



Order Decision

Inquiry opened on 17 July 2018

by Heidi Cruickshank BSc (Hons), MSc, MIPROW

appointed by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Decision date: 06 August 2019

Order Ref: ROW/3181863

- This Order is made under section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is known as South Downs National Park Authority (East Hampshire District) Public Path Diversion Order Reference Binsted Public Footpath 55 (Part) 2017.
- The Order is dated 29 June 2017 and proposes to divert part of public footpath 55 in the Parish of Binsted. Full details of the route are given in the Order plan and Schedule.
- There were 39 objections outstanding at the commencement of the Inquiry¹.

Summary of Decision: The Order is not confirmed.

Procedural Matters

Statutory Parties

1. The South Downs National Park Authority ("the SDNPA"), who are the order-making authority ("the OMA"), advertised the Order in the period 29 June – 27 July 2017. Having received objections they submitted it to the Planning Inspectorate – acting on behalf of the Secretary of State - and the Inquiry into the Order was opened on 17 July 2018.
2. During the Inquiry it became clear that the Planning Inspectorate had not been notified of two statutory parties. As a result the Planning Inspectorate had not notified those parties of the date of the Inquiry. Although one was present, due to her position within Binsted Parish Council, another was not. Questions arose as to whether there were other statutory parties of which the Planning Inspectorate were unaware.
3. Time was taken for the OMA to provide further information and, having reviewed all the documentation and arguments put forward, I was not satisfied that this was simply a technical breach of procedure, as argued by the OMA. Paragraph 3(3)(b) of Schedule 14 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") applies where any representation or objection which has been duly made is not withdrawn and sets out that "*...the Secretary of State shall, before confirming the order... give any person by whom any representation or objection has been duly made and not withdrawn an opportunity of being heard by a person appointed by the Secretary of State for the purpose.*" Without all the objections and representations the Secretary of State is not able to provide that opportunity.
4. The case was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 4 August 2017 and letters were sent out to the statutory parties of whom the Planning Inspectorate were aware on 27 November 2017 inviting them to take part in the process. Those who were unknown were not so notified and so had not had the same

¹ 14 further statutory objections were made in the second notice period, see paragraphs 1 - 6

opportunity for involvement in the process. Taking account of the concerns raised that there may be other unknown parties I decided to adjourn the Inquiry to allow a full review by the OMA to identify any other statutory parties.

5. Following consideration of that review and responses, it appeared likely that all statutory parties had been identified. However, the OMA fairly indicated that an external supplier IT issue meant that the restored backup was dated 2 December 2017, with no earlier information available. To ensure no prejudice arose as a result of this, or any other matter, I asked the OMA to readvertise the Order. The existing statutory parties were not required to make an additional objection; unless an objection or representation already made was, or had been, withdrawn, it was treated as if it had been made to the additional notice.
6. That notice period ran from 11 January – 8 February 2019 and gave rise to a further 14 statutory objections. In addition, there were 14 interested parties who made objections or representations outside either of the formal statutory periods.
7. Unfortunately, the Planning Inspectorate did not ensure that the new statutory parties were notified of the resumed Inquiry date of 18 March 2019, which had been agreed upon at the earlier adjournment. As a result, a number of parties complained that they were unable to attend. Taking account not only of those who may have been prejudiced by not being made aware of that Inquiry date but also of the landowner, who as the applicant for the Order needed to have a decision on the matter within a reasonable timescale, I again adjourned the Inquiry, to 8 July 2019. In the event the only person to attend and give evidence at the July 2019 sitting was one of the two original 'unknown' statutory parties.

The Inquiry

8. Following complaints regarding the venue initially proposed by the OMA, it was altered to the Alton Maltings prior to the opening of the Inquiry. Unusually the resumption dates were set for Mondays; this was due to concerns about venue availability later in those weeks if there was a need to accommodate a number of witnesses wishing to speak. The dates and times for the Inquiry were discussed and agreed with those present at each adjournment.
9. Whilst there were problems with the process which led to two adjournments before being able to complete the Inquiry, we made best use of the time to hear from those who indicated they wished to speak, when they were available. The Inquiry sat on 17 July 2018 and in the morning of 18 July 2018; on the 18 and 19 March 2019; and for the morning of 8 July 2019. It would be fair to say that the afternoon of 17 July and morning of 18 July related to the issues regarding statutory parties, as discussed above.

