#### Recommendation(s) Status: Fatal accident at Frampton level crossing

This report is based on information provided to the RAIB by the relevant safety authority or public body.

The status of implementation of the recommendations, as reported to us, has been divided into eight categories:

#### Key to Recommendation Status

|                           | ress the recommendation are ongoing. |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (replaces Progressing and |                                      |
| Implementation On-going)  |                                      |

| Closed  | ORR consider the recommendation to have been taken into consideration by an end implementer and |
|---|---|
| (replaces Implemented, Implemented<br>by alternative means, and Non-<br>implementation) | evidence provided to show action taken or justification for no action taken.                    |

| Insufficient response: | The end implementer has not provided sufficient evidence that the recommendation has been taken into |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | consideration, or if it has, the action proposed does not address the recommendation, or there is    |
|                        | insufficient evidence to support no action being taken.  |

| Superseded: | The recommendation has been superseded either by a newer recommendation or actions have |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|             | subsequently been taken by the end implementer that have superseded the recommendation. |  |  |  |  |

| Awaiting response: | Awaiting initial report from the relevant safety authority or public body on the status of the recommendation. |
|--------------------|--|
|                    |  |

RAIB concerns on actions taken by organisations in response to recommendations are reflected in this report and are indicated by one of the following:

Red – RAIB has concerns that no actions have been taken in response to a recommendation.

Blue – The blue triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB has concerns that the actions taken, or proposed, are inappropriate or insufficient to address the risk identified during the investigation.

White – The white triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB notes substantive actions have been reported, but the RAIB still has concerns.



| Report Title     | Fatal accident at Frampton level crossing |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Report Number    | 05/2015                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Date of Incident | 11/05/2014                                |  |  |  |  |

| Rec No.               | Status               | RAIB Concern         | Recommendation  | RAIB Summary of current status  |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| Rec No.<br>05/2015/02 | Status<br>Closed - I | RAIB Concern<br>None | RecommendationThe intent of this recommendation is to improve level crossing signs, with<br>regard to their conspicuity, message, content and clarity of information<br>(the RAIB has already made a similar recommendation for user worked<br>crossings (paragraph 124).Network Rail should utilise the findings from this investigation, and all<br>available research (including the forthcoming RSSB research report T983),<br>to update its guidance for signage, and other user guidance, provided at                                 | RAIB Summary of current status<br>ORR has reported that Network<br>Rail has reported that it has<br>completed actions taken in<br>response to this<br>recommendation. ORR proposes<br>to take no further action unless<br>they become aware that the<br>information provided becomes<br>inaccurate. |
|                       |                      |                      | bridleway and footpath crossings. The updated guidance should take<br>account of circumstances where another type of level crossing (eg a user<br>worked crossing) is located at, or close to, the bridleway or footpath<br>crossing. It should also take account of prohibitions (eg use of bridleway<br>and footpath crossings by motorcycles) and circumstances when it is<br>appropriate for pedestrians to use a telephone. Network Rail should also:<br>I liaise with the Office of Rail and Road to ensure that its updated guidance |   |
| 05/2015/02            | Classed 14           | None                 | is compatible with the ORR's own version of good practice; and<br>I seek the assistance of the Department for Transport to enable any<br>necessary legislative changes needed to implement the updated guidance<br>(paragraphs 119a, b, c & d and 120a).  | OPP has reported that   |
| 05/2015/03            | Closed - IA          | None                 |   | ORR has reported that<br>(Dutyholder name) has reported   |

