

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: Stalybridge to Diggle TWA Order
Date: 15 December 2025 12:26:05

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am writing concerning the planned mossley station and surrounding works.

First, let me state clearly that the proposed location is a stupid place for a railway station. Whatever the legal obligations, requirements and restrictions might be, the fact remains that no other station of comparable size is situated so close to houses. Plenty are similarly distant from the populations they serve, but that is an artefact of changing usage and population centres. It is abnormal to rebuild a station further away from where the people who need it live than the existing station.

The new station will inevitably be visibly and audibly intrusive for a substantial number of people on Manchester road and Tame view, at the very least. They will suffer permanent nuisance as a result of the relocation.

According to the current plans submitted, a sewer which sits just outside railway property will be replaced as part of the works. The rationale for this is somewhat unclear, as is the purpose of the sewer.

The plans show a substantial swathe of trees, including at least two thirds of the largest group of mature trees on the land known as Brookfields, being clearfelled. This is far more land than is needed for the sewer works. If the rationale is for access from Archer Street, this too appears excessive. Machinery has previously been moved onto Brookfields via this route with minimal vegetation loss.

The size of machinery able to access the site via this route is limited by the narrow width of Archer Street. Anything which can be moved along Archer Street can equally well use the existing access across the field, with no further loss of trees.

The trees to the southwest of Brookfields path (which is a public thoroughfare of many centuries' standing) are subject to a tree preservation order. Much of the cover is sallow scrub which can regenerate in a decade or so. The aforementioned group of trees marked as due to be felled would take more than half a century to regrow, and from an ecological point of view are therefore irreplaceable. There is no obvious necessity to remove them. It is known that there are two badger seats at the upper end of Brookfields. These are a protected species, what measures are being taken to minimise disturbance?

The replacement station is to be situated on a former goods yard, so there is quite a lot of space on the Manchester road side of the line. I question whether it would not be far more practical to move machinery onsite from there, overnight to avoid disruption to rail services, making a compound at the foot of Brookfields from the railway side. If you believe this is not practicable you need to explain clearly why not.

A compound is also shown on the plans at the southwest corner of Brookfields. As I understand it, the idea is to crane machinery and materials onto this site from Stamford road. Given the steep slope of this site, it seems an unusual choice. No detail seems to be provided in the plans to show how this will be accomplished.

In all, the plans as they stand seem very light on detail, and local residents need and deserve to know the full extent of the plans before any decisions are made.

Another example is that almost the whole of Brookfields is shown as being cordoned off for the works. Given the gradients and the alternative access available, how can this be supposed necessary?

My main objections are therefore as follows:

- There is no obvious necessity for the removal of mature trees, the works can take place without disruption on this scale.
- Using Manchester road as access is preferable to access via Archer street, which would

cause extreme disruption to the network of narrow roads leading to it.

- Much more detail and explanation needs to be provided to residents before any decisions about the works are taken. This just has not been done. You have a responsibility and you have not upheld it.

M. M. Mellett