Prejudice

10. Some parties suggested that the identified flaws in the process should lead to non-confirmation of the Order. I consider some of the unhappiness around statutory processes arose from a misunderstanding that an application for diversion of a right of way falls under different procedural requirements from those required in relation to a planning application.
11. I am satisfied that the actions taken in adjourning the Inquiry, twice, and readvertising the Order mean that there can be no doubt that all parties have had fair opportunity to be heard in relation to this Order. Therefore, I am satisfied

that it is appropriate for me to consider whether or not to confirm the Order on the basis of the evidence and submissions before me.

Costs

12. Four costs applications were made, initially in writing, with three expanded upon orally at the end of the Inquiry on 8 July 2019. Those applications are dealt with in separate decisions and reports, as appropriate.

Site Visits

13. I made an unaccompanied site inspection on 16 July 2018 taking in the sections of Footpath 55 ("FP55") proposed to be diverted by the Order; the proposed alternative route; and the continuation of FP55 to the south-west, which joins other public footpaths leading to the road to Binsted village.
14. I made a second unaccompanied site visit on 17 March 2019, which took in changes to the site in terms of the development at Broadview Farm. On 7 July 2019 I walked the section of FP55 north of Broadview Farm from Bentley railway station, using sections of the promoted route, the Shipwrights Way; connections to FP55 within Alice Holt; and FP55 as it passes alongside Bentley Hall, over the railway line and generally north-west to the River Wey, beyond which it continues as a separately numbered footpath to the village of Bentley.
15. There was no request for an accompanied site visit at the close of the Inquiry.

Main issues

16. The Order was made because it appeared to the OMA that it was necessary to authorise the diversion of part of FP55 to enable development to be carried out in accordance with planning permission granted on 31 March 2017 under Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act"); namely, a new barn to be used as café, farm shop and cycle storage, four timber cabins for tourist accommodation and new access and parking area, reference SDNP/16/03835/FUL.
17. Section 259 of the 1990 Act requires that I must be satisfied that the matters above, falling under s257 of the 1990 Act, make confirmation of the Order necessary. This is one of two tests to be considered and may be referred to as the necessity test: the Order must be required, in the circumstances of the case, to enable development to be carried out in accordance with the terms of its planning permission.
18. The second 'merits' test relates to consideration of whether the disadvantages, either to the public or to individuals, of diverting the route, balanced against the advantages to the public and individuals of the diversion, are significant enough to justify refusing the Order. The advantages include the planning benefits of the development.
19. Additionally, as FP55 is located within a National Park, I am required to have regard to the two purposes of National Parks, which are:
 - a. Conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park; and
 - b. Promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the park by the public.

20. The SDNPA has a duty to foster the economic and social well-being of the local community in pursuit of these purposes.

Reasons

Background

21. The definitive line² of the Order route passes through a farmyard area of Broadview Farm on alignment E – X – A³. As seen on the Order map⁴ the line E – X passes through an existing building, used as a wood store; however, it is possible to follow the route of the footpath with a small diversion at this point. A former owner indicated that people had not used the definitive route in his time, however, this was not supported by the evidence heard at the Inquiry. It is the legal route that is under consideration in this process.
22. In addition to the definitive line there is a route to the north-west, which runs from point E and then can be seen on the Ordnance Survey ("OS") base map continuing as '*Path (um)*' to the dismantled railway. This has been referred to as a permissive route. Although it was indicated in evidence from the OMA that it was possible for such a route to be an unrecorded right of way no claim was made to me that this was the case in relation to this route.
23. The proposed diversion route follows the permissive route in part before diverting from it, in a generally south-westerly direction, to reconnect with the continuation of FP55 to the east from point A.

Whether it is necessary to divert part of the footpath to enable development to be carried out – 'the necessity test'

24. It had been argued that the planning permission could be altered to allow the development and the right of way to coexist. The issue of whether the barn could be sited to avoid the footpath is not before me; the appropriate place to raise such matters was in relation to the relevant planning application. Whether there could be subsequent alterations to the permission is also not a matter before me at this time. I must consider the Order in the light of the permission granted.
25. It was agreed in closing that the definitive route of FP55 is aligned on the proposed location of the barn and, therefore, it would not be possible to implement the planning permission with the footpath in the current location.
26. To allow confirmation of the Order the development cannot have been substantially completed, as this would mean that the Order was not necessary. At the time of my first site visit no works connected with the planning application appeared to have commenced. Due to the delays referred to above some of the works were underway by the time of the subsequent visits, relating to the construction of the lodges. The works undertaken did not directly affect the footpath and the remaining works, relating to the barn, were not commenced.
27. I am satisfied that the development was not substantially complete at the time of the decision. I also agree with the parties that it is necessary to divert that part of FP55 identified to enable development for which permission has been granted to be carried out.

