

THE NETWORK RAIL (SUFFOLK LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION) ORDER 201X

and

Request for a Direction as to Deemed Planning Permission

NOTES FOLLOWING THE PRE-INQUIRY MEETING

Held on 1 November 2017

At Ashlar House, 23 Eastern Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP32 7AB.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. At the start of the Pre-Inquiry Meeting, the Inspector welcomed all present and introduced himself as **Ian Jenkins** (BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MCIWEM). He has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport to hold an Inquiry into the proposed Transport and Works Act Order and related matters.
- 1.2. **Mrs Joanna Vincent** and **Mr Graham Groom** have been appointed as the Programme Officers for the Inquiry. They are neutral officers of the Inquiry, responsible to the Inspector. Their main duties, under the direction of the Inspector are:
1. keeping records of those attending the pre-Inquiry meeting and Inquiry;
 2. organising and keeping under review the Inquiry programme;
 3. organising practical arrangements for the Inquiry, including co-ordinating and advising on appearances;
 4. acting as a contact between participants and the Inspector;
 5. co-ordinating the receipt and distribution of documents;
 6. holding a master set of all documents (inc Inquiry Library) and maintaining document lists; and,
 7. planning site visits.

They will play no part in the Inspector's report to the Secretary of State beyond helping with the collation of lists of those appearing at the Inquiry and of Inquiry documents, which will be appended to it.

- 1.3. The programme Officers' contact details are given below:

	Mrs Joanna Vincent	Mr Graham Groom
Tel. no.	01403 217799	01403 219899
Mobile no.	07483 133975	07860 636909
Email address	joannavincent@personaassociates.co.uk	grahamgroom@personaassociates.co.uk
Postal address	Persona Associates Limited, 1 st Floor, Bailey House, Barttelot Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1DQ.	

2. Scope of the Inquiry

- 2.1. The Inquiry will be into: the proposed *Network Rail (Suffolk Level Crossing Reduction) Order 201X*; and, an associated request for a Direction as to Deemed Planning Permission for the works that would be authorised by the Order.

3. Purpose of the pre-Inquiry meeting

- 3.1. The meeting was to enable all concerned to discuss procedural matters relating to the Inquiry, which is due to open on 13 February 2018. It should help everyone to make the best use of their time between now and the Inquiry, and help the proceedings to run smoothly.
- 3.2. There was no discussion of the merits of any of the cases for or against the proposals, which will have to wait until the Inquiry formally opens.

4. Parties present and appearances at the Inquiry

- 4.1. The absence of any other party from the pre-Inquiry meeting will not of itself preclude their participation at the Inquiry.
- 4.2. Parties appearing at the Inquiry may do so in person and may be represented by counsel, a solicitor or some other representative. The *Transport & Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004* (TW Inquiry Rules) confirm that the persons entitled to appear at an Inquiry are: the applicant, in this case Network Rail; any statutory objector; and, any other person who has served a Statement of Case under Rule 7. It is a matter for the Inspector to determine whether any other person may appear at the Inquiry.
- 4.3. When making a case, prospective participants should bear in mind that if a point is a good one, and is supported by relevant evidence, it needs to be made only once in order to carry weight. Repeating the point will not add to that weight, but will simply waste Inquiry time. With that in mind it may be that arguments for or against the proposals could be made more effectively and succinctly by one person/organisation than by many individuals making the same points in slightly different ways. The Inspector urged parties/individuals to get together wherever possible to present joint cases through a single spokesperson. In order to ensure that the Inquiry is completed as expeditiously as possible, the Inspector will intervene to prevent any unnecessary repetition.
- 4.4. Details of those who identified themselves at the meeting as representing parties who wish to appear at the Inquiry and their proposed representation at the Inquiry, where known, are appended at Appendix 1.
- 4.5. People who do not need or wish to speak at the Inquiry will, nonetheless, be welcome to attend as observers. In considering the Order and associated matters, the Inspector will take account of all of

the evidence heard at the Inquiry as well as written representations received before it closes. However, greater weight can be attached to evidence given at the Inquiry which is open to testing through cross-examination.

