

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Penny Carter](#); [Joanna Vincent](#); transpenninerouteupgrade@brutonknowles.co.uk
Cc: [W2b TRU Stakeholder Management Inbox](#); cllr.davejones@mossley-tc.gov.uk; [Jonathan Reynolds MP](#)
Subject: Re: Urgent - Network Rail (Stalybridge to Diggle Enhancements) Order - Formal Representation [GATELEY-CONSULTANCY.FID428723]
Date: 02 July 2026 08:00:32
Attachments: [Untitled design-3.png](#)

Formal Objection: Tree Felling, Replacement Discrepancy, Barn Owl Protected Species & Lack of Inquiry Coverage for Woodbank Terrace

Dear Ms Carter,

Thank you for your response regarding the Environmental Impact and Loss of Mature Trees points I raised previously. Having now reviewed the Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Proposals (OLEMP) plan for the Overbridge Works (MVL3/16) area (attached), I have several further serious concerns I wish to formally raise. I am copying in Cllr David Jones, who I understand has been involved at other points during this inquiry, as well as other concerned residents of Woodbank Terrace (in BCC), so that everyone directly affected is aware of these issues.

1. Formal objection to the felling of trees opposite Woodbank Terrace

I wish to formally object, on the record, to the felling of the mature trees opposite Woodbank Terrace shown on the OLEMP plan. At no point has Network Rail explained to residents why this felling is necessary or unavoidable. I would be grateful if you could confirm:

- a) The specific reason these particular trees must be removed - for example, whether this is required for construction access, site compound use, or another reason
- b) Whether any alternative options were considered that would avoid or reduce the number of trees felled, and if so, why they were discounted
- c) If the removal is only required temporarily (for example, for site access or compound use during construction), whether retention and reinstatement was considered as an alternative to permanent felling and replacement with scrub
- d) Whether the necessity of this felling has been independently assessed, or is based solely on Network Rail's own working methodology

Until a clear and specific justification is provided, this objection stands and I do not accept that the felling of these trees has been demonstrated to be necessary or unavoidable.

2. Discrepancy between "like for like" claim and actual replacement proposed

Your response stated that any vegetation removal beyond the recorded trees and vegetation "will be replaced like for like as will be required." However, having reviewed the OLEMP plan and legend for the area opposite Woodbank Terrace, the existing mature tree cluster is marked for removal, with the proposed replacement shown as Mixed Scrub and Bramble Scrub - not woodland or trees of

comparable species and maturity.

I do not consider low-growing scrub species to be a "like for like" replacement for mature trees that currently provide meaningful noise screening, visual screening and pollution buffering for residential properties on Woodbank Terrace. I would be grateful if you could confirm:

- a) Whether this is indeed the intended long-term replacement for this specific location, or whether the plan I have seen is indicative only
- b) What replacement ratio (number of new plants/trees per mature tree removed) is proposed
- c) What size and maturity of replacement stock will be planted
- d) What aftercare and survival guarantee period applies
- e) The specific figure reference number covering this location within NR14 Environmental Report Volume 2 Figures, so that I can review the detailed proposals directly

3. Presence of barn owls - a Schedule 1 protected species

I wish to formally notify you that the mature trees opposite Woodbank Terrace, which are proposed for removal, are used annually by nesting barn owls. Barn owls are a **Schedule 1 species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981**, affording them enhanced legal protection. It is a criminal offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb barn owls while nest building or at a nest containing eggs or young, or to damage or destroy their nest while in use or being built, without a licence from Natural England. I have marked the location of the barn owls on the OLEMP plan for ease.

Given this recurring nesting activity, I would be grateful if you could confirm:

- a) Whether a protected species survey, specifically covering barn owls and nesting birds, was carried out for this location as part of the Environmental Report and NR13 Screening Decision
- b) If so, please provide a copy of the relevant survey findings for this location
- c) If not, what steps Network Rail now proposes to take in light of this information, including whether a further survey and Natural England licence will be required before any works or vegetation removal can lawfully proceed at this location

I am gathering supporting evidence of this recurring nesting activity and will also be notifying Natural England and relevant wildlife conservation bodies directly.

4. Failure to consult residents directly affected by tree removal

I also wish to formally raise a serious concern regarding the process by which this information came to light. I only became aware of the tree removal and OLEMP plans by chance, through contact with a resident in a different part of Mossley who had obtained the diagrams as part of the inquiry process. This was not shared with me or any other resident of Woodbank Terrace by Network Rail, the Programme Officer, or any other formal channel.

