

# Response ID ANON-13H4-7Y67-W

Submitted to **Melton Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft**  
Submitted on **2016-12-16 10:49:33**

## About you

### 1 What is your name?

**Name:**  
Anthony Rivero

### 2 What is your email address?

**Email:**  
[REDACTED]

### 3 Are you responding as an individual, consultee, stakeholder or other?

Stakeholder

**If Consultee, Stakeholder, or Other, please give details here. :**  
Network Rail (Infrastructure) Ltd.

### 4 Address

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### 5 Age

**Please select your age:**  
[REDACTED]

## Policy IN1 –Transport & Strategic Transport Infrastructure

### 1 CH8PIN1Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN1 is?

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**  
Yes

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**  
No

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:**  
Yes

### 2 CH8PIN1Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?

3) Effective

**3 CH8PIN1Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN1 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy IN1 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**  
LEVEL CROSSINGS

The safety, reliability and efficiency of the rail infrastructure are of paramount importance to Network Rail and we cannot agree to any proposals which jeopardise these requirements. Level crossings are safe if used correctly. Most level crossing risk has resulted from user error or abuse. We are committed to reducing the risk at level crossings where reasonably practicable and will seek to close and/or divert crossings or enhance their safety through the provision of improved safety

features or equipment. We will work with local councils to take a holistic approach to reducing level crossing risk and will encourage planning authorities to co-operate in securing level crossing closures or improvements in connection with new developments. Only in exceptional circumstances will we permit new crossings to be introduced onto the network.

We would encourage the inclusion of a policy statement which makes it clear to developers that no new crossings will be permitted, that proposals which increase the use of level crossings will generally be resisted and where development would prejudice the safe use of a level crossing an alternative bridge crossing will require to be provided at the developers expense.

LDP site assessments must take cognisance of the impact of development proposals on level crossings. Transport assessment and developer contributions policy and supplementary guidance must ensure infrastructure risks are identified and mitigation secured.

There are a number of level crossings in the Melton Borough area which, if there is an intensification of use through the allocation of land for traffic-intense uses (both pedestrian and vehicular), would give us cause for concern. An example is the automatic half barrier at Normanton Lane, Bottesford, where the impact of the planned additional 400+ dwellings on the operation of the crossing would have to be carefully considered (particularly site BOT5). Although criterion 4 of policy IN1 of the Plan does mention the need to ensure development does not impact on the safety and movement of traffic on the highway network this does not necessarily extend to safety of the rail network where it interfaces at level crossings, and would not be directly applicable to foot level crossings in particular. We therefore advocate an alteration to policy IN1 to specifically mention level crossings.

**4 CH8PIN1Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

**lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:**

We therefore advocate an alteration to policy IN1 to specifically mention level crossings.

Do not unacceptably impact on the safety and movement of traffic on the highway network (including railway level crossings) or that any such impacts can be mitigated through appropriate improvements;

## **Policy IN2: Infrastructure Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy**

**1 CH8PIN2Q1: Do you consider that Policy IN2 is?**

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Legally Compliant::**

Yes

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Sound::**

No

**Do you consider that Policy SS1 - Complies with Duty to Co-operate:**

Yes

**2 CH8PIN2Q2: If answered "No" to "2: Sound" please answer the following question. Do you consider that the Policy is unsound because it is not?**

3) Effective

**3 CH8PIN2Q3: Please give details of why you consider Policy IN2 is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of Policy IN2 or its compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.**

**Please insert text here. :**

The Policy is only considered not to be effective because of an omission from the proposed infrastructure delivery list. As part of policy IN1 it is noted that the Council is keen to develop transport interchange facilities at Melton and Bottesford stations. As part of this we would suggest that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (and by extension the Community Infrastructure Levy and 123 List) should consider the provision of an item concerning the provision of mobility impaired access to Melton station. Network Rail is not funded to provide disabled access at stations. The Department of Transport provides an "Access For All" fund to provide such improvements to access at selected stations. "Access For All" is part of the Department for Transport's (DfT) Railways for All Strategy and was designed to address the issues faced by disabled passengers using railway stations in Great Britain. Central to the programme is funding provided centrally for provision of an obstacle free, accessible route to and between platforms at priority stations. This generally includes the provision of lifts or ramps, as well as associated works and refurbishment along the defined route. Network Rail is tasked with delivering this programme of improvements and is working closely with train operating companies and other relevant stakeholders to ensure a co-ordinated approach to works at stations. Each train Operating Company can bid for some of its stations to be included where it can be justified in terms of patronage; however an additional advantage is to be able to demonstrate an element of third party funding towards the project. In this instance having an item on the CiL 123 list would be advantageous on the assumption that the Access for All Fund is continued into the next Control Period 6 (2019-24).

We would therefore suggest that under the Infrastructure Delivery Plan an allowance is made towards the provision of step free access at Melton Mowbray Station. This in all probability would be in the form of lifts although a feasibility study would need to be carried out to see if a ramped footbridge could also be provided as an alternative. In either event the costs are likely to be in the region of £2 million. Whilst it is not expected that the total cost of the project should be borne by the Levy a contribution of around 25% would be consistent with other such schemes funded elsewhere on the network

**4 CH8PIN2Q4: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 2 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this change will make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

**lease set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Melton Local Plan legally compliant or sound:**

Suggested modification – item on the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule Appendix 4 Page 8

Infrastructure Item – Access Improvements at Melton Mowbray Railway Station

Location – Melton Mowbray railway station

Responsibility for delivery – Network Rail/Train Operating Company

Timescale/Phasing 2019-23

Estimated Capital Cost £2 million

Funding Public Funding

Funding Gap likely to be £0.5 million assuming grant from DfT

Priority Essential

Relevant LP Policies IN1

## **Examination**

**1 EXQ1: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?**

Written Representations

**If you wish to speak at examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary::**

**2 EXQ2: Moreover please indicate if you wish to continue to be involved in the Local Plan (Please tick appropriate boxes).**

If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Melton Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided when the Inspector's Report is available to view, If you wish to be notified at the address/e-mail provided in Part A when the Melton Local Plan is adopted, If you/your organisation wish to be included in future consultations on the Melton Local Plan

## **Acknowledgement**

**1 I understand the above statement and agree I have complied with its requirements**

I agree