

**Sims, Andy M**

---

**Subject:** FW: objection to diversion of footpath at Bailey Lane Level Crossing

**Switch-MessageId:** 4ee09961b56f4504bbcfdf8621e2027b

**From:** M

**Sent:** 15 September 2019 11:11

**To:** Countryside Access <Countryside.Access@cumbria.gov.uk>

**Subject:** objection to diversion of footpath at Bailey Lane Level Crossing

Dear Sir:

Re: Order under Section 119A of the Highways Act 1980 (diversion of footpath at Bailey Lane Level Crossing, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria)

I am writing to object to the above order made on 29 August 2019.

The grounds for my objection are:

1. The reason for the diversion is the proposed closure of Bailey Lane Level Crossing. Closure can be justified if the crossing is found to be unsafe even after Network Rail have exhausted all reasonable efforts to make the crossing as safe as possible. Network Rail has not yet fulfilled this responsibility. For example, efforts to install a "train approaching" indicator, or red flashing lights, or CCTV cameras, etc have not been made. The efforts made so far to improve safety have in fact been very minimal.
2. A "diversion" of a 9 metre path which totals  $154+17+187+28 = 386$  metres cannot reasonably be called a diversion. It is simply a closure of the original path. Thus the order is misleading.

Yours faithfully

M

**WARNING:** Email attachments may contain malicious and harmful software. If this email is unsolicited and contains an attachment **DO NOT** open the attachment and advise the ICT Service Desk immediately. Never open an attachment or click on a link within an email if you are not expecting it or it looks suspicious.