



Affiliated to Peak and Northern
Footpaths Society

CLOSING SUBMISSION

RELATING TO THE CLOSURE OF MOORGATE LEVEL CROSSING, ON BEHALF OF WEDNESDAY WALKERS (OLDHAM), PEAK AND NORTHERN FOOTPATHS SOCIETY, SADDLEWORTH PEDESTRIANS, RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION & MOORGATE FOOTBRIDGE CAMPAIGN GROUP.

THE NETWORK RAIL (STALYBRIDGE TO DIGGLE (SADDLEWORTH) ENHANCEMENTS) TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT ORDER.

Ref: TWA/25/APP/02/OBJ 117, 259, 193, 260 & 65

Kevin Lawton BSc, CEng, MICE (Ret'd)
14 July 2026

1.0 Background

- 1.1 I have been representing three walking organisations at the public inquiry and have submitted detail of our reasons for objecting to the order in a Statement of Case and Proof of Evidence. This is a summary of the evidence presented and my conclusions on the issues raised. I have specifically addressed three of the issues from the Statement of Matters.
- 1.2 In order to respond to the inspector's request not to duplicate issues in Closing Submissions, I have agreed that this document also represents the views of the Ramblers Association (OBJ 260), and issues raised in week two of the inquiry on behalf of the Moorgate Footbridge Campaign Group (OBJ 65). Mr Fletcher will submit a separate Closing Submission in relation to issues discussed in week three of the inquiry.
- 1.3 We are not objecting to the proposals to upgrade the line.
- 1.4 I have noted that several new inquiry documents were submitted by NR after I had given my evidence, then whilst I was away on holiday, and then subsequently. My comments on these are attached as an Addendum.

2.0 Statement of Matters – 3a Effects of the scheme on public rights of way

- 2.1 This matter relates specifically to the closure of the Moorgate level crossing, the suitability, safety and convenience of proposed alternative routes and whether appropriate mitigation has been considered, including the provision of a footbridge.
- 2.2 I believe that NR's case is a cynical attempt to try retrospectively to justify a decision made three years earlier to abandon the idea of a footbridge. They have introduced descriptions of paths 209 and 244 to try and equate the two which is not possible and have made attempts to try and show that the exit of 244 on to Oldham Road is safe. The Mayer Brown reports and recent issues have proved that it is not safe. Mr Wotherspoon confirmed that there would be 'a degree of residual risk on the A670 section'. There are then more subtle changes to the descriptions of the paths, the length of the diversion, the time taken to walk it and which usage survey to use. They have failed on all these issues. The proposed use of 244 transfers a rail safety issue to the Highway Authority which is not acceptable.
- 2.3 No objector has identified any problems in using the existing route over the crossing, no objector has supported the use of 244 as an alternative and no objector has said they would find a footbridge difficult to use.
- 2.4 Usage surveys of 209 showed 40 per day in March/April 2022 which was deemed to be high usage and included a high number of vulnerable users. A survey in November/December 2024 showed 25 per day. Both surveys identified use by unaccompanied children, and we know from Objector 62 that some of

these would be children going to and from school. It was accepted that camera surveys would not identify 'hidden' disabilities, and all but one of NR witnesses referred only to the lower winter usage figures in 2024 in order to try and justify their case.

2.5 Issues were raised about the use of the paths by cyclists and as I pointed out in my evidence, cyclists can use 209 due to its concurrent status as Ancient Highway and Green Lane but they would not be legally able to use 244 as it is footpath only. 244 is not therefore a suitable alternative for cyclists and in addition it would introduce steps, cause conflict at the private driveway and have the dangerous exit on to Oldham Road.

2.6 Mr Barraclough in his Proof explains that the footbridge at Moorgate could be constructed during a 16-day blockade, which would be timed to coincide with other works on the line. I accept that there may be difficulties in constructing a footbridge at Moorgate, but no witnesses have said that it is impossible. Structural details and a construction methodology have already been worked out.

