

**TALLINGTON LEVEL CROSSING
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON 12TH DECEMBER 2008**

Present: Cllr Moore (SKDC), Cllr Trollope-Bellew (LCC), Ken Otter, John Allen, David Allen, Brian Thompson (LCC), Karen Sinclair (SKDC)	
Apologies: Teena Twelves (SKDC)	
Notes of Meeting	Action
<p>It was acknowledged by all present that there was an issue at Tallington which needed to be addressed.</p> <p>BT outlined LCC's involvement since 1999 in trying to progress a solution. It was not disputed that during the peak am period, hold ups resulted in the barriers being down for 46 minutes per hour. However, Network Rail considered Tallington to be a safe crossing, not affecting operations: they had retained this view consistently.</p> <p>LCC had sought to discuss the Tallington issue at Government and regional level. Had not received an encouraging response at Government level but were continuing to work with GOEM, although at meeting with Network Rail and Office of the Rail Regulator (ORR), GOEM had failed to be represented.</p> <p>Network Rail has approved expenditure to upgrade the joint line. This will enable freight to be removed from East Coast Main Line (ECML) and replaced by passenger trains resulting in morning peak being at capacity but also increase throughout the day.</p> <p>Whilst LCC see Tallington as important issue it is not something they consider should be solely down to them to fund (in fact legally they are unable to put more than £5 million into any one scheme) but funding from Regional pot has been allocated up to 2020. Cost of bridge and bypass likely to be in region of £20 million. With possible funding from LCC (£5m) and possibly Network Rail (£1m) will still have funding shortfall: need to keep pressure up on funding agencies.</p> <p>Next planned review of Tallington in 2024, when ORR able to get involved. However, KO has recorded incidents of vehicles getting trapped under barriers having jumped the lights: should use this to keep pressure up on ORR to take action.</p> <p>BT outlined proposal to commission feasibility study (jointly funded by LCC, SKDC and landowner) to look at uplift value in land price through housing development which could be used to contribute towards funding pot. This will provide advice on the minimum quantum of residential development that would be required to fund the construction of the by-pass and bridge.</p> <p>It was noted, however, that although local people wanted to see a bypass built they did not want this to come on the back of major housing development (view from findings of survey as part of Parish Plan process).</p> <p>KS confirmed that the latest version of the Core Strategy did not make provision for any significant level of new housing development at Tallington. Should this be pursued as an option at some point in the future then consideration would have to be</p>	

<p>given as to how the Core Strategy would deal with this i.e. possible amendment.</p> <p>There had been a meeting on site in July 2008 with Network Rail level crossing engineers, who had confirmed that the 1954 bypass route was the most logical. It was queried why a bypass was proposed rather than an on-line solution. It was agreed that there was insufficient room for a bridge to gain sufficient height on the current road alignment and BT explained that it would not be feasible to gain height by turning the road to run parallel to the railway as the curves that would be required to turn the road over the railway would not be permitted by the current national standards for "A" Class roads. There would also be noise issues due to vehicles having to use low gears.</p> <p>DA handed out a table showing trend in closure of crossing and how by 2012, based on predicted train movements (taken from actual movements or from 2010 published information) there would be total closure of the level of crossing.</p> <p>AM queried whether any cost benefit analysis had been undertaken. BT confirmed that regional funding pot bids were now subject to cost benefit analysis but schemes were up against major urban areas, which always scored well. However, LCC had recently been involved in a pilot to test a model being developed for Network Rail that assessed costs against time delays and the type of vehicles involved. In this trial model, Tallington had scored the best ratio for the data LCC had put through. However, it was not known what factors had been fed into the model and it should not be assumed that a bridge would be the favoured solution: others might be diverting traffic to alternate routes, an underpass or closure. Understood that DfT were looking at the model to see if it could form the basis for releasing Government funding in the future.</p> <p>It was clear that interested parties have different priorities and there was, therefore, a need to talk to GOEM and others. It was agreed that the priority was to arrange a meeting with GOEM, Network Rail and ORR to explore how this issue could be progressed.</p>	<p>BT/DA to arrange</p>
<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>To be arranged for mid-July 2009</p>	