



Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 22 August 2025

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

APPLICATION FOR

THE NETWORK RAIL (KETTERING TO WIGSTON SOUTH JUNCTION AND NAPSURY LANE) (LAND ACQUISITION) ORDER

Inquiry held on 4 June 2025
Inspection carried out on 3 June 2025

DfT Ref: TWA/24/APP/02
Planning Inspectorate Ref: DPI/M2460/25/4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Case Details	2
Preamble	2
The Order Land and Surroundings	5
The Case for The Applicant	6
The Cases for The Objectors	25
Rebuttal by The Applicant	27
Inspector's Conclusions	28
Recommendation	32
<u>Appendices</u>	
1 Appearances at the Inquiry	33
2 Inquiry Documents	33

CASE DETAILS

APPLICATION FOR THE NETWORK RAIL (KETTERING TO WIGSTON SOUTH JUNCTION AND NAPSURY LANE) (LAND ACQUISITION) ORDER

- The Order would be made under sections 1 and 5 of the Transport and Works Act 1992.
- The application for the Order was made by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited on 12 November 2024.
- There were two remaining objections outstanding to the Order at the commencement of the Inquiry.
- The Order, if made as drafted, would confer powers on Network Rail to acquire compulsorily land and rights in land and to use land temporarily and for oversailing in connection with the electrification and improvement of the Midland Main Line railway between Kettering and Wigston South Junction in the District of North Northamptonshire, County of Northamptonshire and the District of Harborough, County of Leicestershire and a right of access to that railway at Napsbury Lane in the District of St Albans, County of Hertfordshire. It also confers powers to extinguish rights over the railway at Bridge 34 (Three Arch Bridge) in the District of Northamptonshire, County of Northamptonshire.

Summary of Recommendation: That the Order be made.

PREAMBLE

The Application and Objections

1. The Applicant, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (Network Rail), owns and operates the rail infrastructure of Great Britain. Its purpose is to deliver a safe, reliable and efficient railway. Network Rail is primarily responsible for the maintenance, repair and renewal of track, stations, signalling and electrical control equipment¹.
2. The Order would confer powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary use of land on Network Rail for the purposes of works forming part of the Midland Main Line Electrification (MMLe) programme. The Order relates to the section of the line north of Kettering to Wigston South Junction. The Order would also provide for Network Rail to acquire rights of access to the electrified railway over a private road at Napsbury Lane, St Albans².
3. The Order does not provide any works powers. All the works required to deliver the power upgrade and electrification along the route to which the Order relates will or have been delivered under existing statutory powers and permitted development rights. The proposed Order is needed to confer powers of compulsory acquisition on Network Rail³.

¹ NR-10 paragraphs 2.1 and 2.1.2

² Mr Russell's Proof of Evidence (PoE) section 2

³ NR-04 paragraph 1.5

4. Network Rail seeks powers by way of The Network Rail (Kettering to Wigston South Junction and Napsbury Lane) (Land Acquisition) Order under sections (s) 1 and 5 of the Transport and Works Act 1992.
5. Three objections to the proposed Order were originally received by the Department for Transport. One was withdrawn before the Inquiry commenced and two remained outstanding when the Inquiry closed.⁴

Statement of Matters

6. On 15 April 2025 the Department for Transport issued a Statement of Matters pursuant to Rule 7(6) of the Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedures) Rules 2004⁵. This set out the matters about which the Secretary of State wishes to be informed in her consideration of the Order.
7. The matters specified are:
 1. *The need for the proposed Network Rail (Kettering to Wigston South Junction and Napsbury Lane) (Land Acquisition) Order in achieving the aims and objectives of the electrification and improvement of the Midland Main Line railway between Kettering and Wigston South Junction and a right of access to the railway at Napsbury Lane in St Albans (the Scheme).*
 2. *Confirmation that all statutory procedural requirements have been complied with and whether sufficient information was available to parties about the Scheme.*
 3. *The main alternative options considered by Network Rail and the reasons for choosing the preferred option set out in the Order, including any alternatives not requiring compulsory acquisition.*
 4. *The likely impact of the exercise of the powers in the proposed Transport and Works Act Order on landowners, local businesses and residents.*
 5. *The effects of the Scheme on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers, and their ability to carry out their undertakings effectively, safely and in compliance with any statutory or contractual obligations and the protective provisions afforded to them.*
 6. *Having regard to the criteria for justifying compulsory purchase powers in paragraphs 12 to 15 of the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government 'Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process' published in October 2024 and updated in January 2025:*
 - a. *Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest to justify conferring on Network Rail powers to compulsorily acquire and use land for the purposes of the Scheme, including whether reasonable efforts have been made by the acquiring authority to negotiate the purchase of land by agreement.*

⁴ OBJ-2 (USF Nominees Limited) and OBJ-3 (UBS Triton General Partner Ltd)

⁵ NR-11

- b. Whether the purposes for which the compulsory purchase powers are sought are sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected (having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998).*
 - c. Whether there are likely to be any impediments to Network Rail implementing the Scheme, including the availability of funding.*
 - d. Whether all the land and rights over land which Network Rail has applied for are necessary to implement the Scheme.*
- 7. Any other matters which may be raised at the Inquiry which may be important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.*

The Inquiry

- 8. A pre-Inquiry Note about procedural matters was sent to the parties on 27 May 2025, prior to the Inquiry opening. It was also published on the Inquiry website.
- 9. The Public Inquiry was called by the Secretary of State under s11(1) of the Transport and Works Act 1992. I was appointed by the Secretary of State under the Act to hold an Inquiry into the application for the Order.
- 10. I opened the Inquiry at 10.00 on Wednesday 4 June 2025. The Inquiry was held at the Three Swans Hotel, Market Harborough, Leicestershire and sat for a single day.
- 11. Mrs Joanna Vincent was appointed as Independent Programme Officer for the Inquiry and was supported by Ms Brenda Taplin. Their roles were to assist with the procedural and administrative aspects of the Inquiry, including the programme, under my direction. They helped greatly to ensure that the proceedings ran efficiently and effectively but played no part in this report.
- 12. I conducted an informal, unaccompanied site visit of all of the Order Land on Tuesday 3 June 2025. No request was made for an accompanied site visit.

This Report

- 13. This report sets out a brief description of the land covered by the proposed Order and its surroundings. It summarises the main elements of the cases for the Applicant and Objectors, as well as my conclusions and recommendation. A list of those appearing at the Inquiry is appended to this report at Appendix 1. Inquiry documents are listed at Appendix 2.
- 14. I make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Transport on the application for the Order.

Statutory Formalities

- 15. At the Inquiry, the Applicants confirmed that all the necessary statutory formalities associated with the Order had been fulfilled and provided a Statutory

Procedures Folder⁶. There were consequently no matters arising or unresolved procedural issues.

THE ORDER LAND AND SURROUNDINGS

16. Powers are being sought in respect of land only at five specific locations along the route between Kettering and Wigston South Junction and at Napsbury Lane. The characteristics of the sites and their surroundings can be described as follows.

Pipewell Bridge

17. Pipewell Bridge is located within North Northamptonshire District in the County of Northamptonshire, being less than 2.5 miles east of Desborough⁷. The Order Land is required for embankment works associated with the reconstruction of the Pipewell Road Bridge. Three plots have been identified, comprising one on the northern side of the Midland Main Line (MML) on the eastern side of Pipewell Road (2-003), and two plots to the south of the railway on either side of Pipewell Road close to the junction with Desborough Road (2-001 and 2-002). All three plots are within open countryside with some residential properties and a hotel located within 400m of the plots on the edge of Rushton. The Grade I listed Rushton Triangular Lodge is located to the south-west of the junction adjacent to Desborough Road.

Newtons Bridge

18. Newtons Bridge is also located within the District of North Northamptonshire⁸. Two parcels of land are identified for a realigned bridge and approaches. The plots are to the north-east (3-002) and south-west (3-001) of the MML and form part of a new bridge alignment across the railway which joins with an existing track which in turn provides access to Harborough Road. On the north-western side of the track and to the south-west of the railway are farm buildings. The site is in open countryside approximately two to three miles south-east of Market Harborough.

Three Arch Bridge

19. Approximately 400m north-west of the Newton's Bridge site is Three Arch Bridge, also located within North Northamptonshire District⁹. At this site five plots are required for permanent acquisition (4-006, 4-007, 4-012, 4-013 and 4-014), eight plots for the temporary use of land (4-001, 4-002, 4-003, 4-005, 4-010, 4-011, 4-015 and 4-016), one plot where powers are sought to extinguish rights (4-009) and two plots where powers are limited to oversailing rights (4-004 and 4-008). With the MML running in a south-east to north-west direction, most of the plots are to the south-west of the railway between the railway line and Harborough Road. The site is in open countryside approximately 2-3 miles south-east of Market Harborough.

⁶ INQ/02

⁷ NR-07

⁸ NR-07

⁹ NR-07

Glen Station Road Bridge

20. Glen Station Road Bridge is located in the County of Leicestershire within Harborough District¹⁰. It forms part of Station Road which runs south from Great Glen. The site includes five plots all of which are subject to permanent acquisition: three to the north-east of the MML with two of these on the eastern side of Station Road (5-004 and 5-005) and one on the western side (5-006); and two plots to the south-west of the railway line on either side of Station Road (5-001 and 5-002). On the north-eastern quadrant of the site is an access to a highway compound located alongside the railway while further north along Station Road are sporadic houses and farm buildings. Otherwise, the site as a whole is located in open countryside.

