



Anglia Level Crossing Proposals

Southend-on-Sea Consultation Summary
Round 2
Technical Note TN16 Revision A

October 2016

Network Rail



Anglia Level Crossing Proposals

Southend-on-Sea Consultation Summary
Round 2
Technical Note TN16 Revision A

October 2016

Network Rail

Issue and revision record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
Rev A	31/10/16	Joseph Dakkak	Leanne Farrow	Jason Smith	Draft

Information class: Standard

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

Contents

Chapter	Title	Page
1	Overview of Southend-on-Sea responses	1
2	Level crossing questionnaire results	2
2.1	E32 – Woodgrange Close _____	2
2.1.1	Number of responses _____	2
2.1.2	Level of agreement with preferred option _____	2
2.1.3	Concerns _____	2
2.1.4	Summary of comments received from questionnaires _____	3

1 Overview of Southend-on-Sea responses

Following the public consultation exhibition held in Wickford on Saturday 1st October 2016, 6 questionnaire responses have been received.

It should be noted that this document only reports on the questionnaire responses received at the public consultation exhibitions, via the online survey platform, or via the freepost address. There have been a number of additional responses received via letter or email (to anglialevelcrossings@networkrail.co.uk) relating to level crossing proposals in Southend-on-Sea. This report will be updated to include this information in due course.

The questionnaire is designed to obtain feedback on a level crossing by level crossing basis.

A breakdown of the type of respondent is provided below.

- 100% members of the public (6 responses)
- 0% representatives from a Local User Group (0 responses)
- 0% local stakeholders (0 responses)

Table 1.1 shows the level of response and support for the preferred option for the level crossing within Southend-on-Sea. A question was asked “to what extent do you agree with the preferred option for this level crossing?”

- Positive indicates that the respondent chose either “strongly agree” or “agree” in answer to the question.
- Negative indicates that the respondent chose either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in answer to the question.
- Neutral or no response indicates that the respondent chose neither, “undecided/neither agree nor disagree” or did not respond at all to the question.

Table 1.1: Level of response and support for the preferred option at the level crossing

UID	Name	Event	Responses	Support for proposals (3 categories)		
				Positive (incl. strongly agree and agree options)	Neutral / No response	Negative (incl. strongly disagree and disagree options)
E32	Woodgrange Close	Wickford	6	0%	0%	100%
Total			6			

2 Level crossing questionnaire results

Further details on the responses to the questionnaires are provided below. The questionnaire gave respondents the opportunity to provide comments relating to their concerns about the preferred option. A summary of the comments, are also outlined below.

2.1 E32 – Woodgrange Close

2.1.1 Number of responses

There were a total of 6 responses for this level crossing. Responses received have been split into three categories: local stakeholders (i.e. Parish, District and County Councils), Local User Groups and members of the public. The following number of responses was received from these three categories:

- 6 members of the public

2.1.2 Level of agreement with preferred option

The following level of agreement with the preferred option for this level crossing (in absolute and percentage terms) was received:

Table 2.1: Level of agreement with the preferred option

Level of agreement	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Strongly agree	0	0%
Agree	0	0%
Undecided / neither agree or disagree	0	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	6	100%
Not answered	0	0%
Total	6	100%

2.1.3 Concerns

The following numbers of respondents were concerned with the following themes related to the proposals (respondents were given the chance to select multiple options):

Table 2.2: Level of response for each category of concern

Concern	Number of response
Pedestrian safety	3
Vehicle user safety	0
Convenience of the diversion route	6
Public Right of Way connectivity	5
Ground conditions/flood risk on route	0
Environmental impact	1
Impact on local businesses	1
Impact on the amenity of the area (i.e. landscape, noise etc.).	5

2.1.4 Summary of comments received from questionnaires

Public responses:

- “Basically it would be preferable if the level crossing was not closed. Surely in this day and age of increased congestion and obesity we should be encouraging people to walk and not increase the journey to such an extent that people choose to drive instead. Closing this will increase traffic and put more people on the road. The alternative route is too long an alternative for pedestrians and totally unusable for cyclists or the disabled due to the amount of steps on the floor from Lifstan way to Buttery’s, does this alternative comply with disability regulations? The near miss and accident statistics are represented to fit your ideals, risk on the already overloaded narrow path along Southchurch Boulevard by the church would most certainly counteract this. Basically this whole exercise is about cost cutting for your company and has no regard for the community severance this will cause. Also to note that your notices have only just been displayed for consultation purposes and yet this has been being discussed for months.”
- “It would be a travesty if this crossing is closed as lots of people have used this for years and years. How many people have been killed or injured at this crossing? This is not a nanny state; we should be allowed to cross safely without someone objecting. My mother, father, brother, sister, my three children; and now my grandchildren use this crossing. Have you got the right to close our right of way? Moreover, Woodgrange level crossing is an important link for the local community that we would like to see kept open for residents in this area. I beg you to please reconsider your closure and allow the people in the Southchurch area to have access to this crossing.”
- “Firstly, you ask if I agree with the 'preferred option', but if one can't attend the meeting it seems to be impossible to discover what the preferred option is. I've downloaded all the PDFs but nothing seems to state what is proposed, so I've assumed the preferred option is to close the crossing, which I disagree with. My reasons for disagreeing with any plan for closure are as follows:
 - 1. The crossing has excellent visibility along the line in both directions, so there is no danger of pedestrians failing to see oncoming trains.
 - 2. The safety record at this crossing is good.
 - 3. The crossing is part of a popular walking route from communities north of the railway line to the seafront. If it were closed walkers would have to detour along busy roads which reduce safety.
 - 4. The crossing is used by children and staff going to school. If it were closed they would have to walk further, alongside busy roads, wasting time and energy, or drive instead of walking, adding to pollution and road congestion.
 - There is no justification for closing this valuable crossing which has existed from the opening of the railway and was provided because there was a need, and that need still exists.”
- “Closure is long and along roads (not pleasant) and also involves loss of a RoW footpath.”
- “First thing, this crossing is an ancient right of way, is has been there long before the railway was even built and should be preserved for future use, to close it would be a disgrace. I regularly walk down this path as it connects well with the path that goes across the Thorpe Bay golf course. It does not matter what time of year it is, it's a pleasant walk and it's away from traffic. I have never been aware of an accident on the crossing although I am aware of a suicide at this crossing that that can happen anywhere on the railway network. The crossing is perfectly safe when used correctly, in the 1950's, my father even used to watch and record the steam engines that worked the Fenchurch Street line from

this crossing. It must and should be noted that it is adding a good half a mile to the route, it is a long way round and will add 15 minutes to every journey time. One thing that must be said, the notices about the options for the crossing were removed very shortly after they were put up, most likely deliberately by kids, etc., as a result, I expect not many members of the public will be aware of this crossings possible closure and a better awareness should be employed, e.g. leaflets, adverts in local papers, etc. Everybody in this area should be made aware of the possible closure and given the chance to give their views.”

- “There has not been an accident on this crossing in living memory. It is a safe crossing with good visibility in both directions and is part of a public right of way. The alternative is substantially longer, increasing the distance by at least a factor of three and I can see no good reason to close this crossing. I would also add that this consultation has been very poorly publicised, with the event getting next to no advance publicity, held in a town many miles from the location of the crossing, and this website being very hard to find. Frankly, this cannot be called a genuine public consultation.”