When I shared this information with my neighbours on Woodbank Terrace, every single one of them was seeing these plans for the first time and was surprised by their contents, despite living in the properties directly opposite the trees marked for removal.

5. Lack of any dedicated focus on Woodbank Terrace within the inquiry

I wish to also formally raise a broader procedural concern. As far as I am able to establish, the current and recent sessions of this inquiry have been focused on Mill Lane, with no dedicated session, agenda item or opportunity for debate specifically addressing the impacts on Woodbank Terrace - despite the site compound, tree removal, and now the protected barn owl habitat all directly affecting this location.

Given the matters raised above, I would ask for urgent clarification on:

- a) Whether and when Woodbank Terrace-specific impacts will be given dedicated consideration within the inquiry
- b) How residents of Woodbank Terrace can ensure our concerns are heard, given that the current session focus does not appear to provide room for this
- c) Whether written representations on these points can still be formally accepted and entered into the inquiry record given the apparent absence of a dedicated session

Given that these trees are directly opposite our homes, provide noise and visual screening, and support a legally protected species, I consider it wholly unacceptable that residents most directly affected have had neither a clear explanation for why this felling is necessary, nor proper consultation, nor a clear route to have these specific concerns heard within the inquiry itself.

I would ask for a substantive and urgent response to all five points raised above.

Yours sincerely,
Rachel Kevern

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Cc: [Jonathan Reynolds MP](#); Gary.Roylance@tameside.gov.uk; [TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE](#)
Subject: Re: Urgent - Network Rail (Stalybridge to Diggle Enhancements) Order - Formal Representation [GATELEY-CONSULTANCY.FID428723]
Date: 01 June 2026 11:43:39

Dear Ms Vincent,

Thank you for your response.

I am writing again following my initial email, with a number of significant additional concerns that have come to light this morning following my review of the deposited planning drawings and new information from a neighbour.

I wish to formally place all of the following on record.

My name is Rachel Kevern and I reside at [REDACTED].

1. SITE COMPOUND DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO WOODBANK TERRACE

Having examined Planning Direction Drawing Route Sheet 08, I can clearly see that a proposed TWAO Site Compound is located immediately adjacent to Woodbank Terrace. This means heavy machinery, construction vehicles and industrial operations would be based directly next to our homes, for an unknown duration. We were not directly notified of this.

2. SITE COMPOUND ADJACENT TO A LOCAL SCHOOL

Of grave concern is that the same compound and associated works appear to sit immediately alongside a local school and its playing field. I wish to formally ask what safeguarding, health and safety measures are proposed for pupils and staff, and whether the school and its governors have been properly consulted.

3. LOSS OF MATURE TREES

The plans indicate the removal of mature trees currently standing opposite Woodbank Terrace. These provide a buffer against railway noise and pollution. Their loss will significantly impact residential amenity, property values and drainage given our proximity to the River Tame.

4. TWAO BOUNDARY AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE

The red TWAO Planning Application Boundary on Sheet 08 appears to run extremely close to, or through, properties on Woodbank Terrace. **I formally request confirmation of whether any of these properties fall within the Order limits and what rights residents have regarding compulsory acquisition, temporary use of land and the imposition of restrictive covenants.**

5. ABSENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Given the scale of works visible on the plans - including a new station, electrification, bridge reconstruction, canal works and a large site compound adjacent to both residential properties and a school - I formally question the decision not to require an Environmental Impact Assessment for this application.

6. PRIVATE AND SELECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS WITH RESIDENTS

I have today become aware that a Network Rail representative has already visited at least one property on Woodbank Terrace to discuss the temporary acquisition of their private garden for use as a construction holding and parking area. During this visit the resident was presented with two options: either Network Rail uses their garden, or they use the turning circle opposite - which would require the felling of all the trees in that area.

This raises serious concerns:

- Network Rail clearly has detailed knowledge of which properties are affected, yet has chosen to approach residents individually and privately while other residents on the same street remain completely unaware. This is fundamentally unfair and makes the absence of direct written notification to all residents wholly unacceptable.
- Residents are being asked to make decisions affecting their property rights, their neighbours and their local environment without being informed of their entitlement to independent legal advice, financial compensation, or the right to refuse both options.
- Residents should not be placed in a position of choosing between their garden or their community's trees. Both options have significant impacts on the wider community that have not been openly communicated.
- Any informal agreement reached during a doorstep conversation without legal advice or written confirmation may not adequately protect the resident's rights. I would like clarification on the formal process for temporary land acquisition and what protections residents have at each stage.

