

Network Rail (Reading) (Land Acquisition) Order

Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

By C J Tipping MA (Cantab)

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport

The Planning Inspectorate

4/09 Kite Wing

Temple Quay House

2 The Square

Temple Quay

Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372

Date 28 July 2009

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

THE NETWORK RAIL (READING) (LAND ACQUISITION) ORDER 200_

Inquiry opened: 1 July 2009

Ref: TWA/08/APP/08

CONTENTS

The Report

Case Details	1
Preamble	1
Description of the Site and its Surroundings	2
The Case of Network Rail	2
The Case of the Supporter	10
The Case of the Objectors	10
The Response of Network Rail	12
Modifications	13
Conclusions:	15
Introduction	
The Statement of Matters	

Summary of conclusions

Recommendation	21
Annex: Documents	22

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

DfT: Department for Transport

EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment

EIA Regulations: Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)(England and Wales) Regulations 1999

ES: Environmental Statement

FGW: First Great Western

GPDO: Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995

GWML: Great Western Main line

HLOS: High Level Output Specification

HOOB: High Output Operating Base

INQ/: Miscellaneous inquiry document

NR: Network Rail (also NR/: Network Rail core or inquiry document)

OBJ: Objector (also OBJ/: objector document reference)

ORR: Office of the Rail Regulator

the Programme: Reading Station Area Redevelopment Programme

RBC: Reading Borough Council

SoS: Secretary of State for Transport

the Southern platforms: Platforms 4a and 4b

WCML: West Coast Main Line

CASE DETAILS

The draft Order would be made under sections 1 and 5 of the Transport and Works Act 1992, and is known as the Network Rail (Reading)(Land Acquisition) Order 200_.

The application for the Order was made on 6 November 2008 by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited ("NR").

The draft Order if made would authorise NR compulsorily to purchase land and interests in land for the purposes of altering and improving Reading Railway Station and the railway infrastructure in the vicinity of the Station.

Summary of Recommendation: I recommend that the draft Order be made with modifications.

1. PREAMBLE

1.1 I have been appointed pursuant to Section 11 of the Transport and Works Act 1992 to hold a public inquiry into the above draft Order and to report to the Secretary of State for Transport ("SoS"). The inquiry was held at the Town Hall, Blagrove Street, Reading on 1 and 2 July 2009. I held a pre-inquiry meeting on 5 May 2009 at the same venue.

1.2 I made unaccompanied inspections of the sites affected by the proposals on 4 May and 30 June 2009. On 2 July 2009, I made an inspection of a limited number of the sites affected, accompanied by a representative of NR and one objector.

1.3 There is 1 supporter of the scheme, First Great Western ("FGW"). There is no in-principle objection to the proposals as a whole, but 24 objections were made to elements of the scheme. Of these, 20 were from owners of land affected by the compulsory acquisition proposals and all of these had been withdrawn by the time the inquiry closed. The remaining 4 objections relate to the impact of the proposals on the allotments site at Cow Lane. 2 of these objectors appeared at the inquiry. There are no subsisting objections from statutory bodies or statutory undertakers.

1.4 In April 2009, the SoS caused a Statement to be issued setting out those Matters in relation to which he wished particularly to be informed for the purposes of his consideration of the draft Order. The Matters are set out as the headings to sections 8.2 to 8.9 of this report.

1.5 It was confirmed on behalf of NR that all statutory formalities had been complied with. The inquiry was conducted under the Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004 (SI No. 2018 of 2004). There were no legal or procedural issues.

1.6 The scope of the inquiry was limited to the proposed permanent and temporary compulsory acquisition by NR of land and rights over land for the purposes of implementing the Reading Station Area Redevelopment Programme ("the Programme"). The works contained in the Programme are authorised under the 19th century Railway Acts listed in Schedule 1 to the draft Order, commencing with the Great Western Railway Act 1835. The works are therefore permitted development by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 ("GPDO"), as amended (NR/7). No application for deemed planning permission is therefore necessary. Works to buildings, bridges, and to alter or provide new accesses to highways will require prior approval by Reading Borough Council ("RBC") as local planning authority. Some of these works have already received such

approval, and applications for the remaining works will be submitted at detailed design stage.

1.7 The remaining sections of this report contain a brief description of the area, the gist of the cases presented, and my conclusions and recommendation. A list of documents is annexed.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The town of Reading is located some 55 kilometres west of London. Its railway station is on the Great Western Main Line ("GWML") from London to Bristol, and is located to the north of the town centre, south of the River Thames. A description of the layout of the rail network in the area and of the railway routes which pass through or close to Reading Station is set out in paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

2.2 Cow Lane runs north under the GWML some 850 metres west of the Station. Cow Lane Bridge North, which carries the GWML over Cow Lane, is single track and traffic-signal-controlled. It has a narrow footway on each side. The Cow Lane allotments site is to the west of Cow Lane, north of the GWML. Cow Lane Bridge South carries the existing western rail chord (see paragraph 3.2.6) over Cow Lane. It is also narrow (though it allows private cars to pass with care), and is without footways or traffic signals. The Reading High Output Operating Base ("HOOB") depot is on railway land on the northern side of the GWML in the vicinity of the Cow Lane allotments.

2.3 Caversham Road runs north under the railway immediately to the west of Reading Station. The Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Services premises are located north west of the Station to the west of Caversham Road, and the Royal Mail depot is also to the north and west of the Station, but on the eastern side of Caversham Road. The Apex Plaza is an office block located immediately to the east of Reading Station on the south side of the railway, and the premises known as Reading Central also lie to the south of the railway to the east of Apex Plaza and of Vastern Road. Vastern Road runs north under the railway to the east of the Station.

3. THE CASE OF NETWORK RAIL

The material points are:

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 NR owns and operates the rail infrastructure of Great Britain. It bears primary responsibility for maintenance, repair and renewal of track, stations, signalling, and electrical control equipment. Train services on the network are run by train operating companies to which NR grants rights in the form of track, station and depot access contracts which are approved by the Office of the Rail Regulator ("ORR").

3.2 The current situation at Reading

3.2.1 Reading is one of the busiest stations in Britain, outside London. It is served by the following passenger trains:

- Inter-urban trains between London and: Bristol, South Wales and Cheltenham; Oxford, Worcester and Hereford; and Exeter, Plymouth and Penzance;
- Inter-urban cross country services between the North and Birmingham and the south coast; nd

- Local stopping trains on the above routes, trains to Basingstoke, Redhill, Gatwick Airport and Brighton, and trains to London Waterloo.