5. Inquiry dates and times

- 5.1. The Inquiry is proposed to open at 10.00 hrs on Tuesday 13 February 2018. It is provisionally estimated that the Inquiry will sit for 16 days over 4 weeks (That is: 13-16/2; 20-23/2; 27/2-2/3; and, 13-16/3. The Inquiry will **not** sit 5-9/3). A better idea of the length of the Inquiry will emerge once estimates of the time needed for the various stages in the Inquiry have been provided by the parties and a programme has been drafted. More on this below.
- 5.2. The Inquiry will generally sit at the following times:
 - Tues-Thurs: 10.00 hrs to about 17.00 hrs (with a break for lunch between around noon and 13.00 hrs, and a short break at a convenient point mid-afternoon);
 - Fridays: 09.30 hrs to mid-afternoon (with a shorter lunch break).
- 5.3. Once the Inquiry is underway the Inspector may decide to start earlier and/or finish later. Any changes to sitting times will be announced at the Inquiry.
- 5.4. There were no objections to these arrangements at the Pre-Inquiry Meeting.

6. Inquiry venues

- 6.1. The Inquiry is currently planned to be held at 2 venues:
 - Ipswich Town Hall & Corn Exchange: 13-16/2 & 20-23/2; and,
 - Ashlar House, Bury St Edmunds: 27/2-2/3 & 13-16/3.
- 6.2. In addition to the main Inquiry room, there will be side rooms for the Inspector and the Programme Officer. Photocopying facilities will be available (a reasonable charge may be made for copying). If the parties who intend to appear at the Inquiry need particular facilities they should take the matter up with the Programme Officers.
- 6.3. Concerns have been raised, prior to and during the meeting, in relation to the accessibility of the Bury St Edmunds venue for people based in Newmarket who wish to appear at the Inquiry to address the proposed closure of level crossing S22. The Inspector noted that of the 23 parties who have submitted an objection to the closure of S22, only 5 have submitted a Statement of Case, thereby securing their right to appear under the procedure rules. At the meeting Councillor Hulbert, of Newmarket Town Council, indicated that he and between 6 and 10

other local residents/Councillors may also wish to appear. A local resident, Mr Smy, suggested that there may be others.

- 6.4. The Inspector re-emphasised the guidance set out in paragraphs 4.2-4.3 above concerning appearances at the Inquiry and the need for the avoidance of repetitious evidence. Against that background, the Inspector asked for the following information, to assist his consideration of whether the current venue arrangements are satisfactory:
- Councillor Hulbert- to confirm to the Programme Officers the details of those people whom he has indicated may wish to appear at the Inquiry and whether they are likely to encounter difficulties in travelling to the Bury St Edmunds venue; and,
 - Network Rail- to confirm to the Programme Officers: the extent of public transport services available to those wishing to travel to the venue from Newmarket; and, whether, during the timetabled period for the Inquiry, a suitable venue could be made available in Newmarket to accommodate the Inquiry for 1, 2 or 3 days.

The Inspector requests that the information be provided by **10 November 2017**. Once he has reviewed the position a separate note will be issued on the matter.

- 6.5. In light of the proposed order of evidence referred to below in paragraph 8.2, commencing with strategic matters followed by consideration of local matters on a crossing by crossing basis, and the more central location of the Bury St Edmunds venue, the Inspector asks for Network Rail's view as to whether it would be more appropriate/possible for the Inquiry to sit initially at the Bury St Edmunds venue, rather than in Ipswich.

The Inspector requests that the information be provided by Network Rail by **10 November 2017**. Once he has reviewed the position a separate note will be issued on the matter.

