From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]; TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE
Subject: TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992 "TWA"): Proposed THE NETWORK RAIL (TACKLEY LEVEL CROSSINGS) ORDER
Date: 15 February 2024 12:34:40
Attachments: Image001.png

Your ref TWA/23/APP/05

Dear Ms Jones

I refer to the letter from Shanaz Chaudhary of the 5th February informing me of a local public inquiry on the above matter.

I would like to give evidence.

I note from the letter that in order to be able to do this I need to provide you and transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk with a statement of case. Unfortunately the letter does not specify what a statement of case actually is . I hope the below is near enough . If not, please provide me with guidance as to what constitutes a statement of case.

Yours

Malcolm Ridout

1. **In the past a tunnel was proposed.** This option is much preferred and should be re- investigated.

2. **Siting of proposed 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. (appendix 1) 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.

3. **Light pollution** - The new bridge is said to have low level lighting . It will be important that this is set so it comes on only when needed as people use the bridge.

4. **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 loss 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 a compelling 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 a new bridleway so horseriders can still get to the other side of the railway.

Appendix 1

RE: The Network Rail (Tackley Level Crossing) Order Inbox

Wed, 10 Jan, 12:09

Oxford level crossings

to me, Oxford

OFFICIAL

Dear Mr. Ridout,

I hope this email finds you well. Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed closure of the level crossing at Tackley. We appreciate your detailed feedback, and I would like to address he specific points you raised in your email.

We understand your concerns about the potential overlook from the proposed new bridge and appreciate your diligence in highlighting the importance of minimizing any adverse effects on local residents. The bridge is not included within he Transport and Works Act Order and will be via prior approval. As part of the prior approval application, plans will be provided and he outcome determined by the local authority.

Your concerns about the future of the permissive footpath over the railway are well-founded, and we acknowledge the importance of this amenity for the village. We understand your apprehension regarding the wording in para 3.1 (d) and its potential implications for he continuity of the footpath. Network Rail cannot change the terms of he permissive route. It needs to remain permissive only (it is either that, or close it now). The ticket barrier merely provides an example of why it may close in the future.

I also wish to point out hat the initial intention was to close he footpath, but given local feedback (and importance) as you have stated, we have worked wi h industry stakeholders to provide the continuity.

We value your input, and your concerns will be taken into account during the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) process.

Kind regards

Dan

Daniel Thomas AIEMA
Consents Assistant
07850 405974
daniel.thomas3@networkrail.co.uk