3.2.2 There are two important freight train movements in the vicinity of Reading Station: trains from Southampton Docks to the West Coast Main Line ("WCML"), and trains carrying aggregates from the south west. Both of these freight services approach the GWML from Southcote Junction to its south, where the lines from Basingstoke and from Newbury and the south west converge.

3.2.3 The Station is a critical crossroads on the east-west and north-south rail axes. The routes passing through the Reading area are shown on the plan at Appendix 2 to the Proof of Evidence of Mr W (NR/15).

3.2.4 In 2008, there were some 34 million passenger movements at Reading Station, passengers starting or ending their rail journey there, or using the Station as an interchange. Some 38,600 passengers use Reading Station on a typical weekday. There are about 570 passenger train movements and 55 freight train movements through the Reading area on an average day. Platforms 4a and 4b ("the Southern platforms") at the south eastern end of the station serve about 170 in and out train movements per day between Reading and London Waterloo, Redhill and Gatwick Airport.

3.2.5 The London-Bristol rail route through Reading consists of four running lines, the two main lines to the south which predominantly carry fast inter-city trains, and the two relief lines to the north which predominantly serve slower all-stations services and freight trains. In addition to the four through platforms and the two Southern platforms, the Station has four east- and four west-facing bay platforms, accommodating services which terminate or reverse at Reading. To the east of the Station, there is an at-grade crossing of the main lines between the relief lines and the Southern lines.

3.2.6 South of the GWML to the west of the Station lies the Reading Triangle. This currently accommodates the train care depot for the fleet of turbo trains that provide the passenger services on the FGW London and Thames Valley routes. The depot can accommodate trains of up to four coaches in length. Forming the sides of the Triangle are two rail chords which connect the lines from the south and south west to the London-Bristol running lines to the west of Reading Station. The western chord is mainly used by freight trains, which then cross the two main lines to reach the relief lines to their north. The eastern chord is used by trains accessing Reading Station and the east, where necessary crossing the main lines at grade to reach the relief line platforms. All eastbound trains using the eastern chord need as a minimum to cross the westbound London to Bristol main line to reach the eastbound main line and/or the relief lines.

3.2.7 The constraints of this current layout cause operational problems, among which are the following:

- Reading Station has only 4 through platforms. This, taken with the necessary 3 minutes signalling headway between trains on safety grounds and with the train waiting time at the platform needed for passengers to board and alight, creates a bottleneck. In addition to creating delays locally, this has a magnifying effect on delays arising elsewhere on the network. It also gives almost no scope for increasing services through Reading, especially during morning and evening peak periods;

- Freight trains approaching from Southcote Junction need to cross the two main lines at grade to reach the relief lines on which they travel. Some of these services are time-sensitive, connecting with ships departing from Southampton. Freight trains typically take 5 minutes to cross the main lines, occupying these for a time approximately equivalent to the six-minute signalling headway (three minutes each) needed for two trains to pass in each direction on the main lines;
- Similar considerations apply to trains which cross the main lines at grade east of the Station between the relief lines and the Southern lines;
- There are problems with the timetabling of some services around available capacity at Reading Station, notably Cross Country services, the timetabling restrictions of which on other parts of their route, taken with the length of trains, create particular difficulties.

3.2.8 FGW estimates that some 8-9% of all its delays are caused by the current layout shortcomings at Reading Station and in its vicinity. Theoretically, up to 95 trains per hour could run through Reading on the two main and the two relief lines. A measure of the current operational constraints is that it is currently possible to run no more than between 10 and 15 trains on each of the four through lines.

3.2.9 The station footbridge is used both by fare-paying passengers to access platforms and by others as a thoroughfare. The two categories of user are separated by a barrier which runs almost the whole length of the bridge. This shared bridge is only some 10 metres wide and becomes inconveniently congested at busy times.

3.2.10 The current timetable is designed to be compatible with these capacity constraints. Any incident in the Reading area or across the network generally results in trains being delayed and presenting themselves out of path, that is, otherwise than in their designated order relative to other services and/or at their advertised arrival time. This leads to severe operational problems. The constraints at Reading taken with its position at the intersection of route axes lead to escalating delays. The current limitations at Reading severely constrain any future growth in rail traffic there. The DfT predicts a growth in rail passenger numbers of up to 100% in the next 20 years.

3.3 Government policy

3.3.1 Sir Rod Eddington's Report: "Transport's role in sustaining the UK's productivity and competitiveness" was published in December 2006. Its key findings and recommendations are reproduced in Appendix 10 of Mr W's Proof of Evidence (NR/15). The Report concludes that the economic case for targeted new infrastructure is strong, offering very high returns. It notes that smaller projects, including those that unblock pinch-points, are likely to offer the very highest returns, sometimes more than tenfold. The Programme is a case in point, unblocking a key pinch-point on the Western rail route.

3.3.2 The Government's White Paper: "Delivering a Sustainable Railway", published in July 2007, contains the Government's High Level Output Specification ("HLOS" - NR/2). This specifies the outputs which the Government wishes to purchase from the rail industry during the period 2009-2014; these are in the form of specific metrics that cover safety, reliability and capacity. The White Paper also sets out the funding which the Government proposes to make available. It provides details of specific schemes and these include the upgrade of Reading Station and the surrounding rail network.

3.4 The aims and objectives of the scheme

3.4.1 The aims and objectives of the Programme have been agreed with the DfT and are set out in the HLOS (NR/2). They have also been agreed with RBC and are contained in the RBC Development Plan of July 2007. In summary, they are:

- To provide a local network and station which fits the medium term (2015) and long term (2035) requirements of all the routes which serve or pass through the area and a station suitable for future customer requirements;
- To deliver better service reliability. This is assessed against the Public Performance Measure, based on the percentage of trains reaching their destination within a specified time (10 minutes for long distance services and 5 minutes for regional and London and south east services) of their advertised arrival time. The aims are to achieve 92% compliance for long distance services and (by 2014) for regional services, and 93% compliance for London and south east services;
- To provide capacity for a minimum of four additional trains per hour to the west of Reading and a minimum of nine through platforms at Reading Station;
- To reduce the number of conflicting train movements in the area;
- To redevelop the Station to accommodate a predicted doubling of passenger movements;
- To provide timetabling flexibility to address changing circumstances such as longer trains, and future growth and potential new services such as Crossrail and Airtrack (see paragraph 3.6.4); and
- Passively to provide for possible future electrification of the GWML.

