

Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order Summary of Objections, Representations and letters of Support

This document provides a summary of the engagement with stakeholders who have submitted objections, representations, or letters of support to the Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Transport and Works Act Order.

Reference	Stakeholder	Type of representation	Statutory objector Y/N	Topic(s)	TWAO Element(s)	Matter raised	Agreement reached (insert details where matters subsequently resolved)
OBJ 01	Brian Hall	Objection	No	Heritage & Archaeology Highways	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	Objections raised on the following matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of Grade II listed bridge. Two-way road over new bridge on grounds of safety, noting will encourage more traffic and remove traffic calming. Location of footpath and concerns over pedestrian safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01.09.23 - Response sent addressing points raised in objection. 01.09.23 – Mr Hall acknowledged the response and noted his objection would not be removed.
OBJ 02	Christine Boothroyd	Objection	No	General Design	Peckfield Level Crossing	Objections raised on the following matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of Peckfield Level Crossing, noting use on foot and horse and wider connectivity. Bridge not being provided, noting "bridge provided in another area on the same line, which...sets a precedent". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01.09.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 – Follow up letter and email sent. 06.11.23 – Response received from Ms Boothroyd noting objection will not be removed.
OBJ 03	Stephen Nightingale	Objection	Yes	Land & Property	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	Objection raised on the following matter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land required up to his property limit and requested additional information on proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22.08.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 16.01.24 – Follow up letter sent but no response received.
OBJ 04	Bronislawa Klima	Objection	No	Landscape and Visual Land & Property Ecology	Barrowby Level Crossings	Objections raised on the following matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impact on local amenity and landscape of the new bridge. Land take required for the bridge. Impact of bridge on wildlife and trees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and

				Cost Anti-social behaviour		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of the bridge to taxpayers. Concerns raised over pollution of the local area, noting concerns over it attracting anti-social behaviour. 	email sent but no response received.
OBJ 05	Emma Gledhill	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objection raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of Peckfield Level Crossing, noting is a well-used route for residents and closing the crossing would restrict access to this popular route 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 06	Ashdale Land and Property Co	Objection	Yes	Land & Property	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land requested for passing places on Pit Lane. Note that (without prejudice) they do not object to the construction of passing places, just the amount of land indicated. Noted main concern is ensuring the development of their adjacent land is not frustrated by Network Rail's proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28.02.24 – Undertaking and licence terms agreed with Ashdale Land and Property. Objection due to be removed subject to the agreement being signed (currently being circulated for signing).
OBJ 07	Leeds City Council	Objection	Yes	General	Multiple	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 objection issues and 330 detailed points of objection raised on various matters including: Deemed Planning Permission; highways; land and property; environment; and communications. <p>Please refer to the Statement of Common Ground for the 42 specific points of objection.</p> <p>Objection withdrawn, save in relation to Peckfield Level Crossing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.02.24 – Signed Statement of Common Ground submitted to the Inspector noting the 42 specific points of objection and the position between LCC and NR on these points. 26.02.24 – Objection withdrawn, save in relation to Peckfield Level Crossing. Please see Appendix 1 in this document for details of the 51 meetings held with LCC between August 2023 – February 2024.
OBJ 08	Craig Gold	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	HUL4/15 (Brady Farm)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of Brady Farm Bridge on the grounds they use this bridge twice a week for walking. Request the bridge is rebuilt as part of the works to overhead wires. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10.11.23 – Objection withdrawn following response to OBJ provided by Network Rail, dated 18.10.23.

OBJ 09	Christopher Makin	Objection	Yes	Land & Property Heritage	HUL4/15 (Brady Farm)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of water pipe as part of bridge demolition and perceived impact on land as a result of the loss of irrigation. Heritage and removal of Grade II listed bridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 25.10.23 – Reply received on behalf of Mr Makin raising further points. 10.11.23 – Further response sent addressing the matters raised. 25.01.24 – Further reply received on behalf of Mr Makin raising additional queries. 08.02.24 – Response sent addressing the matters raised. 21.02.24 – Meeting held with Mr Makin and representatives from Northern Gas Network and Network Rail.
OBJ 10	Dylan Brown	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing, noting potential usage of crossing if there was a bridge, increase in housing in the village, traffic free route and unsupportive of alternative proposal through recreation ground. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 12.10.23 – Reply received from Mr Brown raising further questions. 13.11.23 – Further response sent addressing the questions. 16.11.23 – Further reply received from Mr Brown raising additional questions. 21.12.23 – Response sent addressing the questions.
OBJ 11	Daniel Wraith	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ.