7. INADEQUATE PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

I wish to place formally on record that public notification of this inquiry has been wholly inadequate. Lamppost notices are insufficient for works of this magnitude. Many residents remain completely unaware of this process and their rights.

I look forward to your urgent response.

Yours sincerely,
Rachel Kevern



On Sun, 31 May 2026 at 16:37, Joanna Vincent <Joanna.Vincent@gateleyhamer.com> wrote:

Dear Ms Kevern

I acknowledge receipt of your email regarding the forthcoming Public Inquiry.

I have forwarded your email to Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit (Department for Transport), Network Rail (the Applicant) and the Planning Inspector (Mr Matthew Woodward).

There is a dedicated website for this Inquiry and you will find all the documentation there.

Home Page - <https://gateleyhamer-pi.com/en-gb/stalybridge-diggle/>

Application Documents - <https://gateleyhamer-pi.com/en-gb/stalybridge-diggle/inquiry-documents/core-documents/application-documents/>

I hope this is useful to you and I will come back to you regarding appearing at the Inquiry.

Kind regards

Joanna

Joanna Vincent
Public Inquiry Manager
for Gateley Hamer

t: [0148 323 0164](tel:01483230164)

m: [07483 133 975](tel:07483133975)

joanna.vincent@gateleyhamer.com

Gateley Hamer



From: Rachel Kevern <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 30 May 2026 14:08

To: Joanna Vincent <Joanna.Vincent@gateleyhamer.com>

Cc: Jonathan Reynolds MP <jonathan.reynolds.mp@parliament.uk>;
Gary.Roylance@tameside.gov.uk

Subject: Urgent - Network Rail (Stalybridge to Diggle Enhancements) Order - Formal Representation

Dear Ms Vincent,

Copying in MP Jonathan Reynolds (jonathan.reynolds.mp@parliament.uk) and Cllr Gary Roylance (Gary.Roylance@tameside.gov.uk).

I am writing as a resident living in close proximity to the proposed works outlined in the above Order, details of which I became aware of via a notice posted in my local area.

I am writing to formally register my interest in the Public Local Inquiry commencing Tuesday 9 June 2026 at Uppermill Civic Hall, and to raise the following concerns:

1. POTENTIAL IMPACT ON MY PROPERTY

I am concerned that my property may fall within or adjacent to the Order limits. I would be grateful if you could confirm which addresses will be affected by the compulsory acquisition powers, temporary land use provisions, or any restrictive covenants proposed under the Order.

2. REQUEST TO INSPECT PLANS

I wish to formally request access to the deposited plans and documents at the earliest opportunity, so that I may understand the full extent of the proposed works and their impact on my property.

3. RIGHT TO APPEAR AT INQUIRY

Please confirm the process by which I may make representations at the Public Local Inquiry, and whether I need to register in advance.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

I note that the application is stated not to be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment. Given the scale of the proposed works, I would like to understand the reasoning behind this decision.

I would be grateful for an urgent response given the proximity of the inquiry date.

My contact details are as follows:

Name: Rachel Kevern

Address: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,
Rachel Kevern
[REDACTED]

The contents of this e-mail are subject to Gateley Hamer's disclaimer. [Click here to read our disclaimer.](#)

Visit our website at www.gateleyhamer.com

Gateley Hamer is a limited company incorporated in England and Wales and regulated by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors. Registered Number: 3948095. VAT Registered Number: GB 991 2809 90. Registered Office: One Eleven, Edmund Street, Birmingham B3 2HJ.

Gateley Hamer Limited is regulated by RICS. Gateley Hamer Limited is a member of the Gateley (Holdings) Plc group, a group which also contains Gateley Plc, a public limited company authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of England and Wales. Gateley (Holdings) Plc, owns businesses which are regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and businesses which are not regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

Gateley Hamer Limited is not regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. Where you have been referred to Gateley Hamer Limited by Gateley Plc then you should note that there are other providers of services similar to those provided by Gateley Hamer Limited and you are not obliged to use Gateley Hamer Limited.