3.5 The Programme

3.5.1 The principal works proposed are as follows:

- The creation to the west of the Station of a grade-separated railway some two kilometres in length by elevating the main lines above the western and proposed new eastern chords;
- The construction of a new eastern chord, providing a grade-separated connection from a point on the existing western chord to the running lines to and through the Station;
- The construction of a new train care depot on the site of the HOOB depot north of the GWML west of Reading Station, with associated embankment and retaining wall works;
- Works at the Station, including four new platforms and five further usable through lines on its northern side, a new northern Station entrance and a new wider overbridge, providing step-free access to all platforms, for use by fare-paying passengers only. The existing subway would be refurbished and re-opened for use as a through pedestrian route for non-passengers;
- Works to the Southern platforms, including lengthening the existing platforms and constructing an additional platform, together with the dualling of the short stretch of single approach track immediately east of the Station;

- The re-opening of the Southern Tunnel which dives under the four running lines to the east of the Station, allowing Gatwick trains to be transferred from the Southern platforms to platforms on the northern side of the Station and Gatwick services potentially to be extended to Oxford. This transfer would create capacity at the Southern platforms for additional trains; and
- The rebuilding of the Cow Lane North and South Bridges, and improvements to the Caversham Road and Vastern Road bridges.

3.5.2 The 13 main locations where works are proposed are shown on the plan which forms Appendix 7 to Mr W's Proof of Evidence (NR/15). Major track slewing and realignment works would be required throughout the area affected by the Programme.

3.6 Scheme benefits

3.6.1 The grade separation created by elevating the main lines west of the Station would untangle the conflicting rail routes, providing capacity for an additional four trains per hour, mainly to the west of Reading. The improvements to the Station would provide a minimum of nine through platforms, increasing through platform capacity by 75%. They would render the station capable of accommodating a doubling of passenger movements.

3.6.2 The Programme is predicted to deliver a 37% improvement in train performance measured against 2005/6 levels, and better reliability measured by the Public Performance Measure, including the reliability objectives set out in the second bullet point of paragraph 3.4.1.

3.6.3 The new train care depot would be capable of accommodating the longer (five-car) Inter City Express Programme trains currently planned for 2016 and to service the larger number of trains needed to meet the anticipated growth in turbo services. The existing depot caters for a limited number of three- and four-car units only.

3.6.4 The reopening and refurbishment of the Station subway for the use of non-fare-paying passengers and the construction of the new passenger transfer bridge and new northern entrance would greatly ease current passenger congestion and provide for future growth in passenger numbers at the Station. The new Southern platform, the lengthening of Platforms 4a and 4b, and the dualling of the single track pinch-point on the Southern line to the east of the Station would provide greatly improved track and platform capacity for more and longer (up to 12-car) trains, and allow for future rail traffic growth, including potential future use of the Station by Airtrack services. (Airtrack is a proposed new rail link between Heathrow Terminal 5 and the rail network to the south and west, including Reading.) The enhanced capacity at the Station would also accommodate Crossrail services, should the decision be taken to extend these to Reading.

3.6.5 The Programme includes improvements to the local road network, especially the rebuilding to modern standards of the Cow Lane bridges (see paragraph 2.2). Cow Lane Bridge North is a significant traffic bottleneck, especially at peak times. The rebuilding of the Cow Lane North Bridge would also allow two sidings to be joined into a single siding of greatly improved length and utility. There would also be improvements to the Caversham Road and Vastern Road bridges.

3.7 Scheme development and consideration of alternatives

3.7.1 The original initiative to address the bottleneck at Reading was put forward by RBC in March 2006, and was a limited scheme mainly addressing the shortage of platform capacity at the Station. This and other options were considered at a workshop in December 2006.

The original proposals demonstrated a benefit to cost ratio of only 1.7:1 and thus represented poor value for money. This poor economic performance largely arose from the failure of these proposals to address the conflicting train movements to the west of the Station. Two other low cost options considered at the December 2006 workshop were also rejected for similar reasons.

3.7.2 The proposals were then expanded to address the conflicting train movements by means of grade-separation between the main lines and the western and eastern chords. Two options were considered:

- To drop the main lines into a box structure which would pass under the western chord and under a new eastern chord to be provided for use by east-bound trains from the south and south west. However, this option would have created significant drainage problems as the box would have penetrated below the water table level by some two metres. It would also have involved the closure of Cow Lane and required the construction of a new Oxford Road relief road to accommodate the traffic thus displaced; or
- To elevate the main lines above the western and proposed new eastern chords. This would be more visually intrusive, but would avoid the problems associated with the box structure proposal. This option also had the advantage of permitting the two Cow Lane bridges not only to be retained but to be rebuilt to accommodate two-way traffic and foot- and cycle-ways constructed to modern design standards.

3.7.3 The new eastern chord would be required for either of these grade separation options. In either event therefore, the necessary routing of the chord through the Triangle would displace the existing train care depot. Various location options for a new depot were considered by NR in consultation with FGW. Among the relevant considerations were that:

- The depot must be at or near the main focal point of the London and Thames Valley rail routes so as to reduce to a minimum the distance and time between the start and finish of services and the depot, and thereby to minimise fuel consumption (reducing fuel cost and CO2 emissions) and driver working hours. Moreover, the depot should be located close to the service hub so as to avoid the need for additional trains to maintain the existing service pattern. Empty stock trains occupy track space, creating operational inefficiency;
- In the event of mechanical problems whilst a train is in service, technicians travel out from the depot to carry out repairs. To minimise delay to passengers and cost, the depot needs to be located at a central point in railway operations in the area; and
- There is a high level of knowledge and experience among staff at the existing Reading depot. Similarly, the existing depot is a key train crew location. Locating the proposed depot elsewhere would add to the expense of travelling time and may lead to loss of valued maintenance staff and train crew members.

3.7.4 With these considerations in mind, five possible locations for the new depot were identified and assessed:

- Swindon: A site for the depot is available at Swindon, but was rejected because it lies outside the Thames Valley train service area, and does not therefore meet the criteria set out above. The quadruple GWML ends at Didcot and the limited track capacity between Didcot and Swindon is insufficient to run all the necessary empty stock trains to ensure that trains are at the correct service starting point, normally Oxford, Reading or London Paddington;

- Oxford: Locating the depot at Oxford is precluded by insufficient land, and existing operational problems which would be exacerbated by the introduction of additional train movements to and from a train care depot;
- Didcot (Moreton Cutting): Again there is insufficient space available, though a decision has now been taken to relocate the Reading HOOB depot to Didcot, thus releasing the HOOB site for the proposed new train care depot at Reading;
- Southall: The site of the former diesel depot at Southall lies to the south of the main lines, while the Thames Valley services would primarily require access to the relief lines, so that the need to cross the main lines at grade from a depot on this site to the relief lines would lead to a loss of capacity and to operating delays and inefficiencies; and
- The Reading HOOB site: This site has direct access to the relief lines, and is located to the west of Reading Station at the central point of Thames Valley train services. It could accommodate a depot of sufficient length not only for existing trains but for the longer trains planned for the future. Lying within a few hundred metres of the existing depot, it would permit the retention of the current skill base at no material additional travelling or other cost. While the depot would largely be located on existing railway land, locating the depot on the Reading site requires the acquisition of the Cow Lane allotments (see paragraph 6.3).