2.7 Construction details for the proposed works to 244 were updated on 29 May 2026. This followed contradictions as to the width, length and drainage of the proposed improvements to the path. The changes to 244 were described in NR150 and included concrete steps, steel handrails, steps 1.8 metres wide and general path width of 2 metres. It was reported that the drawings were only a concept and would be subject to agreement with Oldham, so I am not now clear what NR is actually proposing for the works on 244. The drawings referred to in the Appendix were not available online until 2 June and I have serious concerns about what is proposed in relation to the impact on the old culvert, access for delivery and storage of a large quantity of aggregate (c.100 tons) and the inadequacy of the filter drainage system. I agree with the advice from Mayer Brown in NR86 that there will be a likelihood of an increased risk of flash flooding and erosion as water will not be able to flow quickly into the filter drain and a significant maintenance responsibility will be passed on to Oldham Council. No solution has been offered to this. A flood risk assessment has not been carried out. The water bars will either cause standing water or erosion if shedding water to one side. There will be a significant cost increase for these changes which has not been assessed nor included in the budget. There is a very big risk that the old culvert will have to be replaced. This culvert carries a natural stream, Wickens Clough, and is therefore the responsibility of the riparian owners, not Oldham Council as suggested. Overall, it is clear to me that the logistics and cost of carrying out the work on 244 have not been thought through at all and there is an assumption that all the necessary permissions will be granted.

2.8 There is no way that introducing 67 steps, some with randomly spaced protruding water bars which will be a trip hazard, and introducing highway interfaces at Oldham Road and Ladcastle Road, can be regarded as equivalent to path 209 which does not have any of these restrictions. We accept that the footbridge would be a compromise solution and would have steps, but only 39 on the Uppermill side. These steps would be over a short distance and be regularly

spaced with handrails which would be a safer option for some mobility impaired people and there would be no trip hazards.

- 2.9 A significant amount of time was spent at the inquiry with NR witnesses attempting to justify the mitigation measures for the junction of path 244 and A670, but there was no evidence to confirm that children, older people, disabled persons and vulnerable users had been considered at all. It appeared to me that it was the physical aspects of the 244/A670 interface that had been considered rather than the category of user. The road safety reports concluded that accidents may still occur and that 244 would only be suitable for 'able bodied', which is evidence from independent experts that it is not suitable as an alternative route. It was also confirmed by the witnesses that there have been no recorded accidents on the A670 where path 244 exits so it is unacceptable to introduce a potential risk that there might be an accident in the future. The only safe solution is not to use 244 as the alternative route.
- 2.10 Path 209 and the level crossing have been used on several occasions by walking groups without problem, whereas the use of 244 in its current state is not recommended. I indicated that walks using 209 could use a short section of Moorgate Street, then the canal towpath in either direction. There is the refuge island to cross Oldham Road which gives continuity of the towpath going south. Improvements to the surface of 244 would not remove the safety issues for group walks at Oldham Road. Path 209 served perfectly well for 43 years as the public access to Moorgate Halt Station and is the reason that there are signs of the original surfacing. The risk to individuals, family groups, tourists and children using the exit of 244 onto Oldham Road, will be significantly higher than for a supervised walking group.
- 2.11 The alternative route is said to be 440 metres longer and will take an extra 5 minutes to walk. My evidence was that it would not be a logical route to follow, and I disagree with the assumption made by Mr Cary that a walking speed of 5kph is appropriate for an older or mobility impaired person walking up 244. It took me 10 minutes to walk it clockwise.
- 2.12 The introduction of a rail signal 20 metres beyond the level crossing has increased the safety risk at the crossing and resulted in the temporary closure order. Mr Doodson was unable to confirm if the signal had actually been used to stop a train. The problem now, as I explained in my evidence, is that the closure of the crossing has prevented walking groups from organising walks in that area because there are no suitable alternatives. Similarly, previous individual users of path 209 will now have been inconvenienced, and I am therefore concerned about the length of time this temporary closure will be in place.
- 2.13 We are delighted that Oldham Council as Highway Authority is also an objector to the proposal and that their witnesses confirmed the inadequacy of the proposed mitigation measures on Oldham Road, including non-compliance with rules for the 20mph limit, and the unsuitability of 244 for increased usage, particularly at the junction with Oldham Road and the pinch point on the footway.

They too are supporting the option of a footbridge which Oldham granted planning consent for in 2022.