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing, noting will isolate residents and cut off crossing point for residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response received from Mr Wraith noting he wished to withdraw his objection but no evidence of this being formally communicated to TIPU. 15.01.24 – Follow up email sent.
OBJ 12	Elizabeth Todd	Objection	No	Heritage & Archaeology Public Rights of Way	HUL4/14 (Ridge Road) Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters at Ridge Road Bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to demolition of Ridge Road bridge and it being rebuilt in "a new design" while using the original stone. Noted it is listed and should be protected or maintained and reconstructed in the original design. <p>Objections raised on the following matters at Peckfield Level Crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing, raising questions on validity of survey results, potential usage of the crossing if there was a bridge/ subway, increase in housing in the village and unsupportive of alternative proposal through recreation ground. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 13	Councillor J Lewis	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing, raising questions on weight of survey results, potential usage of the crossing, increase in housing in the village and the route providing traffic free access. Noted Peckfield Business Park is part of Leeds City Council's Local Development Framework for employment use and residents use the crossing to get to work. Believe this will increase once the site is fully developed. Note two bridge options included as previously considered therefore believe these are technically feasible options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 – Follow up letter sent but no response received.

OBJ 14	K Hickman	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing, noting increase in housing in the village, traffic free route which is available when bridge floods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 15	Jane Walton	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing. • Length of the diversion and route along main road, noting increase in car traffic and safety concerns for using the route. • Unsupportive of alternative proposal through recreation ground. • Request for a footbridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 16	E Galley	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objection raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing, noting does not see a need to close the level crossing on safety grounds. • Concerns over increased noise. • Noted environmental concerns from increased line speeds and increase in use of fuel and carbon dioxide emissions. • Note level crossing usage survey does not take account of temporary closure of onward permissive path in the field adjacent to allotments due to house building construction. • Note future increase in use following additional housing and travel to Peckfield Business Park once the site is fully developed. • Concerns over safety of pedestrians along main road. Request a bridleway bridge or footbridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 10.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.

OBJ 17	L Donoghue	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing, noting preference for a footbridge. • Key north-south connection and needed due to the recent increase in people living in the area (Pit Lane). • Unsupportive of alternative option for a bridleway through the recreation ground, noting its negative impacts on sporting clubs and the safety issues of horse riders and unleashed dogs interacting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 18	D Lee	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing, with preference for a footbridge. • Key north-south connection and needed due to the recent increase in people living in the area (Pit Lane). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 19	John Michael Chapman, Andrew Christopher Chapman and David Alan Leeming	Objection	Yes	Land & Property	Garforth Moor Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of the Order sterilising or adversely affecting a proposed development currently under negotiation via a Promotion Agreement. • Lack of historic negotiation from Network Rail on the licence for the temporary allotment access track situated on the north side of the railway track, off Barwick Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29.09.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 16.11.23 – Meeting held with the Chapmans. • February 2024 – Ongoing negotiations on land and property agreements.
OBJ 20	J Harker (Peak and Northern Footpath Society)	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	<p>Garforth Moor Level Crossing</p> <p>Peckfield Level Crossing</p>	<p>Objection raised on the following matter at Garforth Moor Level Crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the crossing without adequate compensatory measures. <p>Objection raised to the following matter at Peckfield Level Crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the crossing without adequate compensatory measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24.10.23 – Response sent to the OBJ offering a meeting. • 09.11.23 – Follow up email sent. • 13.11.23 – Meeting held with PNFS.
OBJ 21	J Freeman	Objection	No	Environment Consultation Design Highways	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of proposals on community woodland, in terms of environmental and community value, ecology and community identity. Believes this to be unjustifiable, and puts forward a number of alternative options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 13.11.23 and 16.01.24 - Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient consultation, noting resident views need to be taken into account. • Safety concern about the 1.8m wall and risk the public may attempt to climb over/onto it to view trains. • Safety concerns about highway layout, noting it means hostile/errant vehicles can mount the pavement, hit pedestrians or the bridge parapet and that the kerbs should be a minimum of 300mm high to prevent this. • Concerns about the road not being built to adoptable standards and therefore that it will not be well maintained. • Changes to the road potentially increasing “rat-running” and traffic in the area. <p>Objection withdrawn. Awaiting confirmation of withdrawal from TIPU.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 06.03.24 – Email received from Inquiry Programme Officer noting Mr Freeman’s objection withdrawal.
OBJ 22	P Freeman	Objection	No	Various	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of proposals on community woodland, in terms of environmental and community value, ecology and community identity. Believes this to be unjustifiable, and puts forward a number of alternative options. • Insufficient consultation, noting resident views need to be taken into account. • Safety concern about the 1.8m wall and risk the public may attempt to climb over/onto it to view trains. • Safety concerns about highway layout, noting it means hostile/errant vehicles can mount the pavement, hit pedestrians or the bridge parapet and that the kerbs should be a minimum of 300mm high to prevent this. • Concerns about the road not being built to adoptable standards and therefore that it will not be well maintained. • Changes to the road potentially increasing “rat-running” and traffic in the area. <p>Objection withdrawn. Awaiting confirmation of withdrawal from TIPU.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 13.11.23 and 16.01.24 - Follow up letter and email sent but no response received. • 06.03.24 – Email received from Inquiry Programme Officer noting Mr Freeman’s objection withdrawal.