3.7.5 These considerations led to the clear conclusion that the HOOB site best met the criteria for the proposed new train care depot.

3.8 Scheme construction and funding

3.8.1 NR is subject to supervision by the ORR both as to safety and environmental policy. The safety of the design and operation of the Programme works and of their construction will continue to be independently checked and enforced by the ORR.

3.8.2 Preliminary works are planned for late 2009. The main construction would take place between 2010 and 2016. A planning and environmental strategy for the Programme is in course of preparation. A construction health and safety plan would be prepared by the contractor following finalisation of the detailed design. NR's Environmental Policy (document D5 annexed to the Statement of Case (NR/17)) has been approved by the ORR and sets out NR's commitment to avoiding or reducing the adverse environmental impacts of its infrastructure development plans. As far as practicable, construction works would be limited to normal weekday and Saturday working hours, but some track works would need to be carried out at night, at weekends or on Bank Holidays to avoid undue disruption to rail services.

3.8.3 The application documents contain a funding statement (NR/1, Item 5). Including increases to account for inflation, NR has secured funding of £551m for the scheme from the DfT for the period 2009/14. Further funds would be allocated as necessary from its infrastructure renewals budget. NR also has available a £1 billion bank borrowing facility for working capital and a £4 billion facility from the DfT.

3.8.4 It is acknowledged that further funding would be required for the remaining work after 2014; the DfT's letter to NR dated 26 January 2009 (NR/10) states that it can be assumed that such an application will be accepted. The letter continues: "Effectively therefore the Reading improvement proposals can be regarded as a fully funded scheme within the level of the current overall estimated cost of the project".

3.8.5 The business case for the Programme has been prepared by the DfT, and was not in issue before the inquiry. The business case summary shows a positive Net Present Value (the difference between the value of benefits and costs both discounted to 2002 prices) of nearly £1,700m and a ratio of benefits to costs of over 4 to 1. It therefore represents high value for money.

3.9 Public consultation

3.9.1 There has been extensive consultation. Consultees included the DfT, RBC, MPs, rail operators, and statutory bodies, including the Environment Agency and Natural England. Stakeholder preview exhibitions were held for councillors, local business leaders and representatives of local transportation groups. Four public exhibitions were held locally in September 2008.

3.9.2 Further local publicity was provided in the form of advertisements and media interviews. Leaflets (including 70,000 inserted in the Reading Chronicle) were distributed widely. A consultation report is contained in the application documents (NR/1, item 5), and a fuller report forms NR/9. 61% of those who responded in writing were in favour of the Programme, with only 5% opposed to it. Many of the oral responses to consultations are set out in Appendix B of NR/9.

3.10 Compulsory acquisition of land

3.10.1 Despite the substantial scope of the Programme, it can largely be implemented on existing railway land. Permanent acquisition of only four plots of land is required. These are (the Book of Reference (NR/1, document 7) plot numbers are given in brackets):

- The major part of the Cow Lane allotments site extending to about 1.5 hectares (42);
- Part of the Royal Mail depot extending to some 0.4 hectares (77);
- Part of the Apex Plaza plot extending to about 160m² (82) and part of the Reading Central plot extending to about 25 m² (88), both for landscaping purposes.

3.10.2 Access points for maintenance of the railway are also included in the draft Order. However, these are all existing rail access points and are included only to ensure that NR has full rights of access. Rights are also sought over a 3-metre-wide strip alongside the railway where, following implementation of the Programme, there would be new structures, for the purposes of inspection and maintenance. The impact of exercise of these rights would in the normal way be a brief occupation every 5 years or so. Most of the land affected is currently used for commercial car-parking.

3.10.3 Temporary rights are sought over a large number of plots for construction purposes. Occupation of these plots would typically be of short duration.

3.10.4 That the concerns of landowners affected have been satisfactorily addressed is attested by the withdrawal of all 20 such objections by the close of the inquiry. Acquisition of the Cow Lane allotments site is further addressed in section 6.

3.10.5 No compulsory acquisition of residential land or of public open space or other land affected by section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 is proposed.

4. THE CASE OF THE SUPPORTER

The material points are:

4.1 FGW is a train operator and forms part of FirstGroup plc. Its support for the scheme is set out in a letter from the Chief Executive of FirstGroup plc dated 12 January 2009 (SUPP/1 in INQ/2). Reading is a Great Western route bottleneck and the primary cause of delays to rail services, impacting adversely on passenger and freight rail users alike. The primary problems are that there are only four through platforms at the Station to accommodate high speed, local and suburban services. The congestion caused by the route crossings west of the Station reduce capacity and lead to further delays. The local network does not cater satisfactorily for current demand, and makes no provision for the significant growth in rail traffic planned by the government.

4.2 The proposed redevelopment would allow more and longer trains, increasing passenger seating capacity, would reduce delays, provide a better station environment, and deliver capacity for future rail service growth. The scheme has the full support of FirstGroup plc.

5. THE CASE OF THE OBJECTORS

The material points are:

5.1 As noted in paragraph 1.3, when the inquiry closed, the number of subsisting objections had been reduced to four, all of which related to the proposed acquisition of the allotments site at Cow Lane and its use for purposes ancillary to the proposed train care depot. Of these objectors, two, OBJ/8 and OBJ/5 appeared at the inquiry, and two, OBJ/15 and OBJ/4, rely on written submissions. The objections relate to the impact of the loss of the site on the general availability of allotments in the Reading area and to the adverse ecological impact of its loss. Subject to resolution of these objectors' concerns about loss of the Cow Lane allotments site, they have no in-principle objection to implementation of the Programme.