- 2.14 It is very obvious to us that the option of a footbridge replacement for the crossing has so many advantages over 244, namely, no increased highway risk, no extra distance or time, 244 left as it is so no additional problems in terms of construction works and access, no impact on the old culvert, no impact on private land and property, no additional flood risk or erosion, no potential trip hazards from water bars and no additional maintenance for Oldham Council. The historic nature of the two routes would be retained. NR would save the cost of the works, both on 244 and the mitigation on Oldham Road, no land compensation costs and would not carry the risk of substantial extra cost to replace the old culvert or to off-load and transport materials for the path improvements. There would also be less risk of anti-social behaviour if 209 was not left as two cul-de-sacs.
- 2.15 In conclusion, it is clear to me that the reports that NR commissioned from external consultants last year and this, were retrospective attempts to justify the earlier decision to use 244. The evidence that these experts gave to the inquiry included various caveats, and although they would not admit it in answer to my cross examination, they effectively proved that 244 would not be suitable for all the previous users of 209. The main caveat given by the expert witnesses was that 244 would only be suitable as the alternative route after the mitigation work had been carried out. This means that 244 would not be suitable and safe if the mitigation was ineffective. None of the witnesses could guarantee, in advance, that it would be effective, which means that a road accident could occur. That makes the option of using 244 completely unacceptable.
- 2.16 What we seem to have here is NR proposing in 2023 to use 244 rather than a footbridge based only on the cost of a footbridge and without actually considering other implications, particularly with the shared driveway and safety of the exit at Oldham Road. Then two years later commissioning highway and safety reports to try and justify that decision and three years later a road safety audit and EQIA. Each time modifying the proposals and adding more mitigation measures, but there are still issues with the proposed works to 244 that have not been considered such as the impact on the private property with off-loading and transporting materials, the potential for flash flooding and erosion, and the likely additional cost to deal with the Wickens Clough culvert. There is therefore no guarantee that a viable and safe scheme to improve 244 is possible and at reasonable cost.
- 2.17 The proposed use of 244 is therefore not suitable, safe or convenient as an alternative for 209 and cannot be made so. It should therefore be rejected by the Inspector. The only totally safe option for both road and rail is a footbridge.**

3.0 Statement of Matters – 4 Public Sector Equality Duty

- 3.1 This matter relates to the compliance with the Equality Act 2010 and the impacts on accessibility and mobility for children, older people, disabled persons and other vulnerable users.
- 3.2 NR did not carry out a Diversity Impact Assessment (DIA) to check the suitability of using path 244 as an alternative to the closure of the level crossing before making a decision 3 years ago. It is a requirement of NR's DIA policy (NR 121) that an assessment is carried out before decisions are made. I have been supplied with the assessment carried out on the 6 May 2026, but this was only for the section of the route on 244 and not the whole route. The consultation for it was in 2022, but at that time it related to path 209 with a footbridge, not 244, so it is meaningless. It concludes in relation to the junction of path 244 and Oldham Road that a continuous footway should be provided and a safe crossing to the other side of the carriageway – neither of which can be provided due to physical restrictions, so those recommendations are not achievable. There is also a warning about possible collisions on the shared driveway but no proposals at all have been offered to deal with that. NR did carry out a DIA for path 209 in 2022 and that recommended a footbridge. It has been established in my cross-examination of Mr Wotherspoon that even after the proposed mitigation, some risks will remain at the junction with Oldham Road. Mitigation is not a guarantee of safety whereas the retention of 209 with a footbridge would guarantee both rail and highway safety.
- 3.3 The recent EQIA for 244 recommends for nearly all of the protected characteristics, that signage should be put up explaining the condition of the route and thus effectively dissuading them from using it. This illustrates that 244 is not a suitable alternative.
- 3.4 NR150 was a response to the updated EQIA for 244 and introduced widened steps to 1.8 metres and the improved path to 2 metres to satisfy disability standards, but this leaves a section of 60 metres in the middle of the route through Wickens Underbridge and the private garden at 1 metre wide. The width of the private driveway would be acceptable but the pinch point at the footway on Oldham Road would not so the alternative route cannot be said to be DDA compliant.
- 3.5 No evidence was presented to confirm that proper consideration had been given to users of the path who were not deemed to be able bodied. The camera surveys did not produce detail of the users, so this has potentially excluded older people, some mobility impaired people and other vulnerable users. Whilst the surveys did pick up unaccompanied children, the evidence from the independent experts effectively proved that path 244 would not be suitable for the previous users of 209.

3.6 We are now left with a very dubious cost decision to abandon a footbridge which has over-ridden the needs of disadvantaged users. The basic cost of the footbridge in NR 30 is not unreasonable and compares with the costs of other bridges on the TRU. It is the addition of risk at the higher level that results in a cost of £4.5 million and I have not been able to find any other examples of a project on the TRU that has been rejected on the basis of risk.