Napsbury Lane

21. Located in St Albans District in Hertfordshire the Napsbury Lane site covers two adjacent parcels of land (1-001 and 1-002)¹¹. These are at the entrance to the North Orbital Commercial Park. Napsbury Lane runs north from the A414 North Orbital Road and crosses the MML (running in a northerly direction) with the land subject to the acquisition of rights located to the east of the railway.

THE CASE FOR THE APPLICANT

22. The purpose of the Order is to confer on Network Rail the necessary powers to compulsorily acquire land and interests in land, and to use land temporarily and for oversailing in connection with the Scheme. The Order also confers powers to extinguish rights over the railway at Three Arch Bridge¹².
23. The MML runs from Sheffield in South Yorkshire, through the main urban conurbations of the East Midlands, and serving Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire into London St Pancras. The Scheme forms part of the wider MML programme which has already completed electrification between London and Corby with compulsory acquisition powers confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport pursuant to The Network Rail (London to Corby) (Land Acquisition) Order 2020¹³. The MML programme is an enhancement project with the Department for Transport being both the client and funder for the works. It aims to provide a fully electrified railway to Sheffield by the 2030s¹⁴, with the phase of the MML programme to which the Order relates being from Kettering to Wigston South Junction¹⁵.
24. The Order would provide for Network Rail to acquire rights of access to the electrified railway, including an electrical substation that was installed in 2023 as part of the MML programme of which the Scheme is part, over a private road at Napsbury Lane in St Albans¹⁶.

¹⁰ NR-07

¹¹ NR-07

¹² NR-10 paragraph 1.1.2

¹³ NR-34

¹⁴ NR-04 paragraph 1.3

¹⁵ Mr Russell's PoE section 2

¹⁶ NR-10 paragraph 1.1.3

25. The draft Order does not contain any works powers or seek deemed planning permission. All the works needed in relation to the Scheme, apart from reconstruction of Three Arch Bridge, have been approved¹⁷ and completed under permitted development rights¹⁸ on an "*at risk*" basis to meet the delivery demands of the wider programme¹⁹. As Mr Jones explained in his oral evidence, particularly by reference to the Three Arch Bridge site, if the works had not been carried out when they were, and instead had awaited the present Order, Network Rail would not have been able to have installed and operated this part of the MMLe by the required programme commissioning date of December 2024. This would have had major implications for the programming of the works between Kettering and Wigston South Junction and for the introduction of the new bi-modal trains from Spring 2025.
26. Additionally, although most of the works associated with the Order have been carried out "*at risk*" this does not mean that the land or rights sought through the Order are not required. They are required, justified and meet the relevant tests as demonstrated through Network Rail's evidence.
27. The draft Order provides for compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or rights in land and also for the temporary use of land, including compensation for any loss or damage resulting from the oversailing of land²⁰. While most of the works required by the Scheme have been completed with the agreement where necessary of affected landowners, there are some locations where land negotiations have not yet been completed. Therefore, the Order provides for compulsory acquisition powers to secure the land or use the land at the locations specified, should the negotiations prove unsuccessful²¹.
28. The works and powers sought at each location within the application can be summarised as follows²²:

Location	Works and Powers Sought
Pipewell Bridge	To facilitate overhead electrification, it has been necessary to reconstruct the superstructure of the public highway overbridge at Pipewell Road to give sufficient headroom clearance above rail level for the overhead electrified power supply wires to the railway. The design of the replacement bridge, highway approaches, safety requirements and embankment works sought to utilise the smallest footprint of land to minimise the need for acquisition of additional land or rights.

¹⁷ NR-49

¹⁸ NR-15 and NR-16

¹⁹ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 3.1, NR-04 paragraph 1.5 and NR-10 paragraph 1.1.7

²⁰ NR-10 paragraph 1.1.8

²¹ NR-04 paragraph 2.4 and NR-10 paragraph 1.3.1

²² NR-04 paragraph 2.4, NR-10 paragraph 1.1.6, Mr Russell's PoE paragraphs 3.4-3.8, Mr Jones's PoE sections 3-7 and Mr Mole's PoE section 5

	The highway design involved collaboration with the local highway authority, to which, once acquired the land would be dedicated. The bridge was demolished and reconstructed "<i>at risk</i>". Land is required within either existing highway land or third-party land on which the works have been undertaken under an informal agreement with the landowner. The Order would allow for the use of compulsory powers to acquire land in the event that it is not possible to reach agreement with the landowner.
Newton's Bridge	The private roadway overbridge was demolished to expedite overhead electrification at Newton's Bridge. Dialogue between Network Rail and the landowner established the requirements for the design of the replacement bridge which was constructed adjacent to the original one prior to its demolition and removal. The design of the replacement bridge and approaches sought to utilise the smallest footprint to minimise the need for acquisition of additional land or rights for the construction and future inspection and maintenance of the new bridge. Rights of access by way of easement, are now required for inspection and maintenance and to provide permanent rights in relation to the new alignment of the bridge particularly the bridge approaches.
Three Arch Bridge	The demolition of the private agricultural accommodation Bridge 34 was necessary to gain sufficient headroom clearance above the track for the installation of the overhead electrified power supply. The design of the replacement bridge sought to utilise the smallest footprint to minimise the need for acquisition of additional land or rights. The construction of the new bridge would be undertaken from a construction site compound which avoids any interface with National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (National Grid) land and the adjacent National Grid substation and National Grid and Network Rail substation. The acquisition of land is required for the bridge approaches associated with the reconstruction of the bridge. A legal agreement with the landowner includes a penalty clause if the reconstructed bridge is not completed by May 2026. The temporary use of eight plots is required for the worksite and access. Powers are also sought for the extinguishment of rights over the former bridge and the re-provision of equivalent rights. Rights for the temporary oversailing of plots for cranes is also required.
Glen Station Road Bridge	Network Rail has demolished and reconstructed the superstructure of the public highway overbridge at

	Glen Station Road to give sufficient headroom clearance above rail level for the overhead electrified power supply wires to the railway. To provide a replacement structure high enough to span over the electrification wires it was necessary to raise and modify the existing highway approach infrastructure, their earthworks, and associated adjacent road junctions and third-party property access entrances. The design of the replacement bridge, modified approaches and the introduction of safety requirements sought to utilise the smallest footprint to minimise the need for acquisition of additional land or rights, for the construction and future inspection and maintenance of the reconstructed bridge. Works have been undertaken on an "at risk" basis by informal agreement with the landowner. The powers in the Order will enable Network Rail to acquire compulsorily the necessary land if it is not possible to reach a legal agreement with the landowner and will enable that land to be dedicated to the local highway authority, which collaborated in the highway design, to assume full responsibility for the safety of the road. In addition, land is required to install and maintain new permanent traffic lights. Currently, temporary traffic lights are in place as the local highway authority will not commission permanent traffic lights until the relevant land is secured.
Napsbury Lane	The Napsbury Lane site comprises an existing access route used for maintenance of the railway. The access route runs from the public highway over a private road which is used by other users. It has been in use by Network Rail for over 20 years by permission of the landowner and under licence. The design of the new substation has included the provision of off-road parking within Network Rail's fenced site compound to reduce the risk of obstructing the access road outside the Network Rail gates. The Order would provide for permanent rights of access, thereby securing the ability to inspect and maintain the substation and railway at this location on both a programmed and emergency basis.

29. With regard to Three Arch Bridge, Network Rail has a statutory obligation under s68 of the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act 1845²³ to provide a bridge at this location unless it is legally released from the obligation to do so. There is currently no agreement to release the rights of the authorised users at Three

²³ INQ/6

Arch Bridge which would in turn release Network Rail from the obligation to provide a bridge at this location by May 2026²⁴.

30. At all other locations relevant to the Scheme, the works have either been completed within Network Rail's land ownership boundary or the consent of landowners has already been secured. All necessary regulatory consents for the works have been obtained, a list of which was included at NR-09²⁵ and updated during the Inquiry²⁶.
31. The issues raised in the Statement of Matters are addressed below.

The need for the Scheme to achieve the aims and objectives of Midland Main Line electrification and improvement and a right of access at Napsbury Lane (Matter 1)

32. The Department for Transport's High-Level Output Statement for Control Period 5²⁷ (2014-2019) identified key programmes and projects to meet forecast demand growth and support economic growth. It included a major national electrification and capability enhancement of the railway with specific reference to electrification requirements between Bedford and Sheffield as part of the MML programme²⁸.
33. The need for the Scheme is driven by the overall MML programme which would allow electric trains to run on the full length of the MML replacing the existing fleet of diesel trains. Specifically, the Scheme aligns with the introduction of the new bi-mode fleet and allows them to run electrically south of Wigston to London St Pancras. The new rolling stock will tackle current overcrowding on the route, enabling more passengers to utilise the services²⁹. It also improves freight services on the MML, contributing to modal shift from road to rail, and would build upon the significant capacity increase provided by the works undertaken as part of the first element of the MML programme (the introduction of electrified services between London and Corby). Additionally, the electric nature of the bi-modal units would improve the station environment for passengers, due to the reduced levels of diesel within enclosed areas and a significant reduction in engine noise³⁰. Electrification also provides benefits for train performance, with faster acceleration and more efficient braking, as well as quieter operation whilst in electric mode. The works will also facilitate reduced industry costs as electric trains are cheaper to run than diesel trains³¹.
34. The Scheme would support the achievement of the Government's aim to reduce reliance on fossil fuels nationally to achieve carbon dioxide (CO₂) reduction and facilitate reaching net zero in UK carbon emissions by 2050. The MML

²⁴ NR-04 paragraph 2.5

²⁵ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 3.9

²⁶ NR-49

²⁷ NR-35

²⁸ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.1.3

²⁹ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.2.13

³⁰ Mr Russell's PoE section 2

³¹ NR-04 paragraphs 3.4-3.5

programme forms part of the UK Government's national de-carbonisation strategy for transport³².

