



Cabinet

Minutes of a meeting held at County Hall, Colliton Park,
Dorchester, Dorset, DT1 1XJ on Wednesday, 24 February 2016

Present:

Robert Gould (Chairman)

Robin Cook, Toni Coombs, Peter Finney, Colin Jamieson, Jill Haynes and Rebecca Knox.

Members Attending

John Wilson, as Chairman of the Council under Standing Order 54

Deborah Croney, County Councillor for Hambledon

Beryl Ezzard, County Councillor for Wareham

Spencer Flower, County Councillor for Verwood and Three Legged Cross

David Harris, County Councillor for Westham

Ros Kayes, County Councillor for Bridport

Paul Kimber, County Councillor for Portland Tophill

William Trite, County Councillor for Swanage

Officers Attending: Debbie Ward (Chief Executive), Catherine Driscoll (Director for Adult and Community Services), Patrick Ellis (Assistant Chief Executive), Mike Harries (Director for Environment and the Economy), Phillip Minns (Head of Learning and Inclusion) and Lee Gallagher (Democratic Services Manager).

For certain items, as appropriate

Emma Baker (Project Engineer), Matthew Piles (Head of Economy), Kelly Rand (Sustainable Transport Officer) and Andrew Shaw (Dorset Travel Team Service Manager).

(Notes:(1) In accordance with Rule 16(b) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules the decisions set out in these minutes will come into force and may then be implemented on the expiry of five working days after the publication date.
Publication Date: **Tuesday, 1 March 2016.**

(2) These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the Cabinet to be held on **Wednesday, 16 March 2016.**)

Apology for Absence

29 An apology was received from Sara Tough (Director for Children's Services). Phil Minns (Head of Learning and Inclusion) attended for Sara Tough.

Code of Conduct

30 There were no declarations by members of disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

With reference to minute 37, a general interest was declared by Mike Harries (Director for Environment and the Economy) as he lived within the area of the scheme, and was the Director responsible for the scheme from the County Council. During the debate on this item he withdrew from the meeting.

Minutes

31 The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2016 were confirmed and signed.

Public Participation

32 Public Speaking

There was 1 set of public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1) regarding Minute 35 'Rural Bus Service Review'. The questions and answers are attached to these minutes.

There were 4 public statements received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2) regarding Minute 35 'Rural Bus Service Review' and Minute 36 'The Future of Wareham Foot Level Crossing'. The statements are attached to these minutes.

Petitions

There were no petitions received at the meeting in accordance with the County Council's Petition Scheme.

Cabinet Forward Plan

33 The Cabinet considered the draft Forward Plan, which identified key decisions to be taken by the Cabinet on or after the next meeting.

Noted

Approach to Support Services

34 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Development in relation to the current position of the Support Services Transformation programme and options for the future of support services.

It was recognised that although the Cabinet had previously agreed to investigate an in-house option combined with joining or forming a Local Authority shared service and recruiting an incremental partner to work with the Council on the transformation of the support services, given the current budget pressures on the Council, it was not appropriate to continue with the recruitment of an incremental partner

It was recognised that the Council had to be flexible in order to drive efficiencies and deliver savings, and that this would be detailed in a further report to the Cabinet in March 2016 which would present clear targets and timescales.

Members also noted that oversight of the transformation and engagement with communities would be a key role of the new Budget Strategy Task and Finish Group.

Resolved

That the approach of developing a programme of change for support services to save a minimum of £1.5m in 2017/18 be endorsed.

Reasons for Decision

1. As part of the programme, the Council would consider the further steps required to deliver additional savings which would ensure value for money, modern and valued support services.
2. In order to set a strategic direction for the Support Services.

Rural Bus Services Review

35 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Environment on the review of public transport in Dorset.

In accordance with the Council's procedures for public speaking, the Cabinet received 1 set of public questions and 1 public statement at the meeting in accordance with Standing Orders 21(1) and 21(2). The questions and answers, and statements are attached to these minutes. The public questions and statements raised the following issues and concerns:

- The financial position of the Council in being able to provide subsidised bus services.
- The creation of rural isolation for people with no way of accessing work, market town shopping, medical appointments and to other public transport networks.
- Economic impact of reduced routes.
- The plans for alternative provision.
- Not enough time taken to consult the public during the 4 week consultation period and that longer should be spent on consultation.