7. Main issues and areas of agreement

- 7.1. The Secretary of State has circulated a Statement of Matters about which he wishes to be informed. Copies were circulated prior to the pre-Inquiry meeting and the document is available on the Inquiry website, details of which are set out below in paragraph 9.1. Further copies can be obtained from the Programme Officers.
- 7.2. The Inspector asked all parties to have particular regard to this, and to address explicitly all matters identified that are relevant to them, including the scope for mitigating any harm, in the presentation of evidence. But he stressed that the list is not exhaustive and it does not preclude other matters from being raised if relevant.

- 7.3. The Inspector requested Network Rail ensures that it responds explicitly to every objection, including those not the subject of representations at the Inquiry. He recognised that Network Rail's response to an issue raised by more than one objector may be set out only once in its proofs, rather than being repeated for each objector. This being the case the Inspector requested that, accompanying the proofs of evidence, Network Rail provides a document that identifies the sections of its proofs which deal with the particular objections raised on an objector by objector basis.
- 7.4. The Inspector recognises that in a case of this kind there is usually limited scope for formalising Statements of Common Ground. Nevertheless, it will be in the interests of parties to reach agreement on as many issues as possible, thereby enabling them to focus on matters of particular importance to them at the Inquiry. The Inspector confirmed that he would welcome written confirmation, as soon as possible, of areas where agreement has been reached, and where any objections are withdrawn as a result.

8. Inquiry procedure and site visits

Inquiry procedure

- 8.1. The Inspector will broadly follow the procedure set out in the TW Inquiry Rules. Briefly:
1. Following his opening announcements, he will invite Network Rail to make an opening statement, outlining its case; followed by others who are entitled to appear¹, in the following order: supporters of the proposed Order; objectors; and, other interested parties;
 2. The parties may then give evidence in the same order. The evidence of each witness will be open to cross-examination by opposing parties entitled to appear and there may be re-examination to clarify answers given in cross-examination². The Inspector may put questions he has at any stage;
 3. There will be a session to allow discussion of any proposed modifications to the draft Order and also conditions associated with the request for deemed planning permission;
 4. Each party who has given evidence may make closing submissions, summarising their cases in light of the evidence. This is not an opportunity to introduce new evidence. They may do this either at the end of their individual evidence or at the end of the Inquiry;

¹ Rule 14-Statutory objectors and any other person who has served a Statement of Case under Rule 7.

² Rule 18-Network Rail, statutory objectors and any other person who has served a Statement of Case under Rule 7 are entitled to call evidence. Network Rail and statutory objectors are entitled to cross-examine persons giving evidence. The calling of evidence and cross-examination of persons giving evidence shall otherwise be at the Inspector's discretion.

5. Closing submissions at the end of the Inquiry will be heard in the following order: 'other interested parties'; objectors; supporters; and finally Network Rail.
- 8.2. Network Rail indicated that its evidence would broadly fall under 2 headings: 1) the strategic case for/against the proposals; and, 2) the local issues associated with each crossing, on a crossing by crossing basis. Against that background, it suggested that the presentation of evidence at the Inquiry be grouped in the same way. That is: 1) evidence from all relevant parties concerning the Strategic case for/against the proposals be heard first; and, 2) evidence specific to each crossing, is then heard from all parties on a crossing by crossing basis. The suggested approach was supported by the Ramblers Association and there were no objections to it. The Inspector confirmed that he is willing to approach the programming of the Inquiry on that basis in the first instance. Furthermore, it would be useful if proofs of evidence were structured in the same way.
- 8.3. In response to a question from P Baker, the Inspector confirmed that, when programming the Inquiry, efforts would be made to ensure, as far as practical, that evidence concerning interdependent crossings is heard consecutively, provided that an interested party has drawn the interdependence to the attention of the Programme Officers.