PSED and NR's own requirements to carry out a DIA at the start of a project have not been complied with. The response to the risks identified in the recent EQIA is totally inadequate.

4.0 Statement of Matters – 7c Availability of funding

4.1 This matter relates to whether there are any impediments to NR implementing the scheme including the availability of funding.

4.2 We were advised at the PIM that the inspector wished to see evidence of alternatives considered and costs/financial implications. The essential thing firstly is to consider the closure of the crossing and if agreed, whether the alternative of using path 244 is 'suitable and convenient'. If not suitable, and we believe it is not, then the closure should be taken out of the order. NR will then have to find a solution to the safety issues with the crossing, which they have made worse due to the location of a new signal, and because they have ruled out all other options, the only other solution is a footbridge at whatever the cost. Mr Greenwood confirmed that funding would have to be found. We have been concerned that the footbridge for which NR had planning consent in 2022 was abandoned in 2023 on the very dubious cost estimates, which over a period of 12 months, NR was unable to properly justify the £4.5 million cost of a footbridge. Even on a totally different cost basis, NR is still saying the cost, with a risk allowance, is £4.5 million. It is totally unreasonable to add significant risk costs to the cost of a footbridge and then use that as the sole reason to say it is not value for money.

4.3 The basic cost of a bridge in NR30, is said to be £2,797,100, but off this would be the cost of works to 244, now significantly increased due to the changes, the cost of mitigation work on Oldham Road and land compensation costs. There were other costs which I questioned at the inquiry and Mr Barraclough described different elements now included under the heading of 'Works to existing infrastructure'. This gave a different perception as to what was included and gave me no confidence that the costings were accurate. I felt that a substantial part of the design work for a footbridge had been completed so the design fees should be less or written off. Making assumptions about what should be included we must now be talking about a nett cost of around £2million for a footbridge. This is not significantly above the £1.8 million deemed acceptable in 2024 and is less than or equivalent to, the costs of other proposed and approved footbridges on the TRU.

- 4.4 I have not been convinced by the evidence I have heard as to what benefits are included in the latest CBA. There was no evidence that the proper value of a fatality or major accident, currently valued by RSSB at £2.8 million, has been included. It is not valid to add an allowance for risk, which may not need to be spent, to the cost of a footbridge at Moorgate when no such addition is made to other proposed works on this section of the TRU. Mr Doodson agreed that saving just one life at the crossing would be excellent value.
- 4.5 I was advised by ORR that separate funding is available for risk. In any event, the evidence is that NR has completed the preliminary design of a bespoke bridge at Moorgate, sorted out all the piling and structural requirements and that access would be via rail during a 16-day blockade. Under the pricing rules the level of risk should therefore be substantially less than 63%. The estimated costs for work on 244 can be offset against the footbridge costs and there should now be a substantial increase in the cost of 244 as a result of the changes made during the inquiry. In Mr Ashton's evidence he confirmed that the estimate of costs in NR06 is 'indicative' and that funding for the whole project will be sought in 2027, presumably when it is known what is in, and what is not in, the TWAO. Contracts will then be tendered and land compensation agreed, so no costs have yet been finalised. Mr Greenwood emphasised that the Moorgate level crossing has a very high-risk rating and that NR has separate funding for dealing with such crossings, so I am not clear why this cannot be pooled towards the cost of a footbridge.
- 4.6 I drew attention in my evidence to the fact that footbridge replacements in this order at Lower Beestow and Roughtown Road were included despite the bridges being little used and with difficult ground conditions. In the case of Roughtown a viable alternative exists only 70 metres away (Moorgate is 200 metres) so why is expenditure acceptable there and not at Moorgate? There was no evidence that CBAs had been carried out or that high risk figures had been added for these bridges, and the documentation (NR30) actually states in relation to optioneering that Tameside would not agree to closure. Oldham would not agree to the closure of Moorgate, but that has not been accepted by NR and again illustrates the unfair nature of the different standards being applied.
- 4.7 I also drew attention in my evidence to the fact that another option for the footbridge was to consider a small land take from the large, grassed area at the rear of Ridgeworth House and thus save the additional cost of piling and concrete barriers for the protection of the bridge supports. This has not been properly considered by NR despite a rebuttal to Mr Walton who made a similar suggestion.
- 4.8 On the basis of the evidence, and as far as I can ascertain, there are no impediments to the availability of funding for the scheme as a whole if a footbridge is included.**

5.0 Other matters

5.1 Other relevant issues to be considered are **Consultation, Impact on Private Property and Previous Order Decisions**

5.2 Consultation

5.3 I drew attention in my evidence to the misleading consultation and information events in that the public was only asked to consider the option of using 244 and not a footbridge. Despite this 68% rejected the idea.