35. The key benefit of the Scheme is decarbonisation. The Traction Decarbonisation Network Strategy³³ sets out the intention to remove all diesel only trains from the network by 2040 to support the Government's net zero goal. It will initially make use of bi-mode trains to allow the phased roll out of electrification benefits³⁴. It also aligns with Decarbonising Transport (2021)³⁵, the Department for Transport's holistic transport industry decarbonisation plan³⁶. The MMLe when delivered in full is projected to deliver significant carbon savings, resulting in an annual reduction of 80,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent through reduced diesel use on passenger services with an additional reduction of 64,000 tonnes of CO₂ from freight services once full electric traction is in use.
36. Network Rail's Statement of Case demonstrates how the Scheme is supported by a range of planning and transport policies at the national, regional and local levels³⁷. No one has challenged Network Rail's position that a sustainable public transport network is at the heart of planning policy guidance and that transport infrastructure is a key component in ensuring that demand within the economy is able to be released and transformed into growth.
37. The powers that would be conferred by the Order are necessary to allow various high-level outcomes to be met as follows³⁸:
- a. The extension of AC electrification between Kettering and Wigston South Junction;
 - b. Connection to a new Auto-Transformer Feeder Station at Braybrooke;
 - c. Adjusting power, immunisation and overhead line re-sectioning to the existing electrified area south of Bedford;
 - d. Signalling and telecom interventions where required for signal sighting; and
 - e. Route clearance interventions including bridge reconstructions, bridge jacks and track lowering.
38. To achieve these outcomes has required the construction of three new substations, 18 bridges re-aligned to make room for overhead lines, 76 single track kilometres of electrified railway, over 1,000 piles to enable installation of overhead line equipment and over 220,000 metres of overhead line³⁹.

³² NR-04 paragraph 3.2

³³ NR-36

³⁴ Mr Russell's PoE paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7

³⁵ NR-39

³⁶ NR-04 paragraph 3.3 and Mr Russell's PoE section 6.3

³⁷ NR-10 section 6

³⁸ NR-04 paragraph 2.1, NR-10 paragraph 1.2.1 and Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.5

³⁹ NR-04 paragraph 2.2, NR-10 paragraph 1.2.2 and Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.6

-
39. The Scheme has included increasing headroom clearances where there were existing bridges over the railway to physically enable overhead line electrification and achieve compliance with applicable standards. This included three bridge reconstructions, among other works⁴⁰.
40. In providing an electrified route the MMLe project would achieve the following key benefits⁴¹:
- a. To relieve overcrowding and reduce journey times on long distance services;
 - b. To introduce higher-capacity electric rolling stock on outer commuter services;
 - c. To switch from diesel to electric traction to reduce rolling stock operating costs, improve air quality impacts and reduce the carbon footprint of rail services on the MML;
 - d. To improve gauge capability for large box containers trains;
 - e. To reduce annual greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50,000 tonnes in the non-traded sector and 5,000 tonnes in the traded sector; and
 - f. To improve air quality through a reduction of at least 100 tonnes of NO_x on a yearly basis and 0.5 tonnes of PM₁₀ on an annual basis.
41. In addition to securing the remaining land and/or rights required to reconstruct Three Arch Bridge, the Order seeks to secure permanently residual land and rights which are required in connection with the already constructed bridges. The application includes powers over land on which infrastructure connected with modifications made to public highways carried by Pipewell Bridge and Glen Station Road Bridge is situated, and which will ultimately be dedicated as public highway, passing to the local highway authority to maintain as part of the modified highway⁴².
42. The compulsory powers that would be conferred by the Order are necessary to ensure that electrification of the route between Kettering and Wigston South Junction, which is integral to the implementation of the whole MMLe programme, can be successfully completed, operated, inspected and maintained. The Scheme forms an integral part of the overall MMLe programme, without which the benefits of the electrification of the MML could not be fully realised⁴³. In the case of the right of access at Napsbury Lane, it would ensure that the upgraded railway can be successfully inspected and maintained⁴⁴.
43. Network Rail has been able to carry out most works either on land within its ownership or by agreement with affected landowners. Although the works have been substantively completed, they were effectively undertaken at risk in order

⁴⁰ Mr Jones's PoE section 2

⁴¹ NR-10 paragraph 5.3.1 and Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.1.8

⁴² Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 3.2

⁴³ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 2.2.12

⁴⁴ NR-10 paragraph 5.2.1

to meet the overall delivery programme for the MMLe programme and to ensure both that the full electrification of the section between London and Wigston South Junction could take place in 2024. This was necessary to prevent significant delay to the service introduction which would have dramatically increased the cost of the overall scheme⁴⁵.

44. Following the application for the Order, three objections were received in respect of two out of the five locations. None of these objections related to the need for the Scheme⁴⁶ or the aims and objectives of the MMLe programme. Two of the objections related to the right of access at Napsbury Lane.

Compliance with all statutory procedural requirements and whether sufficient information was available to parties (Matter 2)

45. Network Rail has provided details to demonstrate its compliance with statutory procedural requirements⁴⁷. In addition, a Consultation Report⁴⁸ has been submitted which summarises Network Rail's approach to consultation with local authorities and landowners as well as engagement with the public more generally and the feedback provided through that process⁴⁹.

The main alternatives including any alternatives not requiring compulsory acquisition (Matter 3)

46. Strategically, no alternatives to electrification were considered because the remit Network Rail received from the Department for Transport explicitly instructed electrification.
47. For the Kettering to Wigston South Junction project the alternatives considered at each of the bridge locations to accommodate the additional headroom clearances required for the overhead line electrification included track lowering and harnessing the improved capability of bi-modal trains to change between electric/diesel over relatively short stretches. In respect of accommodation overbridges, alternatives included the offline/ online construction of adjacent bridges, alteration to proposed access routes and access methods and the potential for release of rights by agreement. However, after detailed assessment these options were not pursued and the options related to the Order were progressed instead. Through the feasibility and option selection process, alternatives were assessed at each location where electrification and upgrading was proposed⁵⁰.

Pipewell Bridge

48. The severance of access rights enabling the demolition of the existing bridge without the provision of a replacement bridge at this location was not deemed appropriate as the bridge carries a designated public highway owned, managed, and maintained by the local highway authority.

⁴⁵ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 3.11

⁴⁶ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 3.10

⁴⁷ INQ/2

⁴⁸ NR-6

⁴⁹ Mr Russell's PoE section 5 and Mr Mole's PoE section 9

⁵⁰ Mr Russell's PoE paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 and Mr Jones's PoE paragraph 7.2

-
49. An off-line reconstruction comprising a new replacement bridge being built alongside the existing bridge which would be demolished and removed once the new bridge was brought into use was not considered viable or appropriate. This was because of the constraints of the local highway geometry, the proximity of adjacent road junctions and farm field access entrances, available forward visibility to road drivers approaching a realigned bridge, and the impact on the Grade 1 listed Rushton Triangular Lodge.
50. Lowering of the track was considered, but the depth of track lowering required for electrical clearance to industry standards was unacceptable in terms of the vertical track alignments and gradient of the railway. The creation of a localised low point in the railway which could lead to potential flooding in an area that has a history of flooding was an identified risk. This could lead to train service disruption, and the possibility of undermining and destabilising the earthworks of the railway cutting slopes. Lowering the track levels would also have created unsuitable vertical wire gradients for the interface of electric train power pick up pantographs with the railway electrification power system.
51. Lowering of the track to a much-reduced absolute minimum headroom clearance above rail level aided by power control technology on the overhead electrification system was also considered. However, this was determined to be unacceptable as it did not eliminate the negative aspects of traditional full track lowering.
52. Consideration was given to harnessing the flexibility and potential of the new bi-mode train fleet to avoid the need for a bridge reconstruction or removal. This offered the possibility of running the trains either electrically, using power from the overhead line electrification system or alternatively from diesel power. However, due to electric power interface issues, local conditions of the railway's track gradient and the relatively short section of route requiring a change over to diesel it was determined that this option would be inefficient and impractical.⁵¹.

