

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Cc: Max.woodvine@oldham.gov.uk; [Cllr L Lancaster](#); [Cllr P Byrne](#); heidi.alexander.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Network Rail Stalybridge to Diggle TWA Order -OBJECTION
Date: 10 December 2025 22:51:51

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

OBJECTION TO THE CLOSING OF MOORGATE LEVEL CROSSING ON FOOTPATH 209 SADDLEWORTH

To whom it may concern

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register this written objection to the proposal to close the Moorgate level crossing on footpath 209 in Saddleworth.

Our family home is situated on [REDACTED], immediately above the footpath in question (Dark Lane) which provides all of us with direct access to the village of Uppermill via the Moorgate level crossing.

1. Safety. No suitable alternative has been proposed. The other footpath mentioned (244) is extremely unsafe and hazardous, and it does not provide access to the village. It would require enormous investment (several million£s) and a massive refurbishment/ restoration from yourselves to make path 244 safe for public use. Have you even undertaken a survey or analysis of this footpath? Following this in any case you still would have failed to provide an equivalent access from/to the same points.

2. Massive disruption. Works have already caused huge issues for ourselves and other local residents. The ongoing mess, temporary closure and proposed permanent closure of the crossing are causing significant issues in terms of safety, time, convenience and access. This is affecting my own family, children, neighbours, friends and visitors.

3. Conservation. The footpath and level crossing have a long established history. Much longer than your current desire to tidy up the train system. It is a through road that continues on in both directions for walkers, hikers and tourists. Well documented on historical maps, it most certainly can not simply be erased by you simply to save a bit of money on your construction costs.

4. Rights. My entire family use this crossing on a daily basis (my children use it several times every day) as we have done since we moved into [REDACTED] many years ago. The previous resident and her family did the same, as did those that came before. Our neighbour opposite does too. My brother-in-law and his family also live on [REDACTED] and they use the crossing to access the village every day. We all rely on this crossing as part of our lives and its removal would have a hugely detrimental impact on all of our day to day lives.

5. Health. Many people walk this path, because of the convenient historic crossing. If it is closed- as is proven to be the case right now with the temporary closure, there will be a dramatic increase in cars and other vehicles on Ladcastle Road and along each route into Uppermill and other villages. I love that my children can walk to where they want to go, into the village for the shops or to meet friends and walk to school together- it is great for their health as it is for the rest of us and the many ramblers and others that use Dark Lane. I am not a big fan of the alternative which is to drive everywhere- it's expensive, inconvenient, unhealthy and the condition of road surfaces only cause extra problems for all concerned. Why are you forcing more cars on to the road and why do you want to have less people walking outdoors?

6. Access. Closure of the crossing will isolate the properties and residents on [REDACTED] There is no alternative convenient way to access the vital shops and essential services in the village.

6. Negative impact. In addition to the negative impact on many aspects of our daily lives, the lack of access would also negatively impact property values, in some cases this could cause problems or financial hardship to residents.

A permanent closure of Moorgate level crossing cannot and must not go ahead. Any plans should be immediately paused, reviewed and amended as necessary.

We will take legal action to ensure that the public right of way is protected.

We believe that previously your organisation had considered building a footbridge over the crossing but later dismissed the plan in an attempt to cut construction costs. Unfortunately, you have no choice but to either preserve the current crossing or propose the construction of a footbridge (in a style that matches the surroundings). It will cost you far far less to amend the plans now- ie keep the crossing or build a suitable

footbridge, than the ensuing legal costs you are likely to incur before finally being forced into keep the crossing or building a suitable footbridge later.

I'm not sure how your legal losses on this could affect you financially should residents make compensation claims for the myriad impacts your proposals have on properties, safety and other matters. Probably this is something that you should take into account on the cost analysis when you are deciding what sort of footbridge you should build.

Just do the right thing please, for all of us that need that crossing and have a right to keep it.

Rafael Fernandez