² The legal alignment of the right of way as recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement

³ Points A – E and X are as indicated on the Order map

⁴ Attached to this decision

The disadvantages or loss likely to arise as a result of the diversion – ‘the merits test’

Historical interest

28. It was argued that FP55 was part of an historical route and so of local importance. Whilst the mapping evidence indicates that there has been a route in this vicinity for many years it also shows that the route on the ground – at least in the area around Broadview Farm – has altered over time, regardless of potential discrepancies in map dates. These changes were probably in response to developments at different times, much as the change sought by this Order.
29. I do not consider that the evidence shows the affected part of the route of FP55 to be of such historical significance that it should not be altered. The diversion would allow continued use of a route as a whole from end to end.

Views

30. FP55 is situated within an area which was included within the boundary of the South Downs National Park (“SDNP”) during the designation of the area as a National Park in 2011. Having originally been ‘passed over’ for inclusion, the Inspector and the then Secretary of State for the Environment, Hillary Benn, visited the area and decided that it was sufficiently valuable for inclusion.
31. The objection made on behalf of members of the local community indicated that the SDNP Special Qualities identified Quality No.1 as diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. I agree that the views south-west to Home Hanger, and the wider hanger landscape, are of value in the setting and I understand from users that this was part of the reason for choosing to use FP55. There would be a reduction in the time at which views were available when travelling from Blacknest Road, as users would be travelling alongside buildings and planting associated with the development, as well as having the existing oak trees, which run alongside the old railway line cutting, in front of them.
32. I take into account that the existing route, passing through a former farmyard, also has buildings alongside and that there would be nothing to prevent the landowner from planting trees at the western end of the farmyard, which would similarly block views on that route. If the route were diverted the wider landscape view would still be available from at least point C, if not earlier.
33. The visualisations prepared in objection to show the potential changes arising from planting associated with the development were not produced under the appropriate technical guidance⁵ and I agree with the OMA that little weight can be placed on them. Whilst I do not place reliance on the visualisations as they stand I have looked again at the planning permission, which requires a detailed scheme of soft and hard landscape works, intended to integrate the development into the landscape and mitigate any impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties. Plan 136a/05/02⁶ shows that there would be a “*new hedgerow of a farm mix of hawthorne (sic), blackthorne (sic), and hazel & stockproof fence*”. It is understood that the hedges are to be maintained at a minimum of 1m with the average to be 1 – 1.5m. This would affect views for walkers heading generally south-west, with the lodges themselves also interrupting the views.

⁵ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA)

⁶ Version D was submitted with the Order but the approved plan is noted to be version F.

34. The owners of Broadview Cottage have undertaken some planting on their field boundary, to the north-west of the section of the proposed footpath running south-west of point E. If developed and maintained this may also affect views on the approach to the wider landscape. The plan indicates that the area to the south, alongside the proposed route of FP55 would be fire truck/refuse access & turning on existing hardstanding.
35. Objectors felt that the proximity of the proposed route to the lodges would add to the feeling of walking in an urbanised rather than truly rural environment. The definitive line previously ran alongside farm buildings and now passes in part between the already constructed lodges. It seems that the proposed route would be closer to the lodges than the definitive route, although passing to the rear of two rather than between the four with two on either side.
36. This development is within the ribbon development area along Blacknest Road. In walking from Bentley it is noticeable that the footpath alters from being within woodland to running to the rear of Bentley Hall and houses on Blacknest Road. I do not consider this ribbon development area to be particularly rural and do not find the proposed route to be any more or less rural than the existing.
37. I disagree with the OMA that I should only be considering the right to pass and repass on the highway, rather than these wider issues. Whilst there is no requirement for consideration of 'public enjoyment' under the 1990 Act, as there is in relation to diversion under the Highways Act 1980, I consider this to fall fairly under the disadvantages or loss to the public to which *Vasiliou v Secretary of State for Transport and another (1991)*,⁷ refers.
38. Whilst the loss of views may appear a minor matter in terms of time I bear in mind that this route is situated within a National Park. I consider that the objections generally indicate that the proposed changes would affect the enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public. This is a more significant matter than it might be in a different setting and I find it weighs against confirmation of the Order.