Newtons Bridge

53. As with Pipewell Bridge, severing access rights enabling the demolition of the existing bridge without the provision of a replacement bridge was considered but in this case was unacceptable to the landowner and was not taken forward.
54. An on-line reconstruction of the existing bridge, requiring the demolition and replacement of the central arch span over the railway with a squarer shaped taller span giving increased headroom clearance above the railway, and with related infilling of the side spans and raising up of the road and its approaches was considered. However, this solution was also unacceptable to the landowner as it was too disruptive to their commercial business due to the length of time they would have had with no access over the railway. Therefore, an off-line bridge replacement scheme was devised and implemented to maintain continuous access for the user.
55. Lowering of the track was considered, but the depth of track lowering required was determined to be unacceptable for similar reasons in respect of Pipewell Bridge. Lowering of the track to a minimum headroom clearance above rail level

⁵¹ Mr Jones's PoE section 5.2

using power control technology was also considered. However, this was unacceptable as it did not eliminate all the negative aspects of a traditional full track lowering solution at this location.

56. Harnessing the flexibility and potential of the new bi-mode train fleet to avoid the need for a bridge reconstruction or removal was also rejected for similar reasons in respect of Pipewell Bridge⁵².

Three Arch Bridge

57. Alternatives considered included the severance of access rights enabling the demolition of the existing bridge without the provision of a replacement bridge as well as the traditional full track and lowering of the track to an absolute minimum headroom clearance above rail level.
58. Harnessing the flexibility and potential of the new bi-mode train fleet being introduced to avoid the need for a bridge reconstruction or removal, and the implementation of an off-line reconstruction of the bridge, by means of constructing a replacement bridge and then demolishing and removing the original bridge was also considered. However, each considered alternative was determined to be unsuitable for similar reasons as at Pipewell Bridge⁵³.

Glen Station Road Bridge

59. At Glen Station Road Bridge severing access rights to enable the demolition of the existing bridge without the provision of a replacement bridge was judged to be inappropriate as the bridge carries a designated public highway owned, managed, and maintained by the local highway authority.
60. As with Pipewell Bridge an off-line reconstruction comprising a new replacement bridge being built alongside the existing bridge which would be demolished once the new bridge was brought into use was not considered viable or appropriate. This was because of the constraints of an adjacent residential property and associated local business premises, as well as the local highway geometry, proximity of adjacent road junctions, and the highway interface with a further bridge routeing the road over a canal immediately to the west.
61. As at other bridges, full track lowering together with lowering of the track to an absolute minimum headroom clearance above rail level was also considered. Consideration was also given to harnessing the flexibility and potential of the new bi-mode train fleet to avoid the need for a bridge reconstruction or removal. However, each of these alternatives was rejected for similar reasons as in the case of Pipewell Bridge.
62. Alternatives to the highway traffic control signals were suggested to the local highway authority by Network Rail including the provision of appropriate warning signage and the imposition of a permanent speed restriction on the highway. However, these measures were rejected because they would not be as safe as the highway authority's preferred solution⁵⁴.

⁵² Mr Jones's PoE section 3.2

⁵³ Mr Jones's PoE section 6.2

⁵⁴ Mr Jones's PoE section 7.2

Napsbury Lane

63. Network Rail considered alternative options for the location of the substation, but the more constrained and residential nature of the existing highway network within the local area, and the requirement for geographical siting of substations to manage the strength and reliability of the electrical power supply along the MML made the Napsbury Lane site the most appropriate. This location provided the flattest, most at-grade level access to the trackside, was remote from residential properties and most easily accessible to the substation between neighbouring substations in either direction.
64. An assessment of servicing the substation by means other than by road such as by rail was also rejected because it would require track possessions and overhead line electrics to be isolated to allow access along the railway which potentially would be disruptive to train services while reliance on securing possession would be a significant time constraint in contrast to current flexible working.
65. Utilising other trackside access points in the area to access the railway and substation in this location would reduce flexibility and adversely impact on routine inspection and maintenance activities, potentially causing disruption of train services⁵⁵.

The likely impact of the exercise of the powers on landowners, local businesses and residents (Matter 4)

66. The only remaining work to be undertaken as part of the Scheme which is directly facilitated by the Order is the reconstruction of the Three Arch Bridge. This has been designed and planned to minimise the impacts on the affected landowners and the travelling public including through constructing the bridge using prefabricated components where possible to reduce construction time on site. The only landowners affected by the powers of acquisition, temporary use or oversailing in the Order are the landowners for whose benefit the bridge is required to be replaced. One of the landowners, National Grid has withdrawn its objection to the Order while there was no objection to the Order from the other landowner. The rights enjoyed over the current bridge will not and cannot be extinguished until it is replaced with a substitute right of way over the new bridge, unless by agreement⁵⁶.
67. The rights of access being sought at Napsbury Lane reflect the fact that Network Rail has been using the route for access for over 20 years. The use will not materially change, and the substation was designed to ensure that parking on the estate road would be avoided other than for very short periods when the boundary gate was being opened⁵⁷. The two owners of the access road over which the permanent right of access is now being sought do not suggest that there has been any issue caused by Network Rail's use of the road in the past, nor has evidence been provided to demonstrate that Network Rail's use of the road has caused additional wear and tear to the road although Network Rail has offered to make a fair share maintenance cost contribution based on use. For

⁵⁵ Mr Jones's PoE section 4.3

⁵⁶ Mr Jones's PoE section 3

⁵⁷ Mr Jones's PoE paragraphs 4.2.1-4.2.4 and oral evidence

any anticipated major works which would require additional use of the road, communications would be sent to the neighbouring businesses to make them aware⁵⁸.

68. Network Rail's position is that there are numerous access points across the railway network allowing the landowners to control how the commercial business park is accessed in the future. Moreover, the Order provides, through Article 6 and Schedule 2, for compensation to be payable where Network Rail compulsorily acquires easements or other rights over land⁵⁹. Furthermore, if an objector could establish that the grant of the easement inhibits their ability in future to control access to the trading estate and that this had adversely affected the value of the trading estate, then that would, in principle, provide the basis of a claim for compensation under the Order⁶⁰.
69. Rights of access at Newtons Bridge are required for Network Rail to be able to inspect and maintain the replacement accommodation overbridge and its approaches which has been re-provided for the benefit of the landowner. The relevant landowner has not objected to the Order.
70. Apart from the works at Three Arch Bridge and the installation of permanent traffic lights at Glen Station Road Bridge, works associated with the Order are complete. The acquisition of land is sought to ensure that all land which forms part of the re-aligned highway, which provides infrastructure essential to its safe operation or is required to ensure that the realigned highway or that infrastructure can be inspected and maintained, can be dedicated to and thereafter vested in the local highway authority as highway maintainable at the public expense. Not only is there no objection from the affected landowners but Heads of Terms have been agreed with affected landowners at Glen Station Road Bridge as well as at Pipewell Bridge⁶¹.
71. The powers sought to facilitate works required by the local highway authority on land that is to be dedicated to it in due course will enable that authority to fulfil its obligations as statutory undertaker⁶².

The effects of the Scheme on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers (Matter 5)

72. The rights of statutory undertakers to maintain their apparatus is not affected by the Order⁶³.
73. The Scheme would have no negative impacts on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers. It would not impact on their ability to carry out their undertakings effectively, safely and in compliance with any statutory or contractual obligations and the protective provisions afforded to them. Although the Order includes land owned by National Grid, which is affected by the land and

⁵⁸ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 10.3.1.2 and section 12

⁵⁹ INQ/1

⁶⁰ Mr Jones's oral evidence

⁶¹ Mr Mole's PoE paragraphs 9.4.3 and 9.7.4

⁶² Mr Mole's PoE section 12

⁶³ NR-04 paragraph 1.7 and NR-10 paragraph 1.1.9

rights required in connection with the re-provision of Three Arch Bridge, it is not operational land and would not impact on their ability to carry out their undertakings effectively, safely or in compliance with any applicable statutory or contractual obligations or protective provisions⁶⁴.

74. The works at Three Arch Bridge have been designed to avoid having to encroach into the secure boundary of the substation or the National Grid access road on the eastern approach to the new bridge. Additionally, construction access has been planned to avoid any site compound interface with the National Grid or Network Rail substations. Moreover, the design of the bridge works has sought to avoid potential damage or disruption to existing high voltage electricity cables in the vicinity of the bridge⁶⁵.
75. At Glen Station Road Bridge the Order would grant powers to regularise the current position to enable land on which infrastructure associated with the modified highway has been or will be installed to be acquired and then formally dedicated as public highway. This would enable the local highway authority to maintain this infrastructure as part of the public highway. It would therefore facilitate the exercise of functions of the local highway authority without impediment and enable changes to the highway network necessary to accommodate the Scheme. The works have been carried out to a level that has been satisfactory to the local highway authority⁶⁶.
76. At Pipewell Bridge and Newtons Bridge the Order would grant powers to regularise the current position, where works have already been completed under license with landowners and to enable the onward dedication of land to the local highway authority to enable it to properly fulfil its statutory functions⁶⁷.

Compulsory purchase powers (Matter 6)

Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest

77. The land included in the Order limits is required to authorise Network Rail to permanently acquire land or rights or to temporarily use land required in connection with the Scheme. The evidence of Mr Jones provides the design, engineering and construction management justification for the powers sought and demonstrates why all the land and rights sought are necessary for the delivery and maintenance of the Scheme.
78. For each plot included in the Order Network Rail has provided details as to whether the land is subject to compulsory acquisition, temporary possession or the acquisition of rights. In respect of plots which are subject to objections to the Order an explanation as to the rights or powers sought over the land and why, has been provided⁶⁸.

