

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 – SECTION 118A
RAIL CROSSING EXTINGUISHMENT ORDER 2018
KENT COUNTY COUNCIL PUBLIC FOOTPATH CW80 & CWX40, WHITSTABLE
(GLEBE WAY LEVEL CROSSING)

PINS REFERENCE: ROW/3226477

**SUMMARY OF PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF GEMMA KENT, ON BEHALF OF NETWORK RAIL
INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED (NRIL)**

PINS REFERENCE:

- i. My name is Gemma Kent and I am the Level Crossing Manager, for Network Rail, Kent Route
- ii. In my proof of evidence for this Public Inquiry I have covered the following matters:
 - a. A detailed description of Glebe Way Level Crossing (“the Crossing”), including assets relating to current mitigation at the Crossing including signage, Whistle boards and crossing surface. This also includes train movements and train speeds.
 - b. Our Level Crossing strategy on how we approach managing level crossing safety, risk management and how we work with stakeholders to achieve this.
 - c. Our approach to risk management of all level crossings and the standards that set out our requirements for assessment, including the “All Level Crossing Risk Model” (ALCRM) the mandatory tool developed and approved by NRIL in conjunction with Rail Safety & Standards Board (RSSB) to quantify individual risk, collective risk and Fatality and Weighted Injury probability.
 - d. The approach taken by NRIL to risk assessments and for assessing risk under the “Narrative Risk Assessment” (NRA) for Glebe Way, including the details of the census recently carried out at the Crossing,
 - e. I set out how ALCRM and the NRA allow for a comprehensive and expert overview of both the quantitative and qualitative assessment of safety risk and how the data is used to make informed decisions about options for improving level crossing safety.
 - f. Specific to Glebe Way, how the quantitative and qualitative risk assessment data has been used to inform decisions about whether different options that have been modelled in ALCRM determine what, if any, risk reduction each will provide and whether any that may potential to come forward, may simply not prove reasonably practicable in the particular circumstances, thereby concluding why, in the case of the Crossing, closure remains absolutely necessary.

- g. Consideration of risk reduction balanced against Cost Benefit Analysis to determine if any of the options can be considered, concluding that the provision of Miniature Stop Lights would not suitably reduce risk to as low as reasonably practical and that a bridge or underpass cannot be built due to physical constraints and topography on site.
- h. A description of the various profiles of level crossing user, including child, Vulnerable and Encumbered users, dog walkers and adverse human behaviours as a major contributory factor for incidents, with details of these user groups captured within the census.
- i. Protocols for use of Level Crossings. This includes a history of incidents at the Crossing, including accidental human error as well as deliberate misuse, deliberate violations and acts of trespass taken place at the Crossing.
- j. A comparison of other similar Level Crossings, sighting comparable examples which has unfortunately resulted in fatalities to level crossing users and which can feasibly occur at Glebe Way.
- k. The conclusion that in respect of the Crossing, there are no technical solutions either available now or foreseeably, that could reasonably and practically be delivered and in order to meaningfully eliminate or satisfactorily reduce safety risk in overall terms.