Distance and alignment

39. Whilst the proposed diversion is longer than the existing route I agree with the OMA that it is not significant, particularly when considering the length of the whole of FP55. The proposed alternative route of 176 metres is just 25 metres longer than the existing route at 151 metres.
40. The objectors refer to there being seven changes of direction in this short distance, indicating that there are only 15 changes in direction on the whole of the existing route of FP55.
41. I was given no explanation for the diversion into the field north-east of point D, rather than running in a direct line to point E from the railway cutting. This affects the effective land use of a second field and, if the fence was removed, walkers would be unlikely to follow such a convoluted alignment in an open area. The applicant has apparently indicated that he was content to allow the public to take their own line through the field between points C and E but this could fetter future land use, which I do not consider to be in the wider public interest.

⁷ (CA)[1991] 2 All ER 77, [1991] JPL 858 and cited with approval in *R(Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd) v SSEFRA [2017] PTSR 1662*

42. I agree with the objectors that the diversion would be more difficult to navigate and would feel artificial to users. I find this to weigh against confirmation.

Limitations

43. The Order as made does not include limitations and the OMA argued that, as these would be applied for by a separate process⁸ it was not open to me to consider the matter. Whilst the Order appears to offer a limitation-free experience, which could be of value in any landscape, the reality is that the OMA have indicated that the diversification would allow the continuation of sheep farming here. As such, it is obvious that there must be at least one limitation somewhere on the proposed route, or an unaltered section of FP55, to prevent livestock reaching Blacknest Road.
44. The objectors say that there would be 5 field boundaries, which on a working farm would almost certainly mean gates. Any limitation would affect use for those with limited mobility, such as more elderly people or people with a buggy or pushchair. The OMA statement of case refers to 5 gates at the identified boundaries: two gates are indicated where the proposed route crosses the fence to point C before continuing to D to the north-east of fence at top of cutting; one between points C and D; one between point D and E; and, finally a gate at point E. The diversion via the field north-east of point D makes it more likely that an application may be made for additional limitations here as otherwise there would be no need for the fence. The OMA indicate that their policies mean that only gates would be authorised, should applications be made for limitations.
45. Whilst only giving a little weight to this matter, as I cannot know what limitations may be applied for and/or authorized going forward, I consider this uncertainty is a negative factor in terms of confirmation of the Order before me.

Site of Interest for Nature Conservation

46. The dismantled railway cutting runs on a generally north-west to south-east alignment in this area, with points A and B on the south-western side and C and D on the north-eastern side of the alignment. The former railway is generally within a cutting and the section affected by proposed alignment B – C is on the south-eastern end of the Broadview Farm Dismantled Railway Site of Interest for Nature Conservation ("SINC").
47. A SINC is not a statutory designation but a local biodiversity designation, recognising a site of local importance. Ecological surveys undertaken in 1998 and 2018 found several notable species and it has a '2A' designation; '*Agriculturally unimproved grasslands – grassland that is composed of a mixed assemblage of indigenous species in essentially semi-natural communities which has been allowed to develop without the major use of herbicides or inorganic fertilisers.*'.
48. It appears that following comments on the application for the diversion infilling of the section of the SINC over which B – C would pass was carried out. Complaints were raised as to the nature of the material used and the appropriateness of infilling the SINC in the first instance, which was viewed as a means of overcoming potential objections to the unevenness of that section of the proposed route. The OMA, in their role as the relevant planning enforcement authority, decided not to enforce the removal of this material.

⁸ For example under section 147 of the Highways Act 1980

49. I note the concerns raised in relation to this matter and agree that changes to a SINC, particularly in a National Park, should not be an action to be treated lightly. Nevertheless, the situation before me is that the material is already in place. It does not appear that use of the section B – C, as it now stands, as part of the proposed footpath would damage the SINC.