⁶⁴ Mr Jones's PoE paragraph 8.2

⁶⁵ Mr Jones's PoE paragraphs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 and oral evidence

⁶⁶ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 8.3

⁶⁷ Mr Russell's PoE paragraph 8.4

⁶⁸ Mr Mole's PoE Appendix 1

-
79. Network Rail aims to minimise the land required in the Order such that the engineering design and consultation processes have sought to ensure the land identified is no more than that which is required for the Scheme. Notwithstanding the scale of the Scheme, successful negotiations have ensured that it has been necessary to include only a limited amount of land within the Order.⁶⁹
80. The extent of the Order Land has been defined to ensure that it includes sufficient land and rights to ensure that the Scheme can be completed, operated, inspected and maintained. Where possible Network Rail has identified land that is needed only temporarily, or that only the acquisition of rights is required⁷⁰. Where it has been possible to carry out works, or to secure rights or land without the need for compulsory acquisition powers it has done so.
81. Although the powers sought would enable Network Rail to take possession of the land and rights it requires for the Scheme, Network Rail has sought and will continue to seek to negotiate with the affected landowners and reach agreement where possible in accordance with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process (January 2025)⁷¹ and The Crichel Down Rules (September 2024)⁷². Nevertheless, even where terms have been negotiated or agreed, the relevant land needs to be retained within the Order limits to ensure that the necessary land and/ or rights can be secured, and the Scheme delivered in full, if agreed Heads of Terms do not ultimately progress to legal agreement⁷³. This provides an important safeguard for Network Rail to ensure that it can deliver the Scheme.
82. The Order provides for compensation where land or rights are acquired, rights extinguished, or loss or damage suffered as a result of land being used temporarily for the purposes of the Scheme⁷⁴.
83. Network Rail recognises that a compulsory purchase order can only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest which justifies the overriding of any private rights in the land sought to be acquired. Network Rail also understands its obligation to have sought to properly negotiate with landowners to acquire land or interests by agreement prior to using compulsory purchase powers⁷⁵.
84. In respect of the compulsory acquisition of land the Order applies Part 1 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 which, has the effect of requiring Network Rail to pay compensation to qualifying parties under the statutory Compensation Code. All property owners directly affected by the Scheme will be entitled to claim compensation in accordance with the Compensation Code, which provides a consistent approach to the assessment of fair compensation. Compensation will also be payable in respect to any loss in a landowner's retained property caused by it being severed from the land acquired, or by the Scheme itself and in respect

⁶⁹ Mr Mole's PoE Appendix 1 and Mr Jones's PoE

⁷⁰ Articles 6 and 7 and Schedules 3 and 4

⁷¹ NR-40

⁷² NR-41

⁷³ Mr Mole's PoE paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6

⁷⁴ Mr Mole's PoE section 6 and NR-03

⁷⁵ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 6.3

- of disturbance losses that result from the construction. If agreement cannot be reached then fair compensation can be independently determined through the Alternative Dispute Resolution process, or by reference to the Lands Chamber of the Upper Tribunal⁷⁶.
85. For new rights, the Compensation Code applies with the modifications made to it by Schedule 2 of the Order. Clause 11 operates in a similar manner for rights which may be extinguished upon acquisition. Where acquisition by agreement is not possible, the affected party can make a claim to the Lands Chamber of the Upper Tribunal for determination. For the temporary use of land for the construction of works, Article 7 of the Order provides that the person affected by the exercise of the powers is entitled to compensation in respect of loss or damage. Article 8 and Article 9 respectively provide the same powers in relation to the temporary use of land for oversailing and for the maintenance of works⁷⁷.
86. The Order is needed to secure implementation of the Scheme. The compulsory acquisition of the land or rights would allow the works to reconstruct Three Arch Bridge to be carried out; where works have been undertaken "*at risk*" under licence, it would secure the requisite interests in land to enable Network Rail to operate, inspect and maintain the railway into the future; and, in the case of the land that is needed for highway works it will ensure that the land on which apparatus is installed can be acquired and subsequently dedicated to the local highway authority to fulfil its statutory functions⁷⁸.
87. Apart from the re-construction of Three Arch Bridge, works have been carried out under licence to ensure that wider MMLe programme deadlines could be met. Network Rail is seeking the fallback of being able to acquire compulsorily the land needed to fulfil its legal obligations in relation to Three Arch Bridge and to ensure that the works carried out at other locations in the Order can be operated, accessed, inspected, and maintained into the future to secure the benefits of electrification and upgrade of both the Scheme and the MMLe programme as a whole.
88. Land and interests in land are included in the Order where it has not been possible to conclude negotiations by the date of application for the Order. Network Rail can, therefore, rely on the Order powers as a backstop to deliver and secure what is required by the Scheme and the wider benefits of the MMLe programme. Although compulsory purchase powers are required to facilitate the Scheme, all affected parties who own, lease or occupy land have been consulted by Network Rail with a view to seeking a negotiated agreement for the acquisition, either on a temporary or permanent basis, of their land⁷⁹.
89. Article 7 and Schedule 4 of the Order provide for the temporary possession of land for the construction of the works authorised by the Order. Land which is occupied temporarily in accordance with the Order will on completion of the

⁷⁶ Mr Mole's PoE paragraphs 6.4-6.7

⁷⁷ Mr Mole's PoE paragraphs 6.8-6.9

⁷⁸ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 7.4

⁷⁹ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 7.6 and 7.7

works and vacation be reinstated to the reasonable satisfaction of the landowner in accordance with Article 7 of the Order⁸⁰.

Human rights considerations

90. Article 1 of the first Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights is a qualified right stating that no one shall be deprived of their possessions "*except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law*".

91. The compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes specified in the Order is authorised by, and subject to, the Transport and Works Act 1992. By enacting this Act, the Government has determined that, subject to procedural safeguards, it can be in the public interest that individuals are deprived of their land for railway purposes. Procedural safeguards are provided by the 1992 Act and the Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004⁸¹ which enable objections to be raised to compulsory acquisition and considered by an independent inspector. In addition, where land is authorised to be compulsorily purchased by the making of an Order, compensation will be payable under the Compensation Code as applied by that Order. Where disputes as to the amount of compensation arise, these may be referred for independent consideration by the Lands Chamber of the Upper Tribunal⁸².

92. The Order is being pursued in the public interest, as is required by Article 1 of the First Protocol where compulsory acquisition of property is concerned. The public benefits associated with the Order and the reasons why the land and rights sought in the Order are required for the delivery or maintenance of the enhancements to the MML are set out in Network Rail's evidence. Interference with the Convention Rights is justified because the railway purposes for which the Order powers are being sought are sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of the landowners proposed to be affected and the Order, including the requirement to pay compensation, strikes a fair and proportionate balance between the private interests of the landowners and the public interest in securing the benefits of the Scheme to the national railway network⁸³.

Whether there are likely to be any impediments to implementing the Scheme including the availability of funding

93. Network Rail has confirmed that it has all the necessary funding and consents to implement the Scheme and has carried out (or will carry out) works under permitted development rights. The Order provides for land to complete the reconstruction of Three Arch Bridge and provides for rights to ensure that Network Rail can maintain and operate the railway in the future. It also provides for land or rights to regularise the position at three reconstructed bridges⁸⁴.

⁸⁰ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 8.1 and 8.2

⁸¹ NR-11

⁸² Mr Mole's PoE section 11

⁸³ Mr Mole's PoE section 11

⁸⁴ Mr Russell's PoE paragraphs 2.2.3 and 8.5

94. Network Rail's licence requires it to publish a delivery plan that sets out its obligations for enhancement projects. The current Enhancement Delivery Plan⁸⁵ lists the Kettering to Wigston South Junction electrification project under the MML programme. In 2021 the Secretary of State for Transport approved the Full Business Case for the extension of the electrification of the MML to Wigston South Junction project as a section of the wider MML programme with the Network Rail Board approving the final investment decision. The Scheme also received final authority approval in 2021 with the authorised funds to meet the capital costs of implementing the works to which the draft Order relates also secured⁸⁶.

Whether all the land and rights over land are necessary to implement the Scheme

95. Apart from at those locations included in the Order, elsewhere along the line between Kettering to Wigston South Junction, it has not been necessary to acquire third-party land permanently and therefore the backstop of compulsory acquisition powers has not been required. Temporary works on third party land have been carried out under licence, and to date Network Rail has agreed 20 licences with 23 landowners affected by the Scheme⁸⁷.
96. In respect of land and interests sought through the Order, Network Rail has also sought to deliver the Scheme through licences or other agreements where possible. Only a limited amount of land at five discrete locations has had to be included in the Order. Additionally, Network Rail has sought to minimise the land required to be included in the Order through the engineering design and consultation process, to ensure that the land identified for compulsory acquisition is no more than that which is required for the project⁸⁸. In respect of the five locations specified in the Order the position is as follows.

Pipewell Bridge

97. Negotiations at Pipewell Bridge commenced with the relevant landowner in January 2021 in respect of a bridge reconstruction, and a licence was entered into for a construction compound and access requirements. The bridge was demolished in September 2022 and reconstruction of the bridge was completed in March 2023.
98. Additional permanent land is required and negotiations with landowners in respect of permanent acquisition commenced in September 2022, with Heads of Terms agreed in principle in January 2023. Design revisions, final terms and updated land plans were shared with landowners in January 2024. Minor queries are being resolved, but, as the sale has not yet concluded, powers of compulsory acquisition are sought in the Order.
99. No responses were received from the landowners or their agents to consultation letters of September 2024. However, Heads of Terms have been reached for the

⁸⁵ NR-38

⁸⁶ Mr Russell's PoE paragraphs 6.1.5 and 6.2.1

⁸⁷ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 9.3

⁸⁸ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 7.2

purchase of plots 2-001, 2-002 and 2-003, with legal instructions issued and negotiations nearing completion⁸⁹.