Site visits

- 8.4. The Inspector indicated, so far as practical from public vantage points, he would familiarise himself with the areas subject to the draft Order and request for deemed planning permission prior to the Inquiry on an unaccompanied basis, and may make further such visits during or after the Inquiry. Network Rail confirmed that it would provide the Programme Officers with a list of the crossings that are publicly accessible and those that are not.
- 8.5. The Inspector may also, if necessary, make accompanied visits to relevant places. If anyone considers that it would be necessary for the Inspector to carryout accompanied site visits to any locations prior to the Inquiry, they should provide the details to the Programme Officers.
- 8.6. The Inspector emphasised that all visits will be for the sole purpose of observing the sites in question. He will not hear any evidence from the parties to the Inquiry or receive submissions on site. It is important that all that has to be said in evidence should be put at the Inquiry itself.

9. Nature, format and submission of evidence

- 9.1. So far as practical, the submitted documents will be posted on the Inquiry website at <http://suffolk-level-crossings.persona-pi.com/>.

Statements of case

- 9.2. With reference to Rule 7 of the TW Inquiry Rules, Statements of Case have been submitted by Network Rail and 18 other parties. Appendix B of Network Rail's Statement of Case identifies the locations where the documents it intends to rely on at the Inquiry, together with a copy of every Statement of Case served upon it by others, can be inspected.
- 9.3. At the meeting, St Edmundsbury Borough Council requested that a location be added in Newmarket, as the existing locations were not easily accessed by residents of that settlement. Network Rail confirmed that it would investigate whether a suitable location could be identified and would confirm the outcome to the Programme Officers. Network Rail has since confirmed that it has now arranged for a set of the documents to be held at Newmarket Library, 1a The Guineas, Newmarket CB8 8EQ.
- 9.4. At the meeting a concern was raised by a number of the objectors who have submitted a Statement of Case to the effect that 4³ of them have not been served with a copy of Network Rail's Statement of Case. The Inspector asked Network Rail to investigate. Network Rail has since confirmed its records indicate that only one of those parties, OBJ/23, had not been served with a copy and that will be corrected. A further copy has been sent to OBJ/26, for the attention of P Baker. In addition, a copy has been sent to OBJ/3, 13, 19, 34 and 48 (for details see Appendix 1) as well as Bacton Parish Council. In each case, delivery has been arranged for 7 November 2017.

Core Documents

- 9.5. It is likely that some reference documents will be referred to by many parties. A number of these have already been submitted by Network Rail, a list of which is included in Appendix A of its Statement of Case (NR01-26), and the documents concerned are available on the Inquiry website.
- 9.6. It will save paper, time and expense if others wishing to refer to the same documents would simply refer to them (by document number and internal reference) in their evidence without the need to submit further copies. The Inspector would welcome suggestions for any further documents that could usefully be included as core documents. The Programme Officers will maintain the schedule of core documents.

Proofs of evidence

- 9.7. As already set out by the Department for Transport, where a party proposes to give evidence at the Inquiry by reading from a document (known as a 'proof of evidence'), it should be submitted in advance of the Inquiry. Proofs of evidence should be succinct and to the point. Voluminous documents do not add weight to a case (except in the

³ P Butler, H Butler, Messrs E Hudson Baker/MA Baker/PE Baker and Suffolk Local Access Forum.

literal sense) and may detract from it by obscuring the key points. Additional evidence may be given orally, though as far as possible such material would be better included in proofs.

- 9.8. In accordance with the TW Inquiry Rules, if the proofs are longer than 1500 words, summaries of the proofs must be submitted at the same time as the proofs themselves. Summaries should be no more than 1500 words. Only summaries will be read at the Inquiry, but the full proofs will count as evidence and be open to cross-examination. If, in evidence, reference is made to any other document, which is not included in the list of core documents, a copy of that document (or the relevant extract plus the cover page), must be submitted as an appendix to the proof of evidence.
- 9.9. The Inspector urges parties to ensure that proofs of evidence and associated documents conform to the following guidelines:
- Document number on the top right corner of cover page and the spine;
 - Indicate on the cover page the name of the party on whose behalf the evidence is given, the name of the witness, relevant qualifications and the topic(s) covered;
 - Number all pages and paragraphs;
 - Text in at least 1½ line spacing;
 - Supporting material in appendices, bound separately from the proof;
 - Summary bound separately or as a self-contained section in the proof.