A number of members addressed the Cabinet (including formal questions submitted by Cllr Beryl Ezzard – questions and answers are attached to these minutes) in turn to make comments and raise concerns which included rural and urban isolation; access to employment, education, medical appointments and shopping; the independence of the elderly including the need for social inclusion and for them to remain in their own homes for as long as possible; review of rural travel by North Dorset District Council; need to find alternatives to traditional provision; time needed for communities to create alternatives; the length of consultation undertaken; the quality of the Equalities Impact Assessment and consideration of protected characteristics (which was confirmed by the Monitoring Officer to be sufficient for a decision to be made); perceived inaccuracies of detail within the report; scale of the consultation with only 1000 paper copies of consultation being available; and not enough detail in relation to the why the risk assessment was 'high'.

The Cabinet Member for Environment summarised the strategic impact of subsidising bus routes across the County and explained that the current arrangements were not financially sustainable or fit for purpose and it was therefore necessary to have a strategic passenger transport network in partnership with communities. The Cabinet Member for Communities, Health and Wellbeing then provided a comprehensive overview of developments to date on community transport initiatives through a local workshop approach to solutions with residents, partner organisations, and local councils based on data from the review and consultation. It was suggested that the model be rolled out to communities shortly as a blueprint to facilitate local community transport schemes.

The Cabinet discussed the issues and concerns raised together with the approach for the future to be led by local members to develop initiatives across localities with the input of communities. Further clarification was provided regarding the cost of concessionary travel for free bus passes, managing surplus seats, and school bus integration for all travellers (with appropriate safeguarding).

The Cabinet Member for Economy and Growth reported that he was approaching MPs to secure their support for changes to the operation of the Concessionary Fares scheme to ensure a better outcome for public transport in the future.

Resolved

1. That withdrawal of funding support for public transport routes as described in Appendix 1 of the Cabinet Member's report be approved.
2. That the flexible approach in relation to the development of community transport initiatives be implemented.

Reason for Decisions

Improving efficiency in the delivery of passenger transport services would help support the Council's Corporate Aims – of Enabling Economic Growth and Health, Wellbeing and Safeguarding through providing or supporting a more extensive community transport network.

The Future of Wareham Foot Level Crossing

36 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Environment regarding the Wareham Foot Level Crossing.

In accordance with the Council's procedures for public speaking, the Cabinet received 3 public statements, including 2 from Network Rail, at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2). The statements are attached to these minutes. The statements raised the following issues and concerns:

- The risk to the public if the crossing remained open.
- Safety risks of alternative solutions, including the use of an attendant.
- Financial impact of any alternatives to closing the crossing.
- Previous planning considerations by Purbeck District Council.
- The ambitions of the Swanage Railway to reconnect at Wareham but not whilst the crossing remained open.

Formal questions were submitted by Cllr Beryl Ezzard who urged the Cabinet to keep the crossing open and prevent Wareham being split in half with no feasible alternative crossing, but with a preference for an automatic system or lifts. The questions and answers are attached to these minutes.

As the local member for Swanage, Cllr William Trite, addressed the Cabinet to empathise with local concerns and to highlight the need for the reinstatement of the Swanage Railway with Wareham which had huge public support. He also advocated the use of lifts as the best solution.

The Cabinet Member for Environment acknowledged the need for further consideration to be given to the foot level crossing and announced that the report would return to Cabinet in two months.

Resolved

That the report be deferred for further consideration before being resubmitted to the Cabinet in two months.

Dorchester Transport and Environment Plan (DTEP): Implications of West Dorset District Council Decisions

37 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Environment on the future Dorchester Transport and Environment Plan (DTEP) as a result of consideration by West Dorset District Council.

Resolved

1. That the design and construction of all DTEP elements be progressed except the Maumbury Cross/Fairfield link to an amended timetable and spend profile (Table 2) such that all of these elements are funded through the direct DCC, WDDC and DTC capital expenditure, already approved.
2. In addition, it is agreed to construct a partial improvement at Maumbury Cross to provide a much needed safer pedestrian link to the town centre from the south.
3. That full improvement at Maumbury Cross be postponed, including an improved link across Fairfield, until sufficient developer funding is available and West Dorset District Council support is achieved.

