**From:** [redacted]
**To:** Joanna Vincent
**Subject:** Fwd: Network Rail Stalybridge to Diggle TWA Order
**Date:** 09 April 2026 22:04:17

---

Joanna,  copy of my objection as requested.

Regards.

Michael.

On 15/12/2025, 20:09 Michael and Susan Creamer [redacted] wrote:

> Network Rail Stalybridge to Diggle TWA Order
>
> I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed closure of Moorgate Crossing and consequential diversion of the footpath from Ladcastle Road into the centre of Uppermill. This is a well used and popular walking route which provides an essential link between the village and the surrounding countryside.
>
> In addition to the major loss of a well used and valued amenity, my principal objections are;
>
> 1. The proposed diversion route will take pedestrians directly onto an extremely busy main road at a point where there is virtually no footpath, the carriageway is relatively narrow, frequent buses and lorries have to drive very close to the kerb (especially when passing vehicles travelling in the opposite direction), vehicles are travelling downhill close to edge of the road and sight lines are very poor. (See attached photograph from a routine Google Street View)
>
> Pedestrians emerging onto the road without warning will be a danger to themselves and to vehicles swerving to avoid them. Children and leisure walkers unfamiliar with the area will be especially vulnerable.
>
> I am a retired Town Planner and property developer. I am therefore very familiar with development requirements. I cannot recall or envisage any situation where such a dangerous proposal would be acceptable to Highways Engineers. I therefore must ask if you have sought the advice of appropriately qualified Highways specialists?
>
> The proposed arrangement is highly likely to result in fatalities or serious injuries at some point in the future, probably involving children. Should this happen a copy of this letter will be made available to the Coroner. If you are a reader of these comments I would suggest that you ensure that you pass responsibility to all decision makers above you by highlighting the risk.
>
> 2. Under The Freedom of Information Act, costings have recently been provided which are full of huge errors and extremely exaggerated figures. The very late provision of this information makes it difficult to be precise, but for example there is a simple arithmetic error which adds over £900,000, an error of over 25%. The costs also do not appear to have been adjusted for several hundred thousand pounds related to the footpath diversion, which would not be required. In addition Consultant and Site Supervision costs are shown as an addition in excess of 30% to 40%, which is massively over the market norm. (It is difficult to be more precise about the fee percentage because of the high level of inaccuracies in the base cost).
>
> Whilst the gross errors in the costings provided are a concern in themselves, far more relevant is the fact that these costings have presumably been the basis upon which decisions have been made in respect of whether to divert or not divert the footpath. Any

recommendation based on these figures would therefore be guilty of misleading Parliament.

3. There is an alternative solution available by building a bridge as originally envisaged. Costings have previously been produced which show that this can be done within the parameters used by Network Rail elsewhere. The issue therefore seems to be one of a grossly unreliable budget versus safety of walkers and pedestrians.

The proposed diversion route will be significantly more dangerous than the existing pedestrian rail crossing at Moorgate. If the existing rail crossing is considered unacceptably dangerous, then the egress directly onto a very busy part of the A670 is indisputably worse. Therefore building a bridge is the obvious solution.

4. In the hope of assisting you in your decision, there may be an alternative solution which has yet to be considered. The existing nearby pedestrian bridge at Greenfield Station is to be removed in any event. It appears to be constructed in steel sections. When it is dismantled could it be reassembled at Moorgate Crossing, with the addition of new concrete plinths to raise it to the required height above the track ?

The dismantled bridge could be easily transported a short distance along the rail track whilst it is closed for extended periods for other construction works. It should also result in considerable savings in materials, consultant fees, site supervision costs and the considerable costs of otherwise grubbing up and safely closing the existing footpath, in addition to the significant costs that would otherwise be incurred in constructing the unnecessary diverted footpath.

The recycling of the pedestrian bridge from Greenfield Station would also be extremely good in environmental terms, as well a fitting heritage from the old station.

Thank you for reading my submission.

Michael Creamer.

[redacted]

email; [redacted]

6 A670

4 months ago · See more dates ›