5.4 I also drew attention to what I believe is evidence of us being treated so differently to other objectors on TRU schemes east of Leeds. Since 2024 all our attempts to have discussions with NR have been rejected and we were told to make our case at a public inquiry, which with an incredible time commitment to study all the documents, I have now done. This is not honouring NR stated aims of having 'constructive dialogue' with interested parties. Other more expensive bridges have been provided on the TRU at Lady Anne, Church Fenton, Rose Lane and Barrowby Lane. The Lady Anne footbridge was said to have been designed in consultation with the residents and cost £2.7m which is the same as for Moorgate. The statement from Mr Ashton that 'dialogue had continued with interested parties' was in our case, not true.

5.5 I have had to resort to the use of FOI on several occasions to obtain relevant information.

5.6 The consultation report repeats the information that NR propose improvements to 244, but no details of the improvements were available until just before the inquiry. In other words, there was no way of influencing the decision already made to abandon the idea of a footbridge.

5.7 Impact on Private Property

5.8 The recent EQIA advised that consideration should be given to the possibility of a collision on the private driveway. A near-miss with a cyclist and a collision with the front wall have already occurred but no proposals at all have been offered for the management of this situation on the private driveway. All the evidence from NR and its reports, has limited consideration just to the junction of the driveway with the A670.

5.9 Lee Barraclough in his rebuttal, confirmed that access to carry out the work on 244 would be by mini excavator from Oldham Road or adjacent field. Access from an adjacent field is not feasible due to the topography. Access from Oldham Road to import tons of aggregate and transport it in small loads up the valley will wreck the private garden and had not been discussed with the owner. The cost of re-instating the garden and the section of path planned to have only vegetation removed will need complete reconstruction. Off-loading materials on Oldham Road would not be feasible as there is no storage area for it. Mr Barraclough said the material would be off-loaded at night with a lane closure on Oldham Road. This would be contrary to NR policies of not working at night near residential properties and illustrates how the logistics of carrying out the work on

244 have not been properly considered. There is a foreseeable risk that the proposed filter drain and the transport and compaction of materials will damage the old stone culvert. This has not been properly addressed nor costed as a significant risk. No provision has been made for the removal and disposal of unsuitable material and disposal of the excavated material from the filter drain.

- 5.10 In relation to building a footbridge, NR has put a lot of emphasis on not affecting a line-side neighbour at Ridgeworth House but has given no consideration at all to impacts on the owner of 6 Oldham Road.

5.11 Previous Order Decisions

- 5.12 I referred in my SoC to other order decisions relating to closure of level crossings in Essex where 20 out of 57 were not approved, Cambridgeshire 9 out of 25 not approved and Suffolk 13 out of 22 not approved due variously to steps, extra distance, gradients, inconvenience, highway safety, no footways and PSED. All these reasons apply to Moorgate.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 There are two TWAO tests to justify closure of a level crossing and whilst NR will demonstrate the 'necessity' of the closure of the level crossing, NR has not demonstrated, and the external expert witnesses have not proved, that the alternative is a 'convenient and suitable replacement for existing users' as required in the TWAO Procedures. This ought to mean, that the closure application for Moorgate is refused.
- 6.2 There is a viable and safe alternative to the TWAO proposal to permanently close path 209 and upgrade path 244, both in terms of rail and highway safety, and that is a footbridge. This is what was recommended in NR's DIA in 2022. All the other issues in relation to the suitability, extent and cost of works to 244 and the mitigation on Oldham Road, which have been raised in this inquiry, then become irrelevant.

ADDENDUM

Comments on documents submitted to the inquiry after I had completed my evidence and subsequently.