Newtons Bridge

100. Negotiations commenced with the landowner adjacent to Newtons Bridge in April 2020, for a construction compound and access requirements associated with the bridge reconstruction. Subsequently a licence was entered into in September 2022. The bridge was demolished and reconstructed to a new alignment which enabled the landowner to retain access to his land whilst a new bridge was being constructed and made it possible for the new bridge to be built off-line. Reconstruction of the new bridge and demobilisation from site was completed in March 2024. The Order now seeks an easement to provide permanent rights in relation to the new alignment of the bridge and approaches.
101. Negotiations for a permanent easement over plots 3-001 and 3-002 commenced in October 2023. Network Rail has been awaiting a response from the land agent on draft Heads of Terms since July 2024. Revised Heads of Terms were sent in March 2025 but there has been no further response from the landowner or their agent. It has therefore been necessary to seek powers in the Order to acquire the easement compulsorily⁹⁰.

Three Arch Bridge

102. Discussions with landowners at Three Arch Bridge commenced in January 2021, when track lowering options were first presented to them. Once the assessment of possession time, associated costs and the level of disruption to customers had been considered alongside construction costs for this option, a reconstruction of the bridge emerged as the more efficient, and therefore preferred option.
103. Negotiations were undertaken with landowners in January 2023 about a reconstruction of the bridge. Two licences for crop loss, temporary access and a construction compound were entered into with landowners in April 2024 to enable demolition of the bridge, which took place in May 2024.
104. An opportunity for a demolition option, with a buy-out of rights was identified, and negotiations for a release of rights over the accommodation bridge are being explored with both affected landowners at this location. This would remove the need to reconstruct the bridge. However, it has not been possible to reach agreement to date. Consequently, the bridge will need to be reconstructed to re-provide accommodation rights over the railway to comply with both the statutory obligations of Network Rail under s68 of the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act 1845 to provide a bridge at this location unless it is legally released from the obligation to do so and pursuant to a separate legal agreement permitting the demolition of the original bridge.
105. Additional temporary land will be required during the reconstruction works to provide for a construction compound and access requirements, while permanent

⁸⁹ Mr Mole's PoE section 9.7

⁹⁰ Mr Mole's PoE section 9.6

land is required for the re-grading of the bridge approaches and maintenance requirements.

106. Feedback from National Grid, provided at a meeting in June 2023 was incorporated into the bridge design, which was refined with reduced land take, to minimise the impact on the adjacent National Grid infrastructure and substation.
107. Responses to consultation letters in September 2024 were received on behalf of two landowners, indicating a willingness to continue negotiations with Network Rail. Negotiations are ongoing with the landowners of plots 4-001, 4-002, 4-003, 4-007, 4-008, 4-010, 4-013 and 4-016 for temporary and permanent land requirements associated with a bridge reconstruction, with powers of compulsory acquisition being sought to provide certainty if negotiations do not succeed⁹¹.

Glen Station Road Bridge

108. Affected landowners have been consulted on proposals to demolish and reconstruct Glen Station Road Bridge since October 2021. Negotiations were successful and licence agreements were concluded with landowners to provide temporary compounds and access for construction activities. The bridge was demolished in March 2023 and reconstruction was completed in September 2023.
109. Powers are being sought in the Order to secure land for the installation and future maintenance of vehicle restraint barriers and traffic lights associated with the reconstructed bridge.
110. Discussions with landowners have been ongoing since June 2023 in relation to permanent land required for the highway improvement works. Heads of Terms have been agreed in principle, and formal acquisition is awaiting completion. However, powers of compulsory acquisition are still sought in the draft Order to provide certainty if negotiations fail. Planning permission was granted for the highway improvement works by Harborough District Council in October 2024.
111. Affected landowners and tenants received consultation letters in respect of the proposed application for the Order from Network Rail in September 2024. The local highway authority also received a letter in respect of the proposed application from Network Rail in September 2024 and has not objected to the Order.
112. The letters set out what land and/ or rights Network Rail is seeking to acquire under the Order and sought feedback on the proposed Scheme prior to the consultation end date of 27 September 2024. A response was received from one land agent in relation to Glen Station Road Bridge, which provided additional details for a person with an interest in land. A copy of the consultation letter was sent to this tenant in October 2024 although no response was received⁹².
113. A draft agreement has now been settled with the local highway authority in respect of plots 5-001, 5-002, 5-004, 5-005 and 5-006 addressing the traffic management requirements of the local highway authority⁹³.

⁹¹ Mr Mole's PoE section 9.5

⁹² Mr Mole's PoE section 9.4

⁹³ Mr Mole's PoE section 9.4

Napsbury Lane

114. Although Network Rail has been using an access point to the railway at Napsbury Lane for approximately 28 years, there is a need to formalise the existing arrangements because of the electrification and improvement works carried out as part of the MML programme. A formal right is also required to the substation at this location.
115. Negotiations with two landowners commenced in 2021, regarding a temporary access and compound which were required for the construction of the substation, and an access licence was entered into in March 2024 with one of the landowners, USF Nominees Limited (USF). A permanent right of access was also discussed with that landowner, but they indicated that they would only discuss permanent access once the temporary licence was completed. Negotiations for permanent access re-commenced in September 2024.
116. The second landowner (UBS Triton General Partner Ltd (UBS)) did not respond to Network Rail concerning either the temporary or permanent access. Until the receipt of the objection, there had been no response to correspondence from Network Rail's solicitors since August 2021. No responses were received from either of the landowners or their agents at this location following consultation letters in September 2024⁹⁴.

Other matters (Matter 7)

117. No other matters, which are not addressed above, were raised by Network Rail either prior to, or during the Inquiry.

THE CASES FOR THE OBJECTORS

118. During the statutory representation period which ended on 24 December 2024 the Department for Transport received three letters of objection from affected landowners. As a consequence of those objections and in accordance with the Transport and Works Act Inquiries Procedure Rules⁹⁵ the Secretary of State announced on 21 January 2025 her intention to hold the Inquiry⁹⁶.
119. None of the objectors appeared at the Inquiry and therefore their cases reflect their written objections.

Objector 1 – National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC

120. An objection in respect of the inclusion of land interests of National Grid within the Order was submitted on 18 December 2024⁹⁷. This noted that National Grid owns freehold land within the Order, namely plots 4-004, 4-005, 4-006, 4-011, 4-012, 4-014 and 4-015 at the Three Arch Bridge site. The objection noted that Network Rail was seeking powers to acquire plots 4-006, 4-012 and 4-014 and seeking temporary possession powers to use National Grid land for works along with oversailing rights.

⁹⁴ Mr Mole's PoE section 9.8

⁹⁵ NR-11

⁹⁶ NR-10 paragraph 1.4.1

⁹⁷ OBJ-01.1

121. The letter of objection stated that National Grid objected to the compulsory acquisition of its land while noting that National Grid was in negotiations with Network Rail to discuss voluntary arrangements in relation to the use of National Grid land for permanent and temporary use which would be National Grid's preference where such land is required for Network Rail works.
122. On 29 May 2025 National Grid's agent confirmed that National Grid and Network Rail had agreed commercial terms relating to the use of National Grid land and permanent rights to deliver the Scheme and that good progress was being made through solicitors to finalise agreements⁹⁸. Consequently, National Grid wished to withdraw its objection to the Order.

Objector 2 – USF Nominees Limited

123. An objection to the Order was submitted on behalf of USF on 23 December 2024⁹⁹. The objection referenced USF as being an affected landowner in respect of the compulsory purchase of rights in an access road and verge east of Napsbury Lane.
124. The Grounds of Objection stated that although USF did not object in principle to the Scheme being promoted by the Order it did object to the creation of an uncontrolled easement over its land which could negatively impact on the operation of USF's wider estate. Potential impacts were identified including (i) the upwards adjustment of service charges for existing tenants to cover increased wear and tear; and (ii) the loss of ability to control access to the estate in the future, if needed. The objection went on to state that that progress was being made with Network Rail to agree a private easement although it had not been possible to conclude this within the objection period.
125. On 4 March 2025 USF's Statement of Case was submitted¹⁰⁰. This confirmed that USF owns the freehold title to an access road and verge east of Napsbury Lane, identified as plot 1-002. It noted that the draft Order provides for the compulsory purchase of rights in plot 1-002. It also confirmed that USF had continued to engage with Network Rail to attempt to agree a private easement that addresses its concerns but that no such agreement had been concluded. It was also noted that USF and Network Rail had entered into an agreement dated 24 March 2023 which granted Network Rail temporary rights of non-exclusive access over and along the access road for the sole purpose of carrying out works on Network Rail's adjacent land, subject to certain undertakings. It was stated that the licence agreement demonstrated that Network Rail was previously able to carry out works using the access road whilst being subject to some restrictions. On this basis, USF considered that an easement could be agreed on similar terms and that if a private easement were agreed USF would withdraw its objection.
126. While no agreement had been reached by the time of the Inquiry USF did not participate in the Inquiry.