Reason for Decisions

To develop a scheme that achieved the best balance between meeting project objectives and being acceptable to the people of Dorchester and partner councils.

Work experience and access to Apprenticeships for all Year 11 Looked After Young People

- 38 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People regarding apprenticeships for year 11 Looked After Children as part of the Council's corporate parenting duty.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young people strongly supported the need for the Council to provide apprenticeship opportunities from year 11 for Looked After Children (LAC) in its duty as a corporate parent in order to lead by example and encourage other partners and organisations to do the same in the future. This would help to reduce the number of LAC that would end up not in employment, education or training which was currently 49% compared with mainstream children at 4%. It was acknowledged that there was further work required in relation to funding and human resources, but Cabinet was urged to agree the principle of the scheme which had also been agreed by the Virtual School Governing Body.

Members took the opportunity to support the recommendations, together with further support from Cllr Deborah Croney as Leader of North Dorset District Council who informed the Cabinet about apprenticeships being considered across North, West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Councils and the possibility of discussing how the councils could be involved with the scheme.

Resolved

1. That the Cabinet sign up to the commitment of offering all Year 11 LAC students work experience opportunities and access to apprenticeships within DCC and beyond.
2. That the Action Plan for delivering this commitment be approved.
3. That the policies as mentioned in the Cabinet Member's report be implemented.
4. That the pilot outlined in the report be trialled to ensure that the work experiences/apprenticeships are supported during the whole process; that successful outcomes are achieved by the individuals involved; and the trial becomes embedded for future apprenticeships.

Reason for Decisions

Higher duty of care that Corporate Parents have towards Looked After Children.

Regional Adoption Agency (RAA)

- 39 The Cabinet considered a report by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People on the development of a Regional Adoption Agency to improve the adoption process by matching adoptive parents quicker by having a larger pool available, which would have a greater chance of avoiding adoption breakdowns.

Resolved

1. That officers be requested to proceed with development of a proposal to develop a Regional Adoption Agency in an outline business case and high level implementation plan. The proposed Regional Adoption Agency would combine the adoption services of Bournemouth Borough Council, Dorset County Council, The Borough of Poole and Families for Children, a voluntary adoption agency;
2. That authority be delegated to the Director for Children's Services after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to review and approve the proposal prior to submission to the DfE.

Reasons for Decisions

1. Councils had a statutory duty to provide adoption services to all those affected by adoption living in their area. Services to meet those responsibilities were required to meet legislative requirements and Minimum Standards for

Adoption Services and were inspected regularly by OFSED to ensure they did so.

2. The move towards a proposed Regional Adoption Agency would not discharge the Council of its statutory responsibilities but would effect far reaching changes in how those functions were organised and managed: While Bournemouth continued to be a high performing service, central government expected that Regional Adoption Agencies would be better able to target the recruitment of prospective adopters, speed up the matching and placement of children, improve adoption support services and could create efficiency savings.
3. The Education and Children Bill was moving through Parliament and could give the Secretary of State the power to order local authority adoption agencies to combine services if they did not voluntarily do so.

Recommendations from Committees

40 The Cabinet considered the following recommendations.

Recommendation 7 - Proposed Dorchester Parking Review

41 **Resolved**

- 1 That the proposed waiting restrictions for the Dorchester Parking Review, on Queens Avenue/Treves Road/Clarence Road, on South Court Avenue and on Alfred Road/Cromwell Road, as originally advertised, be approved and that there be a commitment to these being enforced effectively.
2. That the advertised proposals for Coburg Road/Edward Road be abandoned; and that parking proposals for Coburg Road/Edward Road be revisited, re-evaluated and a new design drawn up to go out to public consultation early in 2016.

Reasons for Recommendations

1. The proposals should improve the movement of vehicles along Queens Avenue/Treves Road/Clarence Road and help prevent indiscriminate parking causing problems to residents and visitors. The proposal in South Court Avenue would also improve the movement of vehicles and stop indiscriminate parking. The proposals in Alfred Road/Cromwell Road were needed to help alleviate the continued problems of the all-day parking by employees in the town centre, people who park and use the train or those visiting the nearby Brewery Square development. This had caused significant problems to the residents and had also prevented the refuse lorry from accessing the area on a number of occasions.
2. Feedback from the Local Members and Dorchester Town Council following the advertisement of the proposals indicated that the proposals for Coburg Road/Edward Road needed to be reconsidered and the revised proposals consulted upon.