(OBJ8)

5.2 OBJ/8 does not wish to delay or prevent implementation of the Programme. However, the use of the allotments site for the purposes of the train care depot would mean the loss of an important wildlife corridor. Bats have been observed in the area. Moreover, even if, as claimed by NR following initial surveys, the site accommodates no rare species, the flora, including trees and shrubs, on the site support an abundance of wildlife and this would be threatened if the site is cleared. While NR has offered OBJ/8 the opportunity to take part in discussions as to future planting of the site, she is not a qualified ecological expert, but only someone with experience of conservation and working with wildlife.

5.3 OBJ/8 seeks the involvement of an expert independent ecologist who would look at the local biodiversity action plan and decide what replacement species should be included in the design. There is an adjacent piece of land which should be purchased by NR and used to enhance the wildlife corridor. A full Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") should be carried out and its result be made the subject of consultation with the Environment Agency and local environmental stakeholders, so that appropriate ecological mitigation could be agreed and implemented. There is a need to ensure that NR would make available sufficient funds for this purpose.

(OBJ5)

5.4 OBJ/5 is not persuaded that NR has carried out an effective assessment of the alternative sites for a new train care depot. Objectors are not qualified to rebut NR's choice of the Reading HOOB site for the depot, but NR's consideration of the possible sites appears from the evidence presented to have been cursory. NR claims, for example, that there is insufficient land to locate the depot at Oxford, but the same is clearly true of the Reading

site, where it would be necessary to acquire extra land, namely the allotments site, to accommodate the depot. The depot is not an integral part of the Programme, and it should be located on a brownfield site.

5.5 OBJ/5 accepts that all Cow Lane allotment holders who so wished have been provided with replacement allotments. He has been accommodated on the Henley Road allotments site and is content with the assistance provided by RBC and the compensation paid by NR. However, most Cow Lane allotment holders have been accommodated on spare land within existing allotment sites, mainly at the Scours Lane site. No new allotment land has therefore been provided. The use of spare land on existing allotment sites necessarily reduces the ability of RBC to address the growing local demand for allotments. There are currently over 700 names on allotment waiting lists, though these include duplications because applicants have their name on more than one site waiting list. RBC recognises that there is a need for further allotments and has powers to acquire land for the purpose. RBC should be forced to create new allotment sites.

5.6 OBJ/5 also endorses OBJ/8's concerns about the ecological impact of the acquisition as well as the impact of the loss of an important green space. While NR is now proposing to prepare an Environmental Statement ("ES")(see paragraph 6.6), the fate of the allotments site is being determined now. Moreover, even if the site is required for construction purposes, it should be returned thereafter to use as a green space of ecological value; one proposal is that it should accommodate a balancing pond to encourage wetland wildlife.

Written objections

5.7 OBJ/4 is OBJ/5's partner. They worked an allotment at the Cow Lane site together. She submitted a joint Statement of Case (in INQ/2) with OBJ/5, and also shares the concerns of OBJ/8 over the ecological impact of the acquisition. Lizards have been seen on the site, and whitethroats nest there every year.

5.8 OBJ/15 considers that there is no need to use the allotments site for the new depot, as there is land to the west which could be used. There were 49 allotments in use at Cow Lane when the proposal to acquire the site was made public. No replacement site had been allocated by RBC to offset the loss of the Cow Lane allotments, despite RBC's compulsory powers to acquire land for this purpose. Bringing fallow allotment land into use to accommodate the displaced Cow Lane allotment holders is not the same as providing new replacement allotment land.

6. THE RESPONSE OF NETWORK RAIL

The material points, in addition to those set out in section 3, are:

6.1 There is no in-principle objection to the redevelopment scheme. The sole subsisting objections relate to the acquisition of the Cow Lane allotments site for the purposes of the proposed new train care depot. There are three strands to these objections, namely: that the need to locate the depot at Reading, and accordingly the need to acquire the allotments land, have not been adequately made out; that the loss of the Cow Lane allotments would impact unacceptably on the overall supply of allotments in the Reading area; and that the ecological impact of the loss of the site has not yet been assessed and is likely to be adverse.

6.2 The Cow Lane allotments site is owned by RBC which has agreed to sell it to NR; inclusion of the land in the draft Order is to ensure that all possible subsisting rights in the land are acquired. The requisite approval under the Allotments Act 1925 for sale of the allotments site by RBC has been obtained from the Secretary of State for Communities and

Local Government (NR/11). All the allotment holders vacated the site by April 2009 in accordance with lawful notice given by RBC.

6.3 If the depot is to be located on the Reading HOOB site, then access would perforce be across the allotment land; there is no alternative. All of the allotment land would be required for construction purposes, for a period of not less than a year. Various essential facilities ancillary to the depot would need to be located permanently on the allotment land. An illustrative plan of the proposed new depot forms NR/13. Some of the allotments land may eventually be surplus to requirements, and in this event it has been agreed with RBC that it would be handed back. No commitment can be given at this stage as to the extent of such land since the scope to return any land would become apparent only at detailed design stage.

6.4 As to the need for a new depot, it is not in dispute that if the scheme proceeds, the existing train care depot would be displaced from the Triangle by the construction of the new eastern chord. Alternative locations for the new depot have been fully assessed, and the outcome and the reasons for selecting the HOOB site are set out in paragraphs 3.7.3 to 3.7.5. That NR's evidence on the possible alternative locations for a new depot is brief is because the appropriate choice of site is very apparent. The four alternative sites considered all fail because location of the depot there would have an unacceptable impact on operating costs and efficiency. It would also be disproportionate to move the depot away from Reading, with all the disruption and potential impacts on jobs, unless the benefits of so doing were patent; no such benefits have been identified.

6.5 Objectors express concerns that there is inadequate overall allotments provision in Reading. Allied to this argument is a claim that the replacement plots at Scours Lane are not genuine replacement allotments because they could have been brought into use at any time. These are, however, not matters either for NR or for the SoS. All Cow Lane allotment holders have vacated the site and all who so wished have been allocated replacement plots. The cost of the replacement plots has been met by NR which has paid or will pay compensation for loss of crops to any displaced holder who claims. To replace 49 sites lost at Cow Lane, 63 sites have been brought into use at Scours Lane. There is no net loss as a result of the proposed acquisition. The overall supply of allotment land in the area is a matter for RBC. The then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government indicated that she was content with the proposed arrangements and issued the requisite approval for sale of the land.

6.6 As to ecology, there was at the time when the Programme was first under consideration no requirement to carry out an EIA. Changes to the EIA Regulations introduced in September 2008 render it necessary to prepare an ES in the context of applications under Part 11 of the GPDO for prior approval for qualifying development such as the proposed depot. NR is seeking a screening opinion from RBC, and, on the assumption that an ES will be required, work has already commenced and the ES is expected to be published in October 2009. Preparation of the ES will include ecological surveys and consultation with both statutory and non-statutory bodies, including the Environment Agency, Berkshire County Council and Natural England. The work will be carried out by an expert ecologist. These arrangements fully address the concerns of objectors.