Submission of evidence

Proofs of evidence

- 9.10. The Inspector confirmed that all proofs of evidence should be submitted to the Programme Officer and circulated to others (see 'copies' below) **not later than 16 January 2018**, as has been specified by the Department for Transport.
- 9.11. In response to a question from J Hull, the Inspector confirmed that if a party wished to rely solely on the contents of their already submitted Statement of Case as their proof of evidence, it would be taken as such and there would be no need to re-submit it by the deadline.
- 9.12. In the event that objectors intend to promote alternatives to the proposed works at a particular crossing, the Inspector would expect their proofs to include an evaluation of the merits and practicability of the alternative proposed and whether it would meet the aims and objectives set for the original scheme, taking into account, so far as practical, its costs, benefits and comparative impacts, such as on adjoining land owners.

Written Representations

- 9.13. The Inspector requested that if anyone intends to submit additional representations rather than appearing at the Inquiry, they should make their submissions to the Programme Officers and circulate them to others (see 'copies' below) **by 16 January 2018**.

Rebuttal proofs of evidence

- 9.14. There is no reference in the TW Inquiry Rules to rebuttal proofs. However, they can sometimes be helpful to deal with complex evidence raised for the first time in the proofs of evidence, particularly if they deal with points that could reduce the need for cross-examination and so reduce the Inquiry time. However, they should not be seen as an opportunity to gain a tactical advantage by deliberately withholding evidence until a late stage (see section 11. below).
- 9.15. The Inspector confirmed that following submission of the main proofs of evidence, he will consider justified requests for the submission of rebuttal proofs. If any are to be submitted, rebuttal proofs should be submitted to the Programme Officers and circulated to others (see 'copies' below) **by the 30 January 2018**.

Copies

- 9.16. The Inspector will require a hard copy of every document submitted, plus a further hard copy for the Inquiry library and an electronic copy for the Inquiry website. These should be sent to the Programme Officers.
- 9.17. The TW Inquiry Rules specify that copies must also be sent at the same time to the applicant, any statutory objector and anyone who has served a statement of case. The Programme Officers will be able to provide details. The Rules indicate that only 1 copy is to be sent to those other parties. The Inspector leaves the parties to negotiate directly if they seek additional copies of each other's evidence or if they wish to exchange documents other than in hard copy.

Opening, closing and legal submissions

- 9.18. The TW Inquiry Rules require those making closing submissions to provide the Inspector with copies of these in writing before the close of the Inquiry. These should if possible be drafted with a view to incorporating them into the Inspector's report as the case for the party concerned. However, the Inspector reserves the right to edit them and to add material drawn from evidence given orally or in documentary form. It would be helpful if copies in electronic form could also be provided.

- 9.19. The Inspector would also find it helpful if hard copies of the texts of opening submissions would be provided at the time of delivery. Hard copies will also be required of any legal submissions.

10. Document numbering and availability

- 10.1. As indicated above, every document should be numbered. The numbering system should be kept as simple as possible, but numbers should be prefixed with an abbreviation to indicate the party on whose behalf it is submitted, followed by a sequential number. For example, a typical Network Rail document is numbered NR 10. Each objector has been/will be allocated a reference number, which can be confirmed by the Programme Officers, for example OBJ/001. The following numbering system is suggested for objector's documents:

OBJ/001/W1/1 - Proof of evidence of witness 1
OBJ/001/W1/2 - Appendices to the proof of evidence
OBJ/001/W1/3 - Summary of the proof of evidence
OBJ/001/W2/1 - Proof of evidence of witness 2
OBJ/001/W2/2 - Appendices to the proof of evidence
OBJ/001/W2/3 - Summary of the proof of evidence etc.