Recommendation 10 - Proposed Waiting Restrictions, Chiltern Drive & Pennine Way, Verwood

42 **Resolved**

That the proposed waiting restrictions on Chiltern Drive and Pennie Way, Verwood be approved with a minor amendment to relax the restrictions to allow limited waiting on a length of Chiltern Drive.

Reason for Decision

The proposals should allow the free the movement of vehicles at the new entrance to the super store off of Chiltern Drive.

Questions from County Councillors

- 43 Two sets of questions were received from Councillor Beryl Ezzard regarding Minute 35 'Rural Bus Service Review' and Minute 36 'The Future of Wareham Foot Level Crossing' under Standing Order 20.

The questions and answers are attached to these minutes under the items referred to above.

Meeting Duration: 10.00 am - 12.20 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Questions

Item 7 - Rural Bus Service Review

Bus Users UK question submitted by David Redgewell

Question - In view of the Government's rural councils grant and transition grant will Dorset County Council and the cabinet review the proposed cuts to rural bus services especially around Bridport, Blandford Forum, Shaftesbury, Verwood and Ringwood.

At a recent bus users consultation exercise in Bridport, Shaftesbury and Blandford many local residents were concerned about the loss of bus services to market towns, railway stations, hospitals and to the National Express network. We believe that 4 weeks consultation with public transport users to be inadequate in view of the fact that Somerset, Gloucestershire and Devon carried out 12 weeks consultation.

David Redgewell
Director of Bus Users (UK)

Answer

The County Council are committed to consulting with its residents on potential changes to services. To this end the council works carefully to follow the Gunning Principles of consultation and central government guidance, as updated. The third principle is "adequate time for consideration and response". The council has carefully considered how long would be "adequate" for the public to respond to the consultation on potential changes to the bus services. The potential changes are geographically wide ranging but impact , in the majority, on specific one day a week services which has a particular and targetable user group. There is no set length of time to carry out a consultation although earlier government guidelines recommend between 2 and 12 weeks. Whilst longer periods of consultation (up to 3 months) may be reasonable and in fact necessary in some cases, in this case a 4 week consultation period was considered adequate under the Gunning principles. To this end the council made several specific decisions:

to announce the forthcoming consultation before the Christmas break to start the consultation in the new year to ensure widespread publicity for the consultation including on the buses themselves and via parish councils and noticeboards to ensure widespread press coverage over the consultation.

The County Council believes a 4 week consultation on these proposed changes is a reasonable time for consideration and response.

The Somerset consultation mentioned ran right through the Christmas/New Year period.

Public Statements

Item 7 - Rural bus service review

Statement from South West Transport Network submitted by Norman Browne

Re proposed cuts to bus subsidies.

We are concerned about the short length of time allowed for this consultation. All the proposed cuts to bus services will affect the economy of Dorset's Towns and villages as bus passengers will not be able to access the shops. It is not only car drivers that spend money in the shops.

The Environment will suffer as more journeys will have to be made by car and lifts that will have to be given to those without a car all this will do nothing to reduce CO2 emissions that are fueling Climate Change.

Listed below are the bus services we are concerned about and would wish to see retained:-

No X12 Salisbury to Weymouth

No 34 Buckhorn Weston to Shaftesbury.

No 40 Bridport to Yeovil this is a vital cross border link between Dorset and South Somerset with an alteration to the route at the Yeovil end and extending the service at the Dorset end to West Bay has the potential to attract more passengers.

No X51 Retention of Evening and Sunday services between Dorchester and Axminster is also vital for Dorset Tourism and the Jurassic Coast.

No 73 Catistock Maiden Newton Bridport.

No 103 Bovingdon Wool Dorchester.

No 253 Bridport to Weymouth via Langton Herring,

No 315 Blandford to Ringwood

No 317 Stalbridge to Blandford.

No 323 Buckland Newton to Sturminster Newton

No 35 East Stour to Shaftesbury.

No 368 Blandford Sturminster Newton Yeovil.

Plus retaining all other weekday one bus a week services.