Broadview Cottage

50. Broadview Cottage is situated to the north of the Order route. The access road is shared with the track which passes the residential area of Broadview Farm, continues on the current access to the proposed development site⁹ and is shared with the section of FP55 running generally south-west from Blacknest Road. The field immediately to the west of point E is within the ownership of Broadview Cottage. The proposed route from E to the field corner would run directly adjacent to the southern field boundary, this being one of two fields grazed by horses and cattle.
51. The path to the north of point E, which would remain unaltered by the Order, runs closer to the residential area of Broadview Cottage than the proposed route. There is extensive planting around the garden to the south of the cottage which retains privacy there. It is also the case that when walking from Blacknest Road users have a direct view of Broadview Cottage for a short time.
52. The landowner/occupier of Broadview Cottage indicated that whilst the permissive route followed the same alignment alongside their field boundary from point E towards point D¹⁰, it had not particularly affected them previously; the route was not maintained and so few people used it.
53. I note there was evidence from some users that this route had been used over the years and the use sufficient for the route to be noted on the OS mapping used as the Order map base. However, the owners reported increased noise, visual intrusion and the need to pick up litter, including dog poo bags, from their field following increased use of this route over the previous 18 months due to changes on the definitive route E – X – C – A. It is unfortunate that the landowners, who made a statutory objection to the Order, were unable to attend the Inquiry due to personal circumstances.
54. The OMA argued that the planting which has been undertaken on the field boundary would provide mitigation to Broadview Cottage. However, even if this was the case, it places a burden on that landowner to provide and maintain mitigation in relation to actions on neighbouring land.
55. I consider that introducing a recorded public right of way alongside the field boundary of the neighbouring landowner introduces a negative impact for the amenity of the property in this case. Whilst I consider it less significant than it might have been had the permissive path not already been in place this nevertheless weighs against confirmation of the Order.

Summary

56. Taking all the above matters into account I conclude that there would be a disadvantage to the public in altering the amenity of this part of FP55. This relates in part to the boundaries and changes in direction and in part to the

⁹ The planning permission provides for a new entrance to the development site south of the current access

¹⁰ The permissive route diverges from the proposed route north-east of point D

matter of views. I also consider that there would be a negative effect on the neighbouring landowner if the Order was confirmed.

The advantages to be conferred by the proposed order

57. The Order will allow the implementation of the planning permission, which has already been considered and approved by the OMA as the relevant planning authority. It is noted that this was a case where the OMA 'called in' the planning application as it met the 'Guidelines on Significance for South Downs National Planning Applications.' In other cases I understand that East Hampshire District Council acts on behalf of the SDNPA to undertake planning functions. If the Order is not confirmed then the permission cannot be fully implemented.
58. The OMA referred to the advantages which they believed would arise from the planning permission, whilst objectors felt that such advantages had not been demonstrated or were overstated.
59. In relation to beneficial diversification, allowing sheep farming at Broadview Farm to continue, no figures were presented to demonstrate that the diversification was necessary. However, I accept that in general terms there is planning support for farm diversification, particularly where there is enhanced land management.
60. Condition 15 of the permission referred to the development being undertaken in accordance with a farm management plan, including "*...management of the re-wilded area of the Hangars...*" the reason being "*To achieve the conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape...*".
61. An email from the Senior Ecologist of Hampshire County Council, in response to the planning consultation, indicated that re-wilding of Home Hanger was '*essentially unnecessary*'. The email goes on to say that "*...any future management would need to be sensitive to the existing conditions and should be guided by recognised ancient woodland management techniques...*". Condition 15 requires details of the management to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority so it seems unlikely that unnecessary work would be carried out. Given that enjoyment of the hanger landscape is part of the reason for use of FP55 it is appropriate for me to weigh this matter in the balance in consideration of the Order; on the evidence presented it seems that the potential benefit of 're-wilding' has been overstated.
62. The requirement for 80% of goods sold in the farm shop to be regional, with half from the local area, is set out under planning condition 17. I note that there is a shop selling home grown or locally sourced produce situated within 2.5km of the development. However, the planning requirement would ensure that the shop relates to the farm enterprise and the local economy and that there would be some type of farming activity, with continuation of sheep farming being the most obvious, as part of the overall enterprise. This would provide continuation of the management of the land in a way which has led to the landscape that people indicated they enjoyed walking in.
63. In relation to the provision of refreshment services for visitors to the National Park the objectors referred me to ten other similar amenities situated within a 3km radius of the development, with another three on that radius boundary. Whether people choose to use a particular facility will depend on personal choice, as seen from the evidence of the users of the right of way.

64. In relation to walkers, whom the OMA felt would benefit from the provision of such a facility, views were split. The Ramblers representative indicated that they might like to drop in, although found it odd to move the footpath to the other side of the fence if wishing to encourage such use; there would be access to the café from at least the eastern end, point E, although it is unclear whether public access would be provided to and from the footpath to the south-west, point A. A representative organising shorter walks, for example Walking for Health walks, indicated that they would be very unlikely to want to stop on this type of walk. I consider that some people using FP55 would choose to use facilities available on their walk but others would not; this is neutral in terms of walkers and I do not consider that overall benefits have been demonstrated for them.
65. The lodges are under construction and the objectors indicated their understanding that these facilities, including the car park, would not require changes to the route of the footpath. The OMA agreed that the lodges were not dependent on the diversion. It may be possible to develop the car park taking account of the alignment of FP55 but that is not a matter for me.
66. The planning authority should have determined that advantages accrue from the development at the stage of granting planning permission. This is a relatively small-scale development in planning terms but the OMA believed it to conserve and enhance the National Park and be consistent with the Parks purposes. I accept that advantages to those parties directly and indirectly affected by the permission would arise from confirmation of the Order, allowing implementation of the permission as a whole.

