane, with a poor visibility junction onto the A507. This will heap yet further misery on the residents of Lidlington. Much more information is needed to understand the suitability of the mitigation to the A507 junction and Bury Ware itself that is proposed. Alternative routes also need to be considered.
6. The detail design of the new crossing at Marston bridge must incorporate a footpath/bridle/cycleway. It is not clear at present how this is to be achieved.

Taken on a case by case basis I can understand the works and closures NWR are proposing, however, the cumulative effect of these individual schemes on the small village of Lidlington also needs to be considered here. At present the current schemes offer no benefit for the village, only a loss of connectivity, increased severance and considerable disruption during construction. I request that these points are considered further.

Yours faithfully,

Sue Clark

From: Jean Peall
Sent: 30 September 2018 13:39
To: Cllr Ken Matthews; Cllr Robert Morris; David Castella; Iain Clapham; kara milne; Lidlington Parish Council; Peter Sparks; Sharon Bissessar; Shawn Haddaway; Sue Clark; sue.clark@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
Subject: Level Crossing closure - a problem!

Hi all,

I walked up for church this morning whilst the crossing is closed. I was allowed to walk over before (just about) but I was not allowed to go over it afterwards. I had to use the School crossing.

We have mentioned this scenario but what do they expect us to do when the school crossing is closed? The next nearest pedestrian crossing is beyond the sports field, down a muddy lane. There is no other suitable alternative for pedestrians to get to the other side of the village.

On another note, whilst the crossing is closed, do the Emergency services get notified?

Concerned,
Jean