Item 8 - The Future of Wareham Foot Level Crossing

Statement from Damian Hajnus, Network Rail

-The background of the agreement made in 1988 between NR and DCC.

-The renewal of the agreement for a further 25 years in 2013

-What will happen when the agreement ends in 2038

-responsibilities and liabilities under the agreement of DCC and NR

-Status of the permissive Right of Way

Statement from Stewart Firth, Network Rail

-The safety of the crossing

-Past incidents

-Stance of the ORR

-Network Rail's contribution of £500K to DCC

Statement from Frank Roberts, Senior Project Manager, Swanage Railway

- The Swanage Railway's (SR) plans for the Wareham – Swanage rail link
- Highlight the likely reduction in local road traffic across the Isle of Purbeck
- Investment by Network Rail (NR) Infrastructure which will not be commissioned, until after foot crossing has closed, in particular the London End Crossover at Wareham

- Restrictions placed on the SR timetable plans, as the Wareham sidings can't be used, until after foot crossing has closed, in particular less favourable connection times between SR/NR services.
- Increased risks during SR or NR disruption, when, after any serious incident at a location west of Wareham, all trains services will effectively stop to the west of Poole 90 minutes after the incident, as the London End Crossover at Wareham can't be used.

This page is intentionally left blank

Member Questions

DCC Cllr Beryl Ezzard – Wareham Division
23 Walls View Road Carey WAREHAM
01928 550138 Mob 07860503944
Email: beryl.ez@btinternet.com

23 February 2016

Cllr Peter Finney – Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport
Cc Andy Shaw
Cc Matthew Piles
DCC County Hall

Dear Peter

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN LOCAL PUBLIC BUS NETWORK – 186 Route in PURBECK

The very serious concern I have for these cuts to the life-line of rural communities is that it is severe for the elderly, miniscule for DCC running this route; by just by-passing a few villages will not save a great deal, but will cut the day a week life-line these folk have to be independent to shop, meet people and be active. This is very short sighted and ought to be reviewed very carefully before a decision is made. These views come from a number of residents who use these buses on a weekly basis:

1. No 186 Route: This proposed route will be cut altogether as with other rural routes. It has been reported to me by residents, that the buses are not fulfilling their correct routes during this year, missing out Bloxworth & Morden, leaving elderly folk waiting for a bus that never comes! Obviously the statistics will show numbers are zero or non-existent in this case! Please ensure that the buses are being correctly monitored in this respect!
2. It is appreciated that cuts have to be made and that those routes that are not well supported would seem to be an ideal target; however, those very routes are a vital service to rural communities for residents to access employment, shops, medical surgeries and education facilities. Whilst the idea of community buses is a good theory, the practicalities are difficult to overcome when it depends on volunteers using their own cars or a club coach on a regular basis. Parish and town councils have difficulty enough in finding volunteers for their own services on an ad hoc basis so a regular community bus service may be aiming too high.
3. Under the concessionary fares scheme, the County's level of reimbursement to operators has been set at a level that is too low a level resulting in operators needing more subsidy for supported bus services. The probability is that rural routes within the commercial network will become unviable. DCC should be Lobbying Govt (MP's) to increase reimbursement to operators and increase the age for elderly bus passes to 70. Also, those receiving more than £50k income per year to forgo their passes. Another area that should be pursued is that out of County visitors should pay at least 50% fare in the Summer Months (May – September), this will enable locals more chance of getting priority on local buses.

If the local public bus becomes extinct, local elderly folk/and teenagers will be left lonely and deprived of transport in rural towns and interaction with the community. Please think again of the proposals and preserve public transport in rural local rural areas.

Yours sincerely
Cllr Beryl Ezzard
Member Wareham Division; PDC Member St Martin Ward

Answers

1. The bus company is required to register a specific route with the Traffic Commissioner which it is obliged to operate. Policing of such issues lies with VOSA (Vehicle Operating and Standards Agency) with the Traffic Commissioner.
2. Although volunteers will be an important part of the mix, community services would not be entirely reliant on volunteers for example county council staff currently employed to drive adult services vehicles would be available to operate community services. Drivers working for other Community Transport providers would also be employed.
3. The concessionary fare scheme is operated nationally under a mechanism devised and applied by the Department for Transport. Many authorities, including Dorset County Council, are seeking changes that will enable the scheme to operate sustainably.