Created on 09 June 2023



|            |            |      | The intent of this recommendation is to provide the ORR input needed for<br>effective implementation of recommendation 2 by Network Rail. The two<br>recommendations are intended to improve level crossing signs, with<br>regard to their conspicuity, message, content and clarity of information.<br>The RAIB has already made a related recommendation to the ORR for user<br>worked crossings (paragraph 125).<br>The Office of Rail and Road should utilise the findings from this<br>investigation, and all available research (including the forthcoming RSSB<br>research report T983), to update its guidance for signage, and other user<br>guidance, provided at bridleway and footpath crossings. The updated<br>guidance should take account of circumstances where another type of<br>level crossing (eg a user worked crossing) is located at, or close to, the<br>bridleway or footpath crossing. It should also take account of prohibitions<br>(eg use of bridleway and footpath crossings by motorcycles) and<br>circumstances when it is appropriate for pedestrians to use a telephone.<br>The Office of Rail and Road should seek the assistance of the Department<br>for Transport to enable the necessary legislative changes needed to | that it has completed the actions<br>taken (by alternative means) in<br>response to this<br>recommendation. ORR proposes<br>to take no further action unless<br>they become aware that the<br>information provided becomes<br>inaccurate. |
|------------|------------|------|---|---|
| 05/2015/04 | Open       | None | <ul> <li>implement the updated guidance (paragraphs 119a, b, c &amp; d and 120a).</li> <li>This recommendation is intended to provide any necessary legislative support for improving level crossing signage as sought by recommendations 2 and 3.</li> <li>The Department for Transport should work with Network Rail and the Office of Rail and Road, to identify any appropriate legislative changes needed to allow implementation of the improved level crossing signage sought by Recommendations 2 and 3. If required, the Department for Transport should help make the necessary legislative changes (paragraphs 119a, b, c &amp; d and 120a).</li> </ul>  | DFT has a proposed action plan<br>and timescale for delivery to be<br>taken in response to the<br>recommendation. DFT will advise<br>when the status of this<br>recommendation changes.   |
| 05/2015/05 | Closed - I | None |   | ORR has reported that Network<br>Rail has reported that it has  |



|            |            |       | This recommendation is intended to ensure that level crossing risk is<br>managed with an adequate understanding of actual crossing usage.<br>Network Rail should modify its procedures, guidance and/or training in<br>order to obtain, where reasonably practicable, an improved<br>understanding of actual crossing use (eg use of bridleway crossings by<br>motorcyclists), and take action to ensure it adequately controls the<br>associated risks. This should include considering use of social media (eg<br>videos uploaded to internet sites), evening and/or weekend site visits to<br>identify recreational use of the crossing, and the use of surveillance<br>equipment (paragraphs 48 and 119d).   | completed actions taken in<br>response to this<br>recommendation.<br>ORR proposes to take no further<br>action unless they become aware<br>that the information provided<br>becomes inaccurate.   |
|------------|------------|-------|--|---|
| 05/2015/06 | Closed - I | White | The intent of this recommendation is to provide clear information about<br>locations where public vehicular restrictions exist at level crossings that<br>cross highways.<br>Network Rail should identify level crossings where safety management<br>depends on the general public being aware that they are not allowed to<br>use the level crossing with vehicles, including cars, motorcycles and trail<br>bikes (paragraph 78). For these crossings, Network Rail should:<br>I liaise with the relevant highway authorities to ensure their highway<br>records, and any related documents and publications, clearly show the<br>absence of a public vehicle route at the level crossing;<br>I share information about prohibitions with local and national<br>organisations representing groups such as 4x4 vehicle drivers and trail<br>bike riders; and<br>I arrange for signs to be provided on the highway approaches to the level<br>crossing, and at or near the crossing itself, to show the prohibition that<br>applies (taking into account recommendations 2 and 3). | ORR has reported that Network<br>Rail has reported that it has<br>completed actions taken in<br>response to this<br>recommendation. ORR proposes<br>to take no further action unless<br>they become aware that the<br>information provided becomes<br>inaccurate. |



| 05/2015/01 | Closed - I | None | The intent of this recommendation is to provide short-term action at level   | ORR has reported that Network    |
|------------|------------|------|--|----------------------------------|
|            |            |      | crossings where deviations from existing signage requirements are so         | Rail has reported that it has    |
|            |            |      | great that remedial action is required before any implementation of          | completed actions taken in       |
|            |            |      | improvements triggered by recent research.                                   | response to this                 |
|            |            |      |  | recommendation. ORR proposes     |
|            |            |      | Network Rail should identify locations where level crossing sign positions   | to take no further action unless |
|            |            |      | differ significantly from the requirements of guidance and standards, and    | they become aware that the       |
|            |            |      | then install signs at the appropriate location, unless the proposed position | information provided becomes     |
|            |            |      | of the signs is contrary to recent research (paragraph 119c).                | inaccurate.                      |