Each party should agree their proposed approach in advance with the Programme Officers, in the interests of consistency and clarity.

- 10.2. Each party should keep an up-to-date list of their documents, providing a copy of the list to the Programme Officers at the beginning of the Inquiry with an update if necessary at the end.
- 10.3. In addition to the documents exchanged, as I have indicated, a complete set of Inquiry documents will be available in the Inquiry library held by the Programme Officers throughout the proceedings. As many as possible will also be available on the Inquiry website, referred to above.

11. Costs

- 11.1. Normally, parties are expected to meet their own expenses in attending the Inquiry. However, the Secretary of State has the discretionary power to make an order as to the costs of parties at an Inquiry, in effect to award costs to a party against another. Costs may be awarded where a party is found to have behaved unreasonably and thereby caused another party to incur unnecessary expense.
- 11.2. Everyone has a responsibility to meet the deadlines set for the submission of evidence. The procedure is designed to secure maximum disclosure and exchange of information before the Inquiry takes place, so the proceedings can be conducted efficiently and effectively. The Inspector will seek to ensure that no one gains a tactical advantage by deliberately withholding evidence until a late stage. For example, if late evidence is admitted, it may be necessary

to adjourn the Inquiry in order to give others the opportunity to consider and prepare to deal with it. Such circumstances may give rise to an award of costs, associated with wasted or otherwise unnecessary expense, against the party who has submitted the late evidence and caused a delay.

12. Inquiry Programme

- 12.1. The Programme Officers will be contacting all those parties who have indicated that they intend to appear to gain information needed to draw up a programme for the Inquiry. This will be of benefit to all concerned and aid the smooth running of the proceedings and efficient use of time. The Inspector urged parties to be as co-operative as possible in this process.
- 12.2. The draft Programme will be available on the website and in the Inquiry Library when the Inquiry is sitting. It will remain in draft and be subject to change throughout the Inquiry. It is important that people appearing are available when required, and the onus will be on them to keep in touch with the progress of the Inquiry. If they are not there when required, the Inquiry may proceed without them.

13. Other matters

- 13.1. The Ramblers Association asked whether it would be possible to arrange any Inquiry evening sessions, as some of its witnesses may not be able to appear during the daytime, due to work commitments. The Inspector confirmed that it may be possible to make limited provision. However, further details would be required from The Ramblers Association concerning the numbers involved and the time likely to be needed, before a decision could be made.
- 13.2. P Hodson asked that if, in the interests of avoiding repetition, he were to act as a spokesperson at the Inquiry for a group of others, how could he evidence the fact that he was representing a number of other people? The Inspector suggested that he include in his evidence a declaration, signed by those other people, confirming that he has their authority to give evidence on their behalf at the Inquiry.
- 13.3. Network Rail explained that it has recently been identified, at an Inquiry, that the notifications required in relation to another draft Order were incomplete. Therefore, an audit has been instigated, to ensure that the notification requirements associated with the Book of Reference for *The Network Rail (Suffolk Level Crossing Reduction) Order 201X* are complete. P Butler drew attention to his Statement of Case, which identifies a number of parties who may have been omitted from the notification process by mistake. Network Rail confirmed that the outcome of that audit would be confirmed to the Programme Officers **by 10 November 2017**.
- 13.4. Network Rail asked whether one of its witnesses on strategic matters may rely in evidence on a short video clip (<1 minute long), which

could be accessed by others in advance of the Inquiry in a number of ways: via a hyperlink, the details of which would be included in the witness's proof of evidence; provided on a USB memory stick to those who request it; and, the proof would provide a written description of the contents of the clip. At the Inquiry, facilities would be provided to show the clip at an appropriate time. The Inspector confirmed that, under the circumstances outlined, this would be acceptable.