6.7 NR is subject to supervision by the ORR with regard to environmental matters and, with the approval of the ORR, in March 2003 issued an Environment Policy (Document D5, annexed to NR's Statement of Case (NR/17)). This requires NR to take action to avoid or reduce to a practical minimum the environmental impacts of implementation of its investment plans. When the ES recommendations are known, any necessary mitigation

works would be incorporated into the detailed design and put in place. As mentioned above (paragraph 3.8.2), similar mitigation would be provided during the construction phase.

7. MODIFICATIONS

7.1 No substantive modifications to the draft Order are proposed. A number of minor drafting modifications are proposed and are contained in the “filled-up” Order dated 17 June 2009, and described in the covering letter dated 18 June 2009 from NR’s solicitors (NR/14). The modifications proposed include an amendment to the definition of “apparatus” in Schedule 7 to the Order (as agreed with Thames Water), the substitution in Article 2(1) for the reference to the Lands Tribunal of a reference to its successor, the Upper Tribunal, and drafting changes, including a new Schedule 1 to the draft Order, made at the request and with the agreement of the DfT’s TWA Orders Unit.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Having regard to the foregoing, I have reached the following conclusions, references being given in square brackets to earlier paragraphs and sections of this report where appropriate.

8.1.2 In April 2009, the Secretary of State for Transport caused a Statement to be served, setting out those Matters about which he particularly wished to be informed for the purposes of considering the draft Order. I address each of these Matters below, before setting out a summary and reaching an overall conclusion.

8.1.3 As acknowledged in the Statement of Matters, this Order relates only to the compulsory acquisition of land and rights over land. NR considers that the works in the Programme enjoy permitted development rights under the GPDO, and this is a view with which RBC, as local planning authority, concurs. No application for deemed planning permission is therefore before me.

The Statement of Matters

8.2 Network Rail’s reasons for promoting the Order, including:-

(a) The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the Reading Station Area Redevelopment Programme (“the Programme”)

(c) The anticipated benefits of the Programme

8.2.1 In my view, these two subheadings may conveniently be addressed together.

8.2.2 The existing situation at Reading is described in section 3.2. Reading sits at a critical point on the Western rail network, where a number of rail routes intersect. Certain of these routes intersect at grade, particularly to the west of Reading Station, reducing rail capacity and creating delays by reason of conflicting train movements. Further delays arise when there are problems elsewhere on the network; these cause delays and difficulties to cascade to focal points on the rail network such as Reading. Among examples of these delay-creating route conflicts is the need for freight trains from Southampton to the WCML to cross the main lines to reach the relief lines, blocking the main lines for up to 5 minutes, approximately equivalent to the time needed for two trains to pass on the main lines [3.2.7].

8.2.3 The second principal problem is the lack of through lines and through platform capacity at Reading Station [3.2.7]. Other examples of operating difficulties at Reading Station and in its vicinity are set out in paragraphs 3.2.7 to 3.2.10.

8.2.4 The principal objective of the Programme is to increase the capacity of the rail network in the area by untangling the intersecting rail routes, especially to the west of Reading, and by constructing additional through platforms and lines at the Station [3.4.1].

8.2.5 The anticipated benefits of the Programme are set out in section 3.6. The conflicting routes west of Reading would be untangled by grade-separation. Provision for grade-separation of the crossing east of the Station would also be made by re-opening the Southern tunnel. At the Station, through platform and through line capacity would be greatly enhanced by 75%, and the capacity of the Southern platforms and the rail approach thereto much improved. The currently congested passenger footbridge would be replaced, segregating passengers and non-passengers, and a new northern entrance would be provided with step-free access to all platforms [3.6.4]. Relocation of the train care depot would allow it to be enlarged to accommodate more trains and cater for the longer trains which are to be introduced [3.6.3].

8.2.6 The improvements to the Station and the local rail network would not only provide immediate benefits by addressing current problems, but would also meet the medium and long term requirements of the predicted growth in passenger numbers by up to 100% [3.2.10 and 3.6.1]. There would be associated improvements to the local road network and not least the rebuilding of the Cow Lane Bridges [3.6.5], which, as I observed in the course of my accompanied site visit [1.2], currently cause significant inconvenience to all road users and not least to cyclists and pedestrians.

8.2.7 It is not gainsaid by any party that these substantial improvements to Reading Station and to the rail network in its vicinity are much to be desired. There is a degree of local enthusiasm for the Programme [3.9.2]. The four objectors whose concerns had not been resolved when the inquiry closed did not oppose the Programme in principle, subject to the issue of the Cow Lane allotments site [5.1 and 5.2].

(b) The main alternative options considered by Network Rail for meeting the objectives of the Programme and the reason for selecting the proposals included in the Programme

8.2.8 The redevelopment Programme relates to existing rail infrastructure. A railway has been in place in this location since the construction of the Great Western Railway pursuant to the private Acts of the 1830s [1.6]. Compared with a scheme for a new railway, that there is existing rail infrastructure of itself reduces the range of viable alternatives to the works proposed. By the same token, it also limits the extent of land acquisition required; by far the greater part of the Programme can be implemented on existing railway land [3.10.1].

8.2.9 The initial scheme, put forward by RBC and limited to an expansion of the Station itself, failed to meet economic criteria [3.7.1]. That this was the case is, with the benefit of hindsight, perhaps not surprising, because it failed to address the impact of conflicting train routes, particularly to the west of Reading, on the ability of trains to reach the Station on time, one of the two principal problems identified in the course of development of the Programme and which the Programme now seeks to address [3.4.1]. The initial proposals were therefore abandoned in favour of a more radical reconfiguration. Two low cost options were also considered at the December 2006 workshop but rejected because the proposals were again limited to works to the Station [3.7.1].

8.2.10 The decision to promote a wider scheme having been taken, the elements of the Programme to which viable alternatives are available are limited. They are: the design of the grade-separation to the west of Reading Station and the siting of the new train care depot. As to the decision to elevate the main lines, no party suggests that this is inappropriate: the alternative of sinking the main lines into a subterranean box would conflict with the water table, as well as rendering necessary a new relief road, disadvantages that elevation of the main lines would not import [3.7.2, first bullet point]. That the elevation would have a somewhat greater visual impact does not seem to me to be a disadvantage of great weight, in an existing rail corridor through a largely urban landscape [2.1].