Conclusions

67. *Vasiliou* recognises that it is open to the Secretary of State to form a wholly different view on matters taken into account by the planning authority when considering the planning application and subsequent application for diversion, in relation to those matters relevant to the diversion. I accept that the OMA felt that the planning permission was appropriate and that the diversion of part of the footpath became necessary as a result.
68. I accept that there are advantages in confirmation of the Order so that the planning permission as granted can be implemented in full. However, having had the opportunity to hear the evidence I consider that the even recognising the potential alignment of the small-scale private development with the purposes of the National Park, the disadvantages flowing directly from the proposed diversion are of such significance that the Order should not be confirmed. In particular, I am not satisfied that the proposed convoluted alignment is appropriate and I am concerned at the effect upon the neighbouring property. I consider that the location within a National Park demands a greater level of sympathetic design in relation to features such as rights of way, which has not been met in this case.

Other matters

69. There was unhappiness with regard to the granting of the planning permission in the first instance. There were also questions around the appropriateness of certain conditions attached to the planning permission; discussion of the recently adopted South Downs Local Plan¹¹; and, the National Planning Policy Framework.

¹¹ Adopted 2 July 2019

I understand that there had been a judicial challenge to the permission but this was discontinued and so the planning permission is extant.

70. There was discontent with the process in deciding that the Order should be made. That decision was not judicially challenged and so the Order remains to be determined, taking account of the relevant matters, as set out above.
71. Concerns about obstructions or interference with existing alignment of FP55 in this location are not matters before the Inquiry.
72. Concerns that a precedent may be set if the Order was confirmed are not relevant.
73. The number of people making objections to the Order is not a relevant matter to the decision.

Conclusions

74. Having regard to these and all other matters raised at the Inquiry, and in the written representations, I conclude that the Order should not be confirmed.

Formal Decision

75. I have not confirmed the Order.

Heidi Cruickshank

Inspector

APPEARANCES

For the Order Making Authority:

Mr L Wilcox of Counsel, *instructed by* the South Downs National
Park Authority

who called:

Mrs S Manchester Consultant, *instructed by* the South Downs National
Park Authority

In Support of the Order:

Mr Cullen

In Objection to the Order:

Mrs C Fargeot *on behalf of* herself and Binsted Parish Council

Mr S Alexander

Cllr M Kemp-Gee

Mr I Salisbury *on behalf of* himself and members of the local
community

who called:

Mr I Fleming

Mr M Goble

Mr R Hannah

Mrs S Phillips

Mrs M Salisbury

Mr P Wonson

Mr G Woollen

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- 1 The Order
- 2 National Park Authority's Opening Statement
- 3 Addendum to SDNPA Proof of Evidence
- 4 Information on non-statutory conservation designations
- 5 National Park Authority's Closing Statement, with attachment
- 6 Information on statutory parties (July 2018)
- 7 Information on review of statutory parties (September/October 2018)
- 8 Binsted Parish Council Proof of Evidence (updated)
- 9 Proof of evidence, Mr Ian Salisbury, with attachments
- 10 Proof of evidence, Mr Fleming
- 11 Proof of evidence, Mr Goble
- 12 Proof of evidence, Mr Hannah
- 13 Proof of evidence, Mrs Salisbury
- 14 Proof of evidence, Mr Wonson
- 15 Proof of evidence, Mr Woollen
- 16 Proofs of evidence taken as read, Mrs Butler, Mrs Freeman, Mrs Goble & Mr Tuttlebury
- 17 Alice Holt – A Brief History, relevant parts
- 18 Members of the Community Statement of case (updated), with attachments
- 19 Members of the Community closing submissions
- 20 Proof of evidence, Mr Alexander
- 21 Written costs application, Melissa Salisbury
- 22 Written costs application, Claire Fargeot
- 23 Written costs application, Ian Salisbury
- 24 Written costs application, Simon Alexander