⁹⁸ OBJ-01.2

⁹⁹ OBJ-02.1

¹⁰⁰ OBJ-02.2

Objector 3 – UBS Triton General Partner Ltd

127. UBS owns the freehold interest in land and buildings lying to the east of Napsbury Lane which serves as an access route to the North Orbital Commerce Park. Through an objection letter dated 20 December 2024 concerns were raised about the proposed land acquisition of plot 1-001 and its impact on all relevant parties¹⁰¹.

128. The UBS objection was made on the following basis:

- Network Rail had not demonstrated that they had taken reasonable steps to acquire the land by agreement which is necessary to do to justify the use of compulsory purchase powers. Furthermore, to put the parties in a position of financial equivalence, the total package would need to reflect the value of the freehold, but no offer has been received.
- The property should be excluded from the Order at this stage to give Network Rail sufficient time to take the reasonable steps that they are expected to take to acquire the land by agreement. If subsequently it is not possible to acquire the land by agreement it should be included in a further later Order.
- Very limited information has been made available to the parties about the proposed Scheme, when the property would be needed and what importance it has to Network Rail's wider aspirations.
- Network Rail had failed to demonstrate what alternatives (if any) had been considered and/ or already discounted. Until justification is provided it is difficult to ascertain whether there are suitable alternatives to compulsory acquisition, whether the land is actually needed or whether a lesser area could be acquired to achieve the same effect.

129. Although no agreement was reached by the time of the Inquiry UBS did not participate in the Inquiry.

REBUTTAL BY THE APPLICANT

130. Network Rail responded to the main grounds of objection both before and during the Inquiry. The material points are as follows.

131. In respect of USF's objection (OBJ-2) about additional wear and tear, Network Rail has been using this access point on a weekly to daily basis for railway maintenance purposes for over 20 years¹⁰². Moreover, the new substation would not result in a significant increase on the use of the road. Routine maintenance of the substation equipment is on a two- and four-year cycle which includes visual inspection monthly and a daily inspection for a period of a week every two years both of which involve access with one vehicle. Network Rail would be amenable to making a fair share maintenance cost contribution based on use and has offered to do so¹⁰³.

¹⁰¹ OBJ-03

¹⁰² Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 10.3.1.2

¹⁰³ Mr Mole's PoE paragraph 10.3.1.2

132. In relation to its future access. Network Rail has several access points across the railway network that have gates/ barriers etc where it is provided with keys/ codes or has a shared locking system. Thus, any future access control system implemented by the landowners would not be a concern for Network Rail. As a considerate neighbour Network Rail has no intention to cause any disruption or to obstruct other users at this location. As part of Network Rail's Engineering and Social Management Plan¹⁰⁴ process all neighbouring landowners who may be potentially affected by significant engineering works are notified of the nature and duration of the works and this would be the case for the owners and operators of the North Orbital Commerce Park at Napsbury Lane¹⁰⁵.
133. Table 3 of Network Rail's Statement of Case¹⁰⁶ challenges the position of UBS that insufficient steps were made to acquire the land by agreement noting that no correspondence was received from the landowner until an objection was made to the draft Order. Numerous attempts were made by Network Rail and its agencies to contact UBS without success. Network Rail also challenged the assumption that the right of access was not required imminently, stating that it is needed to facilitate ongoing access to the railway including the electrical substation installed in 2023 and to provide access to the railway in the event of an emergency. Moreover, Network Rail is seeking the right of access in common with other existing users and is not proposing to take exclusive access.
134. Network Rail disputed that insufficient information was available, noting that it had made an offer to UBS on 28 January 2025 and negotiations were continuing with regard to detailed arrangements. With regard to alternative options, Network Rail's position was that the UBS land was required to provide an efficient route of access from the public highway to the railway, providing no disruption to existing users. Alternative access options would require the construction of a new access to the substation over privately owned land which would be more disruptive, involve permanent third-party land take and create an exclusive right of access. It would also potentially require the temporary blockade of the railway which would be more disruptive and expensive than the use of Napsbury Lane.
135. The acquisition of a non-exclusive permanent right of access over an existing private road in common with other users would not cause disruption to existing users. The regularising of this unrestricted access over an existing route which Network Rail has enjoyed would not significantly change the current situation, and would provide the necessary certainty for Network Rail's delivery and operation of the Scheme and the MML programme as a whole¹⁰⁷.

INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS

136. I have considered the matters arising from the proposed Transport and Works Act Order. In these conclusions, references denoted thus **[XX]** at the end of a paragraph refer to previous paragraphs of this report.

¹⁰⁴ NR-42

¹⁰⁵ Mr Mole's PoE section 10.3.1

¹⁰⁶ NR-10

¹⁰⁷ Mr Mole's PoE section 10.3.2

The need for the Scheme to achieve the aims and objectives of Midland Main Line electrification and improvement and a right of access at Napsbury Lane (Matter 1)

137. The need for the Scheme is based on the identified programme set out in the Department for Transport's High-Level Output Statement to meet demand growth and support economic growth. It is also driven by the overall MMLe programme which aims for electrification of the MML south of Wigston to London St Pancras. The Scheme would address overcrowding, support modal shift of freight from road to rail, improve the station environment for passengers and reduce costs of services. Most significantly, the Scheme assists the decarbonisation of transport. **[32-35, 40 and 42]**
138. The Scheme is also supported by a range of planning and transport policies which would provide a sustainable public transport network to unlock demand in the economy leading to economic growth. **[36]**
139. None of the objections questioned the need for the Scheme as part of the wider MMLe programme. Similarly, there were no objections to the acquisition of land in principle and the only remaining objections at the end of the Inquiry related to securing rights of access to Network Rail's land at the Napsbury Lane site. **[44]**

Compliance with all statutory procedural requirements and whether sufficient information was available to parties (Matter 2)

140. Network Rail has confirmed that the application has been made in accordance with all statutory procedural requirements. Additionally, a Consultation Report clarifies how Network Rail has engaged with local authorities, landowners and the public generally. While UBS indicated that information was limited there is little evidence to support this view as shown by Network Rail's response. On this basis I consider that all statutory requirements have been met and that sufficient information was available to parties about the Scheme. **[45, 128 and 134]**

The main alternatives including any alternatives not requiring compulsory acquisition (Matter 3)

141. The remit which Network Rail received from the Department for Transport explicitly instructed that no alternatives to electrification should be considered. Consequently, the consideration of options should be seen in this context. **[46]**
142. Alternatives considered at each bridge location to accommodate the additional headroom clearances required for the overhead line electrification included track lowering and harnessing the improved capability of bi-modal trains to change between electric/ diesel over relatively short stretches. In respect of accommodation overbridges, alternatives included the offline/ online construction of adjacent bridges, alteration to proposed access routes and access methods and the potential for release of rights by agreement. For each site adequate evidence is presented of the detailed assessment of each option and the reasons why they were not pursued. **[47-62]**

143. Although Network Rail requires compulsory purchase powers to facilitate the Scheme the powers can be considered as a backstop to deliver and secure the Scheme and the wider benefits of the MMLe. **[88]**

144. At Napsbury Lane, in addition to considering potential alternative options for the location of the substation evidence was presented to indicate alternative access to the substation by means other than by road. Other trackside access points to reach the railway were also considered. None of these options provided realistic alternatives to Network Rail's proposal and Network Rail has engaged with both USF and UBS to address their concerns and avoid the need for the compulsory acquisition of rights. **[63-65]**

The likely impact of the exercise of the powers on landowners, local businesses and residents (Matter 4)

145. The only outstanding physical works associated with the Scheme are at the Three Arch Bridge site. In that situation the original objection by National Grid has now been withdrawn as agreement has been reached in terms of the securing of access rights although Network Rail proposes to retain the compulsory acquisition powers in the Order as a fallback position. **[66]**

146. In respect of the Napsbury Lane site where there are two outstanding objections, the rights of access which are sought through the Order would regularise a situation which has existed for many years. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Network Rail's use of the Lane in the past has had an adverse impact. Moreover, compensation would be payable through the Order provisions where Network Rail compulsorily acquires easements or other rights, and should an easement inhibit access to the estate in the future that could provide the basis of a compensation claim. **[67-68]**

147. At Pipewell Bridge, Newtons Bridge, Three Arch Bridge and Glen Station Road Bridge agreements have been reached with affected landowners and/ or relevant landowners have not objected to the Order. **[69-71]**

The effects of the Scheme on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities and other utility providers (Matter 5)

148. The rights of statutory undertakers to maintain their apparatus would not be affected by the Order. Additionally, there would be no negative impacts on statutory undertakers, statutory utilities or other utility providers and the Scheme would not impact on their ability to carry out their undertakings effectively, safely and in compliance with any statutory or contractual obligations. **[72-73]**

149. While the Order includes land owned by National Grid which would be affected by the acquisition of land and rights, the land is not operational land and would not impact on their ability to carry out their undertakings. At Glen Station Road Bridge, Pipewell Bridge and Newtons Bridge the works have been planned and/ or implemented to enable the onward dedication of Order Land to the respective local highway authority to enable them to properly fulfil their statutory functions. On this basis, and the fact that no other statutory undertaker, statutory utility or utility provider objected to the Order I find that there would be no adverse impact on the interests of such bodies. **[73-76]**

Compulsory purchase powers (Matter 6)

Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest

150. In facilitating the delivery of enhanced rail services as part of the MML programme and bringing about economic and environmental benefits the need for the Scheme is pressing and immediate. The land within the Order limits is required to authorise Network Rail to permanently acquire land or rights or to temporarily use land in connection with the Scheme. Evidence has been provided to justify the powers sought including why all the land and rights sought are necessary and no more than required. Where it is possible to undertake works or secure rights or land without compulsory acquisition Network Rail has done so.