INQ-25

This document responds to the consultation comments made by me and the Moorgate Footbridge Campaign Group about the amended proposals for path 244. The response from NR quotes powers in the TWAO to apply for various permissions from Oldham Council but this assumes that approval will be forthcoming. If approval is not given, and that is quite likely as Oldham is an objector, then it would not be possible to carry out the work. The suggestion of importing materials in small loads during night-time or off-peak temporary lane closures will have a significant impact on the owner of 6 Oldham Road and other local residents, and there is no response to my point about the damage that will be done to the garden and private driveway and the consequent cost of

reinstatement. A temporary lane closure on Oldham Road would have a significant impact on traffic as an extended length would be required due to the proximity of a refuge island, and I note the admission that this has not yet been properly considered. It is stated that a Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out and is in ER Vol3 App 12B, but I can find no reference at all to Wickens Clough and the impact from the proposed work to 244. This is a misleading statement as a Flood Risk Assessment has not been carried out for the Wickens Clough culvert.

INQ-19

This document responds to the changes to the Environmental Impacts of the works to path 244. I disagree with the summary section 3.5.5 where it is stated that there is no identified flood risk. All the evidence is that there is already a flooding problem, and I do not accept that this is a SUDS design that will 'provide an effective brake on flooding'. It is likely that the flood risk will be increased.

INQ-35

This document deals with the temporary closure of PROWs and in particular paths 244 and 209. It is stated that 209 will be used whilst the work to Wickens Underbridge is carried out and to construct the new works to 244. This means that the level crossing will be reopened. I specifically raised this as an issue in my rebuttal to NR and Mr Pearson responded that the crossing would not be reopened (s 2.2.4 in NR's rebuttal to me). The evidence in INQ-35 is therefore contradictory and incorrect. It is also interesting to note the contradictions in the time to walk the diversions. It will take 13 minutes to walk the diversion whilst doing the work to Wickens Bridge but only 5 minutes doing the same route whilst 244 is upgraded! The plan shows the alternative route along High Street rather than the official diversion along the canal towpath.

INQ-37

This document deals with the estimated cost of replacing Wright's Overbridge and again illustrates my argument that Moorgate is being treated differently from all other projects. The bridge cost is similar but the risk costs added are only 10%, although an explanation is given. My argument has been that adding 63% is not appropriate for Moorgate as the design work, ground investigation, bridge and structural design and construction methodology have all been completed.

INQ-42

This is the report submitted to Oldham's Highways Regulation Committee on 18 July 2024 recommending closure of the crossing under Highway Act powers, but I would point out that I and others objected and that the Members refused the application, principally because no alternative route was offered. A copy of the minutes of the meeting (item 7) is attached as Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1

710/710B Hollins Road and 205, 207 and 207A Chapel Road from the scheme.

3. 5 District Public Spaces Protection Orders be made for all the remaining schemes which received no objections.

NOTE: In relation to Scheme 51/20 and objector addressed the Panel and no decision was made in respect of the proposal.

7

APPLICATION FOR RAIL CROSSING EXTINGUISHMENT AND DEFINITIVE MAP AND STATEMENT MODIFICATION ORDER – DEFINITIVE FOOTPATH 209 SADDLEWORTH (PART), AT MOORGATE HALT, UPPERMILL

Panel Members considered an application from Network Rail for the extinguishment of part of Footpath 209 Saddleworth as a result of the Transpennine Route (TRU) Upgrade Project at Moorgate Halt, Uppermill.

The Panel were informed that the TRU Upgrade Project will electrify and re-signal the railway at Moorgate Halt, Uppermill, where there is currently an unprotected 'passive' crossing.

The crossing receives an exceedingly high volume of usage. The most recent 9-day census recorded 434 movements over the crossing in 11 days, and a high proportion of this use was by vulnerable users.

The Panel discussed the safety concerns of removing a level crossing and the historical local importance of an estimated 175-year-old level crossing.

The Panel discussed the need for Network Rail to have an alternative in place to compensate for the loss of a level crossing.

Options Considered:

Option 1: To approve the application to make a Rail Crossing Extinguishment and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order in respect of Footpath 209 Saddleworth at Moorgate Halt, Uppermill as requested by Network Rail.

Option 2: Not to approve the application.

RESOLVED: That the application to make a Rail Crossing Extinguishment and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order in respect of Footpath 209 Saddleworth at Moorgate Halt, Uppermill be refused.

NOTE: A representative of Network Rail, an objector and a Parish Councillor addressed the Panel on the application and the Chair requested that his abstention on the vote be recorded.

8

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF WAITING – COVERHILL ROAD, GROTTON

The Panel Considered a report recommending the introduction of prohibition of waiting restrictions on Coverhill Road and