8.2.11 As to the train care depot, it is not in dispute that the existing depot would be displaced by the proposed new eastern chord [3.7.3]. I have considered carefully the alternatives considered for the location of the new depot [3.7.4]. I have had regard to the doubts expressed by objectors that the consideration of alternatives has been no more than cursory [5.4].

8.2.12 Reading is to my mind clearly not only near the geographically central point of First Great Western's Thames Valley routes but also the main focus of existing maintenance skills and train staff [3.7.3]. Use of the HOOB depot site would allow construction of the new train care depot largely on railway land, and, an ancillary advantage, the site at Didcot has been identified as appropriate for relocation of the HOOB depot [3.7.4]. The extent of the land available at Reading would enable provision to be made for the servicing of the longer trains proposed to be introduced from 2016. Its location to the north of the relief lines minimises interference with operations on the main lines, compared, for example, with the Southall site [3.7.4, fourth bullet point]. Having regard to these considerations, I take the view that the selection of the HOOB depot site at Reading for the new train care depot is appropriate, and, as submitted on behalf of NR, obviously so [6.4].

8.2.13 For these reasons, I conclude that the scheme would meet its aims and objectives, and that NR has established that, where alternatives exist, its promotion of the proposals selected for inclusion in the Programme is appropriate. It is also clear to me, as is not disputed, that implementation of the Programme would bring the substantial public benefits referred to above.

8.3 Whether all the land and rights in land for which compulsory powers are sought are required by Network Rail in order to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme.

8.3.1 I have considered carefully the proposed compulsory acquisition of land and rights over land against the redevelopment proposals. Save in respect of the Cow Lane allotments site, no objector suggests that any of the land proposed to be acquired is not required in order to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme [3.10.4]. The existing train care depot would be displaced by the proposed eastern chord. I have concluded above [8.2.12] that there is no satisfactory alternative location to the Reading HOOB site for the proposed train care depot; this would involve the acquisition of the Cow Lane allotments for access and construction and for ancillary purposes [6.3].

8.3.2 I conclude that all of the compulsory powers sought for acquisition of land and rights in land are required to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme.

8.4 The likely impacts of the exercise of the powers in the proposed Order on the owners and occupiers of premises and land to be used, including any adverse impact on their ability to carry on their businesses effectively and safely and, in the case of the Royal Mail and the Berkshire Fire and Rescue Services, in accordance with their statutory duties.

8.4.1 The redevelopment would largely be accommodated on railway land, requiring the permanent compulsory acquisition of less than 2 hectares of land [3.10.1], of which only about 0.5 hectares remains occupied, the remainder being the Cow Lane allotments site which I further consider below. No acquisition of residential land or rights over residential land is proposed [3.10.5]. There is no subsisting claim that making the Order would result in any interference with human rights. No public open space is to be acquired such as to trigger the provisions of section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 [3.10.5].

8.4.2 Of the 24 objections generated by the Order application, 20 related to the compulsory purchase of land or rights in land currently owned and/or occupied by commercial enterprises and by the Royal Mail and the Berkshire Fire and Rescue Services [1.3]. All of these objections were compromised and withdrawn before the inquiry closed. It seems to me clearly and reliably to be inferred from these withdrawals that there would not be any unacceptable adverse impact on the ability of the owners and occupiers of the land affected by the draft Order to carry on their businesses. It is also clear in my view from the withdrawal of their objections that Royal Mail and the Fire and Rescue Services are satisfied that their ability to carry on their operations in accordance with their statutory duty would not be compromised.

8.5 The effect of the proposed compulsory acquisition of allotment sites at Cow Lane on the availability of allotments in the Reading area.

8.5.1 The effect of the loss of the Cow Lane allotments site was the sole subsisting contentious issue at the inquiry. As far as the individual allotment holders are concerned, their occupation of the Cow Lane plots was lawfully terminated with effect in April 2009, and the site is now vacant [6.2]. All holders who so wished have been accommodated elsewhere, and, if applied for, compensation for loss of crops has been or will be paid to them by NR [6.5]. In evidence at the inquiry, OBJ/5 expressed himself satisfied with these arrangements [5.5]. The making of the Order would have no material further impact on the former Cow Lane allotment holders. I address the objection regarding the ecological impact of acquisition of the allotment land below in section 8.6.

8.5.2 There were 49 allotments at Cow Lane [5.8]. Their loss is more than offset by the 63 allotments which have been brought into use at the Scours Lane site [6.5]. To my mind, the fact that these new plots are on land already designated for allotment use does not detract from the fact that they were not previously in use as allotments, and have been brought into use at the expense of NR to compensate for the loss of the Cow Lane allotments and to accommodate some of the displaced allotment holders. Beyond that, the future provision of allotments in Reading seems to me, as submitted by NR [6.5], to be a matter for RBC. RBC is not a party to the Order, and, even if I thought it appropriate, no party has suggested that, in the context of this proposed Order, there is any legal basis on which I could recommend that RBC be directed to provide more allotment land.

8.5.3 RBC, as owner of the Cow Lane site, has agreed to sell it to NR for the purpose of implementing the Programme; the sale to NR has the requisite approval of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and the site is vacant [6.5]. Clearly, the agreement between RBC and NR for the transfer of the site to NR could lawfully be completed even if the draft Order were modified so as to exclude the Cow Lane site.

8.5.4 I have concluded above that NR's decision to locate the new train care depot on the Reading HOOB site is appropriate [8.2.12]. This necessarily involves the use of the Cow Lane allotments site for the purposes described in paragraph 6.3. Even if it were concluded that there would be a net loss of allotments in the Reading area arising from the compulsory acquisition of the Cow Lane site, any adverse impact would to my mind fall significantly

short of outweighing the very clear public benefits which, as I have concluded above, implementation of the Programme would bring, including benefits to the large number of rail users from the Reading area and from elsewhere.

8.6 Any measures proposed by Network Rail to mitigate any significant adverse impacts arising from the exercise of the powers in the proposed Order, and whether any such measures are appropriate and sufficient.

8.6.1 With the exception of the effect of the loss of the Cow Lane allotments, no objector suggests that any significant adverse impacts would result from the exercise of the powers in the draft Order; I have also been unable to identify any such impact. I have expressed the view that, even if it were concluded that there would be a net loss of allotments in Reading (on the ground that the Scours Lane allotments are not properly to be considered genuine replacements), this is not an adverse impact of sufficient gravity to outweigh the Programme benefits.