The Future of Wareham Foot Level Crossing

Question from Councillor Beryl Ezzard

Dorset County Councillor Beryl Ezzard

23 Walls View Road, Carey, Wareham BH20 4BL

20 February 2016 contact: beryl.ez@btinternet.com 01929 550138 / 07860 503944

Mr Mike Harries

Director for Environment & Economy

Dorset County Council

Dear Mr Harries

Ref: Pedestrian Level Rail Crossing at Wareham Station

As the local Member of Wareham, I am very concerned and disappointed that the solution to the Pedestrian Level Rail Crossing at Wareham Station has not been solved yet and the recommendations in the Report, I believe, will not resolve the issue satisfactorily and will not be fit for purpose for the local Wareham community, especially those living in Carey, Northmoor, and to the North of the Town.

The Crossing as above has been in use as a footpath and level crossing for over 150 years. There has been no fatality for over 100 years. The controversy over its closure has been going on now for at least 6 years. During the last 12 years progress has been made to re-join the Swanage branch-line back into Wareham Station with an Amenity DMU service for local commuters and tourists to alleviate some of the congestion on the A351 through to Swanage from the Bakers Arms.

DCC has contributed £3.2 million to enable the signalling to connect the Swanage Railway back with the mainline railway. Has this money been well spent? Has it all been paid to NW Rail? Apparently there are still outstanding issues with the signalling connections along the line! Was the signalling arrangements at Wareham Station to accommodate the DMU's when the Swanage Wareham service is running, part of the deal with NW Rail? As I understand it the sidings at the station prepared for just such usage, are not linked into the signalling system at Basingstoke to accommodate this! This, needs addressing, as if true, it is a major blow to any continuous through service working from Swanage to Wareham!

The common sense solution for the Pedestrian foot crossing is, as most townspeople have pointed out, to have a barrier and lights system (POGO); Gates automatically close when lights change from GREEN to AMBER before RED without the need for Gate Keepers, who, with respect, only monitor and observe. They have no powers! To stop or limit antisocial action. And even supplied with new technology at County Council's expense, will not be any more effective!

The solutions suggested in the report are most unsuitable and expensive, we are talking public money; a quarter of a million pounds, being spent on unnecessary measures, in times of austere swingeing cuts? It is ludicrous and a gross waste.

It appears to me that if the ORR & NW Rail wish to impose the restrictions to the Pedestrian Crossing to close it, when it has existed for over 130 years, then it is up to them to come up with the alternative and pay for it! DCC are being held to ransom over this issue. A lift system, was suggested and apparently turned down because SW Trains would need to “man” the Station 24 hrs. Not a bad idea, with increasing passenger numbers year on year using the Station and Swanage Railway re -joining with the mainline next year, this would seem feasible enough? Why has this solution not been re-visited?

The footpath/cycleway over the flyover, is a step too far - with the public having to leg it, and I assure you, not an extra 3 minutes added to their journey as stated in your report? – but an extra 15 minutes for children & local folk to get into town. The Primary & Secondary Wareham Schools are both on the Town side too, so pupils will have longer journeys. For those with walking issues, the elderly, in wheel chairs or buggy’s and/or with heavy bags will be very disadvantaged. Passengers will have great difficulty is carrying bags across the bridge or paying a Taxi to crossover!

The economic effect will be enormous, lots of people, who usually shop in Wareham Town Centre, will in future, take their car or catch the bus to shop at Poole from the North side and Carey. It seems to me that barriers to common sense and practical reasoning are being applied here! The measures of so called “Health & Safety” have gone into overload, with evermore restrictions on folk’s innate inbuilt sense of survival, the Nanny State still prevails..... So I say, enough is enough, the community of Wareham need a level crossing that can be accessed easily and quickly, making their own sensible & safety decisions. Simple -KEEP THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL CROSSING AS IS WITH ADDED AUTOMATIC BARRIERS AND LIGHTS. Many other places still operate this system, safely. We do not need to pay for the Gate Keepers or make people trek over the hill into Town.

Please listen to the local community of Wareham and give some extra thought to the solution required by them.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Beryl Ezzard
Member Wareham Division; PDC Member St Martin Ward

This page is intentionally left blank