
CLOSING SUBMISSIONS

on the behalf of the

Welsh GOVERNMENT

M4 Corridor Around Newport, Newport

Public Local Inquiry

Note: this is the revised version of the Closing Submissions which addresses the typographical errors that were noted during the delivery of the speech on 28 March 2018

PINS reference number: APP/E6840/V/17/3166811

Called-in Listed Building Application for Woodland House reference number: DC/2016/01033

Highways Schemes

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) Scheme 201-

The London To Fishguard Trunk Road (East Of Magor To Castleton) Order 201-

The M4 Motorway (West Of Magor To East Of Castleton) And The A48(M) Motorway (West Of Castleton To St Mellons) (Variation Of Various Schemes) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) (Supplementary) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) (Amendment) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) (Supplementary) (No.2) Scheme 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Amendment) (No. 2) Scheme 201-

The Side Roads Orders

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) And The London To Fishguard Trunk Road (East Of Magor To Castleton) (Side Roads) Order 201-

The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) And The London To Fishguard Trunk Road (East Of Magor To Castleton) (Supplementary) (Side Roads) Order 201-

The Compulsory Purchase Orders

**The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) And The London To Fishguard Trunk Road (East Of Magor To Castleton))
Compulsory Purchase Order 201-**

**The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) To West Of Junction 29 (Castleton) And Connecting Roads) And The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East Of Magor) Connecting Road) And The London To Fishguard Trunk Road (East Of Magor To Castleton))
Supplementary Compulsory Purchase Order 201-**

**The Welsh Ministers (the M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard trunk road (East of Magor to Castleton))
Supplementary (no. 2) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-**

**The Welsh Ministers (the M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and connecting roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard trunk road (East of Magor to Castleton))
Supplementary (no. 3) Compulsory Purchase Rrder 201-**

**The Welsh Ministers (the M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard trunk road (East of Magor to Castleton))
Supplementary (no. 4) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-**

M4 CaN

CLOSING SUBMISSIONS on behalf of the WELSH GOVERNMENT

INTRODUCTION

1. The M4 is a route of strategic importance. It is critical to the Welsh economy and society, linking two thirds of the Welsh nation to Wales' largest trading partner. It connects the capital city of the Welsh nation with the capital city of the UK and takes travellers to and from the Valleys and West Wales, for business, social, cultural and tourist purposes. The M4 directly serves institutions which are central to defining the nation's identity and developing its future – its devolved Assembly, leading universities, hospitals and colleges, concert halls, Swansea Bay City Region, Cardiff Capital City Region, National Botanic Gardens and its sports stadia including Principality Stadium, home of the Welsh Rugby Union, a supporter of the Scheme. The proper functioning of this road is

- fundamental to the well-being of the nation – economically, socially, culturally.
2. But there is a huge problem. The existing M4 between Magor and Castleton does not meet modern motorway design standards and a greater volume of traffic uses the motorway than that for which it was originally designed. Around 100,000 vehicles per day use the M4 and the transport related problems are only getting worse, with population and traffic levels continuing to grow in Wales. Congestion, with frequent incidents, is a daily occurrence. These characteristics bring adverse economic and environmental impacts. Really serious hold-ups are a fact of life. When they occur, this critically important corridor grinds to a halt, with traffic chaos spilling out into Newport and surrounding areas.
 3. The Scheme is proposed because of the manifest inadequacies of this stretch of the M4. It is WG's case that the evidence heard at this Inquiry proves that there is a pressing problem demanding a solution, that the only practical solution is one which involves an increase in road capacity and that the Scheme is preferable to the various alternatives which have been advanced. Furthermore, with the removal of the Severn crossing tolls, the economic and traffic case for the Scheme is strengthened.
 4. The engineering of the Scheme comprises the following principal components:
 - A new section of dual three-lane motorway to the South of Newport connecting to the existing route at junctions 23 and 29. The 23 kilometre route of three-lane motorway would pass south of Newport, crossing the Gwent Levels, River Usk Estuary, Newport Docks, close to the

Llanwern Steelworks site and the Docks Way landfill site. To cross the River Usk, the motorway would be raised on approach viaducts and a cable stayed bridge.

- Re-classification of the existing M4 around the north of Newport between junctions 23 and 29 as a trunk road, with changes to lane configurations. The existing A48(M) between junction 29 and St. Mellons in Cardiff would also be reclassified. The road between Junction 24 (Coldra) and Junction 23 (Magor) would become a two-lane dual carriageway.
 - A new B4245/M48/M4 connection at Junction 23 which would reduce traffic through Magor and improve accessibility, including to the Severn Tunnel Junction railway station.
 - A new interchange junction at Castleton would connect the proposed new motorway to the existing M4 between Newport and Cardiff and to the reclassified A48(M).
 - Intermediate junctions at Glan Llyn and Docks Way would connect into existing roads at the A4810 and A48, serving Newport and its development sites, and Newport Docks
 - Re-opening of the west facing slip roads of Junction 25 (Caerleon), improving access to Caerleon and the St. Julians areas of Newport.
5. Opponents of the Scheme have generally been reluctant to acknowledge the environmental benefits which it would bring, notably in terms of improved air quality and noise conditions for the thousands of people who live close to the current, overloaded M4.