OBJ 23	J Parkinson	Objection	Yes	Land & Property	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	<p>Objection raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot interpret plans and does not understand impacts to property. <p>Objection withdrawn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 09.10.23 – Objection withdrawn following provision of additional information by Network Rail.
OBJ 24	P Maude (LLAF)	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing on the grounds that it will sever a definitive bridleway and impact connectivity. Notes alternative routes are hazardous for bridleway users due to use of Great North Road, as well as being circuitous. Preference for previous options for a bridleway extension and footbridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 – Follow up letter sent but no response received.
OBJ 25	N Rhodes	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objection raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing and lack of viable alternative routes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 26	J Kilburn and B Elliott	Objection	No	General Highways Environment Construction	HUL4/21 (Austhorpe Lane)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of information to make an informed decision. Raised questions on road closures, resident access, parking, refuse collections during the works and whether the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be consulted on. Raised questions on environmental concerns, including tree retention, timings for publication of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and Biodiversity Net Gain assessment; and requested information about Invasive Non-Native Plant Species and how any risks will be managed. Raised questions on the compound locations and how the land will be left following demobilisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. 09.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 27	J Plackett	Objection	No	Transport	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objection raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that works would shut down access for trains in this area and create complaints and inconvenience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ.

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letter and email sent but no response received.
OBJ 28	Mr and Mrs Backhouse	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Peckfield Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the level crossing. • Request for a bridge to be provided. • Noted increase in new housing increasing the requirement for a bridge. • Current route is traffic free. • Referenced previous closure of Castle Hill Woods and railway bridge at Micklefield station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letters sent but no response received.
OBJ 29	M G Crowhurst	Objection	No	Public Rights of Way	Multiple	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised multiple questions including: clarity on which level crossings are being closed; rights of way proposals and whether proposals are temporary or permanent; alternative routes; the need for crossing closures; timings of the consultation and notice periods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09.11.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the OBJ. • 16.01.24 – Mr Crowhurst spoke to Penny Carter and noted he wished to withdraw his objection but does not have an email address and is not able to write to TIPU.
OBJ 30	Jean Makin	Objection	Yes	Land & Property	HUL4/15 (Brady Farm)	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed field access to facilitate demolition of Brady Farm Bridge. <p>Objection withdrawn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20.02.24 – Objection withdrawn following agreement on land and property negotiations.
OBJ 31	Lindsey Hubball	Objection	Yes	Maintenance	Garforth Moor Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The temporary access track to the allotments being made permanent. • Maintenance costs to owners of Sisters Villas who are responsible for the unadopted track. • Network Rail's lack of engagement on the matter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 05.02.24 - Objection received. No further correspondence issued or received.
OBJ 32	Sally and Russell Hansell	Objection	Yes	Maintenance	Garforth Moor Level Crossing	<p>Objections raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The temporary access track to the allotments being made permanent. • Maintenance costs to owners of Sisters Villas who are responsible for the unadopted track. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 02.02.24 – Objection received. No further correspondence issued or received.

REP 01	D Graham	Representation	No	Public Rights of Way	Neville Hill (Newmarket Approach)	<p>Representations raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals impact a cycleway that forms part of route 66 of the National Cycle Network and that no timescales have been advised and Sustrans has not been consulted, and there is no information about alternative routes and signage. Requested that alternative signed routes, meeting the approval of Sustrans and the Cyclists' Touring Club (Cycling UK), are in place for the duration of the closure and that the closure is in place for the shortest time possible, and that this time limit is specified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.09.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the REP. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letters and emails sent but no response received.
REP 02	L Walker (Environment Agency)	Representation	No	Flood Risk & Drainage	Multiple	<p>Representations raised on the following matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not satisfied with wording of protective provisions in draft Order, and require further discussion with Network Rail. <p>Representation withdrawn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20.10.24 – Representation withdrawn following provision of additional information by Network Rail.
REP 03	J Hebden (Micklefield Parish Council)	Representation	Yes	Public Rights of Way Design Construction	Peckfield Level Crossing HUL4/14 (Ridge Road) Phoenix Avenue Compound	<p>Representations raised on the following matters at Peckfield Level Crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to maintain north-south pedestrian connectivity via a footbridge in the location previously suggested by Network Rail. Do not believe user surveys have considered recent housing developments and do not acknowledge those who would use the route if it were safer. Believe an underpass should have been considered. Do not believe a replacement bridleway is needed, particularly through the recreation ground. Think existing routes on-road are sufficient, and horses are inappropriate in a recreation ground (safety and amenity of the grounds). Note the proposed route would also impede access to 4 and 5 Railway Cottages. <p>Representations raised on the following matters at Ridge Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of a Grade II listed structure, noting it is rare and unique. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the REP. 06.11.23 – Follow up letter sent. 08.11.23 – Response received noting the Parish Council would not remove its representation.

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended closure of Ridge Road. <p>Representations raised on the following matters at Phoenix Avenue Compound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend round the clock security and full restoration once site is vacated. 	
REP 04	Mr and Mrs Mann	Representation	No	Public Rights of Way General Highways	Peckfield Level Crossing Highroyds Wood HUL4/14 (Ridge Road)	<p>Representations raised on the following matters at Peckfield Level Crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of the level crossing on the grounds of danger (mixing horses and other users), impracticality (amenity of the new route), inconvenience and waste of money (no one will use the route). Suggest a bridge or underpass close to the location of the existing crossing would be better. <p>Representation raised on the following matter at Highroyds Wood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted support for the proposals. <p>Representation raised on the following matter at Ridge Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note object on the grounds of the disruption that would be caused by closing the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.10.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the REP. 06.11.23 and 16.01.24 – Follow up letters and emails sent but no response received.
REP 05	Royal Mail	Representation	No	Operations	Multiple	<p>Representation raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption to the highway network impacting on Royal Mail's operations and ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation. <p>Representation withdrawn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16.01.24 – Representation withdrawn following agreement of a letter of commitment between Royal Mail and Network Rail, dated 09.01.24.
REP 06	P Bedford (National Highways)	Representation	Yes	Highways	Not specified	<p>Representation raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested protective provisions are included for their benefit. <p>Representation withdrawn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 08.01.24 – Representation withdrawn following an Agreement between National Highways and Network Rail, dated 08.01.24.
REP 07	M Lindsley (Coal Authority)	Representation	No	Environment	Not specified	<p>Representation raised on the following matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note large areas of the scheme fall within the defined Development High Risk Area and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.09.23 – Response sent addressing matters raised in the REP.

						appropriate guidance and mitigations should be applied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16.10.23 – Response received acknowledging the letter but noting the REP would not be withdrawn.
SUP 01	Office of Road and Rail	Support	No	General	Multiple	Support noted on the following matter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note support for the closure of level crossings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.08.23 – Response sent to ORR acknowledging its letter of support.
SUP 02	North Yorkshire Council	Support	Yes	Public Rights of Way Heritage & Archaeology	Highroyds Wood	Points raised in the letter of support on the following matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested construction and detailed design details of the proposed footpath diversion, prior to works commencing. Noted a requirement for the works to be carried in accordance with the approved details and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council. Noted NYC is happy to agree this via a PRoW construction and management plan (via a condition) or a side agreement. Archaeology Officer advised there is a Scheduled Monument adjacent to the proposed diversion. Note it is unlikely to be impacted, but suggested Network Rail checks with Historic England as to whether Scheduled Monument Consent will be required. Requested detail of the full scope of the works at the underpass which is a Grade II Listed Building so it can consider whether Listed Building Consent is required separate to the Transports & Works Order. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.01.23 – Response sent to NYC acknowledging its letter of support and addressing the questions raised. 29.02.24 – Response received from NYC noting no objection to the Order and will work with Network Rail to deliver the Highroyds Wood footpath diversion.
SUP 03	West Yorkshire Combined Authority	Support	No	Transport Cost Construction Environment General	Multiple	Points raised in the letter of support on the following matters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of the works on bus operation and mitigations required, as well as impact on active modes of travel. Questions raised on the electrification and line speed improvements in the overall scope of the Transpennine Route Upgrade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 09.11.23 – Response sent to WYCA acknowledging its letter of support and addressing the questions raised.

						<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Request continued collaborative working with the Combined Authority on any design and construction interface issues.• Noted importance of carbon and net zero targets in the Combined Authority's strategy.• Encouraged Network Rail to make use of the existing meetings and governance to work closely with the Combined Authority and the Local Authority to minimise disruptions and impacts on our businesses, public transport users and communities.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Appendix 1 - Summary of engagement with Leeds City Council on the Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order, between August 2023 – January 2024

This document contains a summary of the engagement with Leeds City Council (LCC) on the Network Rail (Leeds to Micklefield Enhancements) Order (“the Order”) between their objection on 18 August 2023, until 23 February 2024.

Network Rail has been working collaboratively with LCC on this Order, following their objection and has undertaken engagement in a number of ways, including virtual meetings and briefings, email correspondence and regular information provision. A broad range of officers, councillors and elected members at LCC have been briefed as part of this engagement, as evidenced by the range of meeting topics detailed below.

Network Rail is committed to continuing to work collaboratively with LCC on this scheme.

Meetings

A total of 51 meetings have been held with LCC on the Order between 18 August 2023 and 23 February 2024, with further future meetings already under discussion.

The section below sets out the series of meetings which are held with LCC on a regular basis, as well as the more detailed topic-specific sessions that supplement the regular engagement.

Fortnightly/ weekly meeting – A series of weekly meetings were established with LCC on 24 October 2023. These meetings are used as a forum by both Network Rail and LCC to raise key matters relating to the Order and are attended by members of the Station Development and Highways teams at LCC (Tracey Piper, Lauren Browne, Angela Lawson, Ben Mallows and Catherine Kimuli).

Highways Working Group – The Highways Working Group was established in February 2023. This meeting is used as a dedicated forum to discuss detailed highways matters. Twelve meetings have been held to-date.

These meetings are supplemented with targeted sessions on specific topics. Representatives from LCC’s Network Management, Bridges, Transport Development, Engineering and Highways teams are invited to attend these meetings. These meetings will become known as the Network Management Group going forwards, and will be used to discuss highways matters as the Order progresses.

Topic-specific meetings

As noted above, a number of topic-specific meetings have also been organised with LCC following the Order submission, in order to close out LCC’s concerns raised in its objection. Please see below for a list of the topics discussed with LCC between August 2023 – January 2024.

- Communications
- Consents
- Design
- Environment
 - Arboriculture

- Ecology
 - Environment Agreement
 - Biodiversity Net Gain
- Funding agreement
- Highways
 - Highways Side Agreement
- Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)
- The Order process and objection management
- Transport

These sessions are attended by the relevant technical leads from both Network Rail and LCC.

A detailed briefing was also held with LCC Councillors on the proposals for Austhorpe Lane on 11 September 2023.