[77-80]

151. Network Rail has sought to negotiate with affected landowners to reach agreement in accordance with Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process while recognising the need for the powers in the Order in providing an important safeguard so that the Scheme can be delivered. Provision is made for compensation to be paid where the case is made for overriding private rights in the land to be acquired. The Order is required to implement the Scheme to enable Network Rail to operate, inspect and maintain the railway and to ensure that the land on which apparatus is installed can be acquired and subsequently dedicated to the local highway authority to fulfil its statutory duties. On this basis and in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary I find that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of land and rights. Moreover, Network Rail has provided clear justification for the need for the land to be acquired. **[82-89]**

Human rights considerations

152. Based on the compelling case for compulsory acquisition, interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land affected is justified. The interference with Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act is engaged and having taken account of the public and private interests involved the case for compulsory acquisition has been made. The need for the Scheme as part of the wider MML programme is clear and the benefits are considerable. The interference with the Article 1 rights is proportionate, lawful, limited in extent and mitigated as far as possible. Where acquisition is necessary compensation will be payable in accordance with the Compensation Code. **[90-92]**

Whether there are likely to be any impediments to implementing the Scheme including the availability of funding

153. No further planning approvals are likely to be required to exercise the powers necessary to implement the Scheme. Furthermore, there is no indication that there are any outstanding requirements which could impede the implementation of the remaining elements of the Scheme. Network Rail has provided evidence that the necessary approvals have been secured for the electrification of the MML to Wigston South Junction and that funding has been secured to implement the Scheme. **[93-94]**

Whether all the land and rights over land are necessary to implement the Scheme

154. Network Rail has sought to deliver the Scheme through licences or other arrangements where possible and where it has been necessary to include land in the Order, has sought to minimise the land required. Justification has been provided for the inclusion of each individual plot required to implement the Scheme including the purpose for which each plot is required. Evidence has also been presented to show how negotiations with landowners about the amount of land or rights required in each case have evolved. No evidence has been provided that any land take or rights sought is excessive or unnecessary. **[95-113]**
155. In respect of Napsbury Lane where there are two remaining objections, I find that Network Rail has sought to engage with the objectors without success and has appropriately considered alternatives to the proposed acquisition of rights at this location. I can identify no realistic alternative approach to meet Network Rail's needs even if the substation had not yet been constructed. **[114-116 and 131-135]**

Other matters (Matter 7)

156. No other matters have been raised by the Applicant or other parties which have not been addressed above. **[117]**

Overall Conclusions

157. I have addressed the relevant matters raised in the above reasoning and find that none of them suggest that the Order should not be made.
158. In the light of the above, I conclude that the Order is justified on its merits and that there is a compelling case in the public interest for making it, with clear evidence that the public benefits from the public transport and environmental benefits would outweigh the harm due to private losses. It would accord with relevant national, regional and local policies. Funding is available for the Scheme and no impediments to its implementation have been identified. Consequently, there is a reasonable prospect of the remaining element of the Scheme to be implemented without delay.
159. I therefore concluded that the Order should be made in the form in which it was proposed without modification.

RECOMMENDATION

160. I recommend that **The Network Rail (Kettering to Wigston South Junction and Napsbury Lane) (Land Acquisition) Order** be made.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR

APPENDIX 1 – APPEARANCES AT THE INQUIRY

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Jacqueline Lean of Counsel

Instructed by Winckworth Sherwood LLP

She called

Robert Russell BSc ChPP MAPM

Senior Sponsor, Network Rail

Steven Philip Jones BSc MICE FPWI

Senior Project Engineer (Structures and
Geotech) and Designated Project
Engineer (Civil Engineering)
Network Rail

Simon Mole BSc MRICS

Partner, Montagu Evans

APPENDIX 2 - INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

General Documents

Reference	Description
GEN-01	Department for Transport Statement of Matters, 15 April 2025
GEN-02	Inspector's Pre-Inquiry Note, issued 27 May 2025
Reference	Description
	Order Application Documents
NR-01	Transport and Works Act Application to the Secretary of State for Land Acquisition Order
NR-02	Draft Order
NR-03	Explanatory Memorandum
NR-04	Statement of Aims
NR-05	Funding Statement
NR-06	Report Summarising Consultations Undertaken
NR-07	Land Plans
NR-08	Book of Reference
NR-09	List of Consents
NR-10	Statement of Case
	Other Supporting Documents
NR-11	The Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004
NR-12	Network Rail Licence

NR-13	Section 8 of the Railways Act 1993
NR-14	The Railway and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (ROGS)
NR-15	Part 8 of Schedule 2 to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (GPDO)
NR-16	Part 18 of Schedule 2 – to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) England Order 2015(GPDO)
NR-17	Section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
NR-18	Management of Health & Safety at Work Regulations 1999
NR-19	National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
NR-20	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects Order (2013)
NR-21	National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014)
NR-22	Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan (2018)
NR-23	Leicester & Leicestershire Economic Growth Strategy (2021 – 2030)
NR-24	Leicestershire Local Transport Plan No.4
NR-25	South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan Vision Statement 2023
NR-26	Hertfordshire Transport Plan No.4 May 2018
NR-27	The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy - July 2016
NR-28	Northamptonshire Transportation Plan
NR-29	North Northamptonshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (September 2017)
NR-30	St Albans District Local Plan
NR-31	Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan
NR-32	Harborough Local Plan
NR-33	National Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016-2021
NR-34	The Network Rail (London to Corby) (Land Acquisition) Order 2020
	Proofs of Evidence Supporting Documents
NR-35	High Level Output Statement for Control Period 5
NR-36	Traction Decarbonisation Network-Strategy - Interim Programme Business Case, 31 July 2020
NR-37	London to Corby Land Acquisition and Bridge Works Order – DfT decision letter, 29 October 2020
NR-38	Eastern Control Period 7 Delivery Plan, March 2024
NR-39	Decarbonising Transport – A Better Greener Britain, DfT 2021
NR-40	CPO Guidance – Update January 2025
NR-41	Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government- Crichel Down Rules (Oct 2024)
NR-42	Network Rail Environment & Social Management Plan, July 2022
NR-43	Drawing No: 3108-MHB-DRG-0001 P02 - Three Arch Replacement Bridge Option 1 (copy)

NR-44	Drawing No: 157897-SCR-DRG-ECV-356100 - Over Bridge 35, Newtons Existing General Arrangement (copy)
NR-45	Drawing No: 157897-SCR-DRG-ECV-356200 - Over Bridge 35, Newtons General Arrangement (copy)
NR-46	Drawing No: 157897-SCR-ZZZZ-SPC3_10-DRG-EHW-000031 - Station Road VRS and Fencing
	Proofs of Evidence
NR-W1.1	Witness 1- Robert Russell, Senior Sponsor, Network Rail (Needs Case) Proof of Evidence
NR-W1.2	Witness 1- Robert Russell, Senior Sponsor, Network Rail (Needs Case) Summary Proof of Evidence
NR-W2.1	Witness 2 - Steven Jones, Senior Project Engineer, Network Rail (Engineering Proof of Evidence)
NR-W2.2	Witness 2 - Steven Jones, Senior Project Engineer, Network Rail (Engineering) Summary Proof of Evidence
NR-W3.1	Witness 3 - Simon Mole, Partner, Montagu Evans (Property) Proof of Evidence
NR-W3.2	Witness 3 - Simon Mole, Partner, Montagu Evans (Property) Summary Proof of Evidence

OTHER PARTIES' DOCUMENTS

Reference	Description
OBJ-01.1	Objection on behalf on National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC, 18 December 2024
OBJ-01.2	Withdrawal of Objection on behalf on National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC, letter dated 29 May 2025
OBJ-02.1	Objection on behalf of USF Nominees Ltd, 23 December 2024
OBJ-02.2	Statement of Case on behalf of USF Nominees Ltd, 4 March 2025
OBJ-02.3	Position Statement on behalf of USF Nominees Ltd, 3 June 2024
OBJ-03	Objection on behalf of UBS Triton General Partner Ltd, 20 December 2024

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

Reference	Description
INQ/01.1	Network Rail: Draft Filled Order (Clean Copy), 4 June 2025
INQ/01.2	Network Rail: Draft Filled Order (Tracked Copy), 4 June 2025
INQ/01.3	Network Rail: Note to Inquiry on Filled Order Amendments
INQ/02	Network Rail: Bundle Confirming Procedures Compliance
INQ/03	Network Rail: Bundle of Correspondence with Objectors
INQ/04	Network Rail: Pipewell Road Bridge Plans
INQ/05	Network Rail: Opening Statement

INQ/06	Network Rail: Railway Clauses Consolidation Act 1845
INQ/07	Network Rail: Closing Submissions