

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Cc: [Oxford level crossings](#)
Subject: The Network Rail (Tackley Level Crossing) Order
Date: 01 January 2024 15:56:35

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

I write to object to the above order in two respects.

1. Siting of bridge is not clear and may contravene stated aim of minimising overlook. The proposed new bridge site was moved north to avoid it overlooking people's houses. This is appreciated. However, it appears it has moved far enough along the railway to be overlooking our house. Our house is no 16 balliol close and the land acquired comes exactly to the bottom of our garden. The plans do not specify where the new bridge will go, but it looks possible that it will not be level with the houses that are set well back from the railway but with our property. Seeing as the bridge was moved due to overlook concerns this seems unjust. We had assumed the bridge would be constructed where it would not overlook houses. This is possible as the houses immediately to the south of us have long gardens and are away from the railway and down a slope. Network Rail has not been forthcoming on the exact location of the bridge. Their consultations are therefore insufficient as they have not allowed affected or potentially affected people to make assessments of any disruption/ overlook. I would ask for the precise location of the proposed bridge to be specified and for the approval process to assure that it will minimise overlook of properties as Network Rail has asserted it is trying to do.

2. Permissive footpath - the footpath over the railway is an important amenity for the village. This is recognised in the statement of aims. However its future is in doubt as para 3.1 (d) states. "*The permanent solution to re-provide the (barrow crossing) functionality of the Level Crossing at the station itself will be a stepped footbridge, with lifts, installed at the station, spanning across the railway. Permissive access can be provided to non-railway users, including pedestrians and cyclists on foot, along the platforms and over the footbridge unless and until ticket barriers are installed at the station, or Network Rail otherwise determines access to non-railway users should cease.*" This provides weak to no assurance of the continuation of any permissive footpath. Given Tackley is a very minor station and unlikely to have ticket barriers that is less of a concern than the very wide grounds that Network rail can remove the permissive path pretty much on a whim. This clause should be amended to ensure there is oversight on the path, and that Network Rail would need to provide an effective reason to the regulator to remove permission. I would argue the easiest way to do this would be simply to divert the existing right of way over the new railway bridge and create the new bridleway so horseriders can still get to the other side of the railway.

Yours
Malcolm Ridout

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