6. By contrast, WG's professional team has been open about the environmental impacts of the proposals throughout the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") and Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment ("SIAA") processes and in its evidence to the inquiry, including the Ecosystems Services Appraisal ("ESA"). Effects have been assessed throughout on a precautionary basis.
7. Following the failed challenge to the strategic Plan for a solution to the problems, mounted on SSSI and other environmental grounds¹, great attention has been paid, as the Scheme has been developed, to its design and to the mitigation of adverse environmental effects, reflecting the acknowledged sensitivity of much of the proposed route. Ecological mitigation measures would, given time, contribute positively to the environment and to biodiversity, in particular, by means of three SSSI mitigation areas and management of Coed Mawr woodland as dormouse habitat (part of a comprehensive package of measures for this species). Continuity of the Levels' characteristic network of reens and ditches and quality of the water going into them from the road have been addressed in minute detail by a multi-disciplinary team of environmental and construction engineers in consultation with WG's ecologists and NRW. Rather than simply demolishing the G2 listed Woodland House (known locally as 'Magor Vicarage'), WG has worked, in collaboration with Monmouthshire County Council ("MCC"), to identify a new site to which it is committed to moving the building, should MCC grant the necessary consents; other heritage features also have their own bespoke mitigation measures.

¹ Alleged failure to carry out Strategic Environmental Assessment properly and alleged failure to comply with statutory duties in relation to SSSIs. Breach of the Government's duties in relation to carbon reduction (the latter ground was withdrawn): CD. 4.5.45

Contrary, perhaps, to popular impressions, the Scheme would, in time, be carbon neutral as a result of user emissions reductions on the shorter route offsetting construction emissions.

8. Many of those who presented evidence to the inquiry have objected to the *idea* of the Scheme without doing justice to its detail; there have been suggestions that the proposals, as a matter of principle and law, are inconsistent with environmental legislation. Those contentions are wrong, as we shall demonstrate. The time for challenging the *idea* of the Plan for this road is past; the judicial review tested the Plan on a number of alleged environmental grounds and it was roundly dismissed. The Ministerial decision must now be made on the basis of the Scheme as it has actually been developed and designed. It is, in truth, a very special Scheme, imbued with Future Generations principles. It is an exemplar in the sense that where a new road or motorway is necessary and justified, it should be designed to the same high standards as the published Scheme. It offers the chance to solve serious problems facing Wales now whilst preserving the essential integrity of the areas through which it would pass for handing on to future generations.

THE SCHEMES, ORDERS and LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION

9. A comprehensive list of the Schemes and Orders is set out in the section below, together with their dates of publication and the statutory powers relied on for each.

10. In addition to draft Schemes and Orders, there is also an application for Listed Building Consent (“LBC”) which has been called in for the Welsh Ministers’ determination.
11. The various Schemes and Orders have generated representations of support and objection. At the end of the inquiry, the global tally stands at 216 supporters and 319 unique objectors (i.e. those who have submitted individual objections with 6189 being the total objections including campaigns).
12. Many of these people have chosen to leave their representations in writing only. Others have appeared at the inquiry.
13. Annex 1 appended to these Submissions lists each unique objection and charts where, in Welsh Government’s (“WG”) evidence, the objections have been specifically addressed. Inevitably, there is a fair degree of overlap and repetition of points of objection, not least because thousands (4859) of objections are in a standard form from an RSPB campaign. These Submissions will deal with the main points of support and objection in the context of the network of statutory provisions which govern the decision-making process.

STATUTORY POWERS and TESTS

14. We referred in the last paragraph to a “*network*” of statutory provisions and the statutory context here is undoubtedly complex.
15. To help simplify matters, we shall present the statutory material and supporting analysis in the following way:

- (1) Identify the Scheme / Order making/confirming powers under the Highways Act 1980 (“HA 1980”)
- (2) Set out and address the statutory requirements which must be met to support confirmation of the HA 1980 Schemes / Orders
- (3) Set out the statutory framework for determination of the LBC application and analyse the evidence in relation to it
- (4) Identify and analyse the relevant overarching environmental and other legal duties informing the process of determination.