- 13.5. Network Rail confirmed that facilities would be available at the Inquiry to allow those giving evidence, who wish to do so, to display images (e.g. plans and photos), which are already included in the submitted documentation, when giving their evidence.
- 13.6. Regarding the need to provide copies of reference documents (or the relevant extract plus the cover page), where referred to in proofs of evidence, P Baker requested advice concerning copyright. In response, Network Rail has drawn attention to section 46 of the *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988*.

I Jenkins
INSPECTOR

6 November 2017

Appendix 1-Appearances at the Pre-Inquiry meeting

Parties who have duly submitted a Statement of Case

Network Rail Infrastructure Limited		Promoter/applicant
Rep at PIM	Ms Jacqueline Lean of Counsel.	
Rep at Inq	Ms Jacqueline Lean of Counsel.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mark Brunnen, Network Rail – National strategic case. 2. Eliane Algaard, Network Rail – Anglia strategic case. 3. Nigel Billingsley, Bruton Knowles – Property. 4. Andrew Kenning, Network Rail – Proposals (crossing by crossing). 5. TBC, Network Rail – Risk/maint/crossing characteristics (crossing by crossing). 6. Sue Tilbrook, Mott MacDonald – PRow and diversionary routes. 		
Mrs P Collins		OBJ/19
Rep at PIM	Patricia Collins.	
Rep at Inq	Patricia Collins.	
Suffolk Local Access Forum		OBJ/23
Rep at PIM	Stephen Kerr, Suffolk County Council.	
Rep at Inq	TBC.	
Messrs E Hudson Baker/Mabel Ann Baker/ Paul Edmond Baker		OBJ/26
Rep at PIM	Paul Baker.	
Rep at Inq	TBC.	
Forest Heath District Council		OBJ/27
Rep at PIM	Sara Noonan.	
Rep at Inq	Sara Noonan.	
St Edmundsbury BC		OBJ/28
Rep at PIM	Sara Noonan.	
Rep at Inq	1 witness – TBC.	
Suffolk County Council		OBJ/29
Rep at PIM	Stephen Kerr.	
Rep at Inq	TBC.	
Philip Butler		OBJ/30
Rep at PIM	Philip Butler.	
Rep at Inq	Philip Butler.	
Hilary Butler		OBJ/31
Rep at PIM	Philip Butler.	
Rep at Inq	Philip Butler.	
The National Farmers Union		OBJ/32
Rep at PIM	Louise Staples	
Rep at Inq	Louise Staples and a number of farmers/landowners TBC.	
Mr G Crosby		OBJ/34
Rep at PIM	Gordon Crosby.	
Rep at Inq	Gordon Crosby.	

The Ramblers Association		OBJ/36
Rep at PIM	Sue Rumfitt.	
Rep at Inq	Sue Rumfitt and others TBC.	

Hulls Farms		OBJ/37
Rep at PIM	Judith Hull	
Rep at Inq	TBC.	

Mairi Johnston and Alistair Fish		OBJ/42
Rep at PIM	Mairi Johnston	
Rep at Inq	1 witness – TBC.	

Mr & Mrs Brace		OBJ/48
Rep at PIM	Mrs Brace.	
Rep at Inq	2 witnesses – TBC.	

David Caldwell		OBJ/60
Rep at PIM	Sarah Caldwell.	
Rep at Inq	Sarah Caldwell.	

Other parties

Cambridgeshire County Council		OBJ/61
Rep at PIM	Stephen Kerr, Suffolk County Council.	
Rep at Inq	TBC.	

Newmarket Town Council		OBJ/03
Rep at PIM	Peter Hulbert (Councillor).	
Rep at Inq	Peter Hulbert (Councillor), Warwick Hirst (Councillor) and 5-9 no. others-TBC.	

Philip Hodson		OBJ/13
Rep at PIM	Philip Hodson.	
Rep at Inq	Philip Hodson.	