8.6.2 There is before me little evidence as to the ecology of the Cow Lane site. Objectors referred in evidence to the presence there of bats, lizards and nesting birds [5.2 and 5.7]. OBJ/8 submitted that, even if the flora and fauna present on the site were commonplace, their presence nevertheless warranted either the protection of the site as a wildlife corridor or a programme of mitigation to be agreed and/or imposed at this stage [5.3].

8.6.3 NR's case that the application for the draft Order does not trigger a requirement for an EIA has not been challenged. For its part, NR accepts that potential adverse ecological impacts should be addressed [6.6], and agrees to consider, with the guidance of an expert ecologist and in consultation with the appropriate bodies and with objectors if they wish, what mitigation might be required. There is a clear context in which any adverse ecological impact can be assessed and addressed, namely, the EIA and ES which, under the EIA Regulations as amended, would be required in respect of qualifying development such as the proposed train care depot. Indeed, NR has already begun work on the ES [6.6].

8.6.4 I nevertheless considered whether to adjourn the inquiry to allow ecological surveys to be completed. In my view, however, there are insufficient grounds for adjournment. I accept that objectors do not have the resources or expertise to carry out surveys to support their claim. I note, however, that despite very widespread publicity and consultation, including consultation with the Environment Agency and with Natural England [3.9.1], no concerns as to the ecological impact of the loss of the site have been raised by any statutory body or by any local wildlife organisation.

8.6.5 It would also be open to me to recommend that the Order be made, but modified so as to exclude the compulsory acquisition of the allotments site. However, as I concluded above [8.5.3], this would not prevent the private agreement between RBC and NR for sale of the site from being completed.

8.6.6 To my mind, NR's proposals for ecological assessment and mitigation essentially meet the aspirations of objectors. Given these proposed arrangements and the supervisory role of the ORR [6.7], it seems to me sufficient and appropriate for the potential ecological impacts of the Programme at the Cow Lane site to be determined and addressed at the detailed design stage, as proposed by NR [6.7].

8.6.7 I have identified no other significant adverse impact which could trigger a need for mitigation measures.

8.7 Network Rail's proposals for funding the cost of the Programme and whether it is reasonably capable of attracting the necessary funding.

8.7.1 The overall cost of the scheme at 2002 prices was £559m. NR has obtained funding which with increases for inflation now amounts to £551m through its Strategic Business Plan 2009-2014, and would commit additional funding from its infrastructure renewals budget [3.8.3]. The DfT has confirmed that the necessary funding post-2014 would be made available [3.8.4], stating that the Programme can be regarded as fully funded. In addition, NR has the substantial bank and government borrowing facilities referred to in paragraph 3.8.3. I conclude that the Programme is reasonably capable of attracting the necessary funding.

8.8 Whether, in all the circumstances, there is a compelling case in the public interest for granting Network Rail the powers they seek to acquire compulsorily land and rights in land for the purposes of the Programme, having regard to the guidance on the making of compulsory purchase orders in ODPM Circular 06/2004, in particular paragraphs 16 to 23.

8.8.1 As I have concluded above, clear and substantial public benefits would follow from implementation of the Programme. The Programme would require relatively limited compulsory acquisition of land and rights over land. There is no subsisting claim that human rights would be infringed by the making of the Order. I have concluded that the Programme is reasonably capable of attracting the necessary funding, and I can identify no significant impediments to implementation of the scheme such that compulsory acquisition might be regarded as premature. I am reinforced in this view by NR's intention to begin preliminary works later this year [3.8.2]. I have satisfied myself that all of the land and rights in land proposed to be acquired (including the Cow Lane allotments site) are required to secure satisfactory implementation of the Programme.

8.8.2 I therefore conclude that there is a compelling case in the public interest for giving NR the powers sought and that the proposed compulsory acquisition powers are compliant with the criteria set out in Circular 6 of 2004.

8.9 Whether Network Rail has proposed any substantive changes to the draft Order since the application was made; if so, the purpose and effect of any such changes and whether anyone likely to be affected by such changes has been notified.

8.9.1 I have summarised the modifications proposed to the draft Order in section 7 and they are set out in the covering letter and the filled-up Order (NR/14) therein referred to. The modifications are mainly designed to correct drafting deficiencies or to make drafting changes proposed by the DfT. I can identify no proposed modifications to the draft Order which might be characterised as substantive. None would result in an increase in the proposed acquisition of land.

8.10 Summary of Conclusions

8.10.1 For the reasons set out above, it is my view that there is a compelling need for the Programme in the public interest. Only in respect of the train care depot has it been suggested by objectors that an alternative location might have been preferred, but I have concluded above that locating the depot on any identified site other than the Reading HOOB site would not meet the scheme objectives as effectively. I can identify no potential significant adverse impacts from implementation of the Programme.

8.10.2 I have had regard to these and all other matters raised both at the inquiry and in written representations. They do not alter the conclusions I have reached. I therefore propose to recommend that NR be granted the powers sought.

9. RECOMMENDATION

9.1 I recommend that The Network Rail (Reading)(Land Acquisition) Order 2009 be made, subject to the modifications referred to in paragraph 7.1 and set out in NR/14.

C J Tipping

Inspector

Annex

DOCUMENTS

A. NETWORK RAIL'S CORE AND INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- NR/1 Application Documents
- NR/2 High Level Output Statement
- NR/3 Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004
- NR/4 Network Rail Licence
- NR/5 Section 8 of the Railways Act 1993
- NR/6 Railway and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006
- NR/7 Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995
- NR/8 Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999
- NR/9 Reading Redevelopment Public Consultation Report (November 2008)
- NR/10 DfT letter to Network Rail, dated 26 January 2009
- NR/11 Letter from the Government Office for the West Midlands to Reading Borough Council dated 15 June 2009
- NR/12 Opening Submission
- NR/13 Illustrative plan of proposed train care depot
- NR/14 Filled-up draft Order dated 17 June 2009, with covering letter
- NR/15 Proof of Evidence of Mr W, with summary
- NR/16 Closing Submission
- NR/17 Statement of Case

B. OBJECTORS' DOCUMENTS

- OBJ/5/1 Email and summary of evidence of OBJ/5
- OBJ/8/1 Email and summary of evidence of OBJ/8

C. MISCELLANEOUS INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- INQ/1 Statement of Matters
- INQ/2 Folder of correspondence from the supporter and objectors, also including objectors' Statements of Case
- INQ/3 Notes of a Pre-Inquiry Meeting held on 5 May 2009