Draft Highway Schemes and Orders

16. There are six Schemes and one Order which will, if confirmed, become Statutory Instruments pursuant to section 325 HA 1980. These are:

- a) ***The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor)) Connecting Road) Scheme 201-***

This is the main Scheme for the M4CaN which will be a special road. It was published on 10 March 2016, together with the Environmental Statement (“ES”). The period for making representations closed on 4 May 2016. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 to the Act apply and, s. 105A imposes a requirement to carry out environmental assessment not later than the date of publication. Section 105A and 105B require the WG to undertake an

environmental assessment (“EIA”) of the project, publish notice of it and make the ES available to the public.

b) *The London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Order 201-*

This directs that the new road, slip roads and certain lengths of existing highway shall become trunk roads, with provision being directed as to their maintenance. The Order was published on 10 March 2016 together with the ES. The period for making representations closed on 4 May 2016 It was made under sections 10 and 41 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 to the Act and sections 105A and 105B (EIA) apply.

c) *The M4 Motorway (West of Magor to East of Castleton) and the A48(M) Motorway (West of Castleton to St Mellons) (Variation of Various Schemes) Scheme 201-*

This varies the original M4 Scheme taking the relevant stretch of the existing M4 out of the special road category and making it into a Trunk road. The Variation was published on 10 March 2016, together with the ES. The period for making representations closed on 4 May 2016. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 326 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 and sections 105A and B of the Act (EIA) apply.

d) *The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Supplementary) Scheme 201-*

This provides for temporary restrictions on navigation in the Rivers Ebbw and Usk during construction of the bridges. The Supplementary Scheme was published on 5 September 2016, together with an Environmental Statement Supplement (“ESS 1”) and the period for making representations closed on 17 October 2016. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 to the Act and sections 105A and 105B (EIA) apply.

e) *The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Amendment) Scheme 201-*

This provides for raising of the proposed bridge, as explained below. The Amendment Scheme was published on 14 December 2016, together with an Environmental Statement Supplement (“ESS 2”). The period for making representations closed on 31 January 2017. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 to the Act and sections 105A and 105B (EIA) apply.

f) *The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Supplementary) (No.2) Scheme 201-*

This makes provision for the provision of an eastbound off slip at Magor to connect with the A4810 at a roundabout with the B4245 which leads to Junction 23A at Magor Services. It

also amends the Supplementary Scheme Order published on 5 September 2016 so as to include a reference to Newport Docks as navigable waters. The scheme was published on 21 March 2017 together with an Environmental Statement Supplement (“ESS 3”). The period for making representations closed on 10 May 2017. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 and sections 105A and 105B (EIA) apply.

g) *The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and The M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) (Amendment) (No. 2) Scheme 201-*

This amends all the draft schemes above to provide for the carrying out of a narrowing of the navigable waterway known as Junction Cut within Newport Docks to 11m as part of a Special Road. This scheme was published on 15 August 2017 together with an Environmental Statement Supplement (“ESS 5”). The period for making representations closed on 26 September 2017. The powers relied on were sections 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980. The procedural requirements of Schedule 1 and sections 105A and 105B (EIA) apply.

17. There are also two draft Side Roads Orders:

a) *The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and The London to Fishguard Trunk*

Road (East of Magor to Castleton) (Side Roads) Order 201-²

b) The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads) and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) (Supplementary) (Side Roads) Order 201-

18. The first of these Orders makes provision carrying out for improvements of highways; to stop up highways or areas of highways; to construct new highways; to stop up private means of access to premises; to provide new means of access to premises; and to construct temporary lengths of highways. It was published, together with the ES, on 10 March 2016.
19. The second provides for the stopping up of private means of access to premises, and makes provision for new means of access to premises within Newport Docks. It was published, together with a Supplemental Environmental Statement (“ESS 4”) on 20 April 2017.
20. The periods for making representations closed on 4 May 2016 and 1 June 2017 respectively. The initial Side Roads Order was made under sections 12, 14, 18, 125 and 268 HA 1980. The Supplementary Side Roads Order was made under sections 18 and 125 HA 1980. The procedural provisions set out in Schedule 1 to the Act apply.
21. The basic power for making the draft Schemes is s.16(3) Highways Act 1980 (“HA 1980”), which provides as follows:

“A highway authority may be authorised by means of a scheme under this section to provide, along a route prescribed by the scheme, a special road for the use of traffic of any class prescribed thereby.”

² Mod19 which modifies the SRO (of which two revisions were prepared) is explained in PIQ122. The PIQ confirms that NCC did not object to the proposal.

22. The Welsh Ministers are the relevant highway authority.³
23. The supplementary powers invoked in sections 17, 19 and 41 HA 1980 deal with the classification of vehicles that will be permitted to use the new road and achieve trunk road status for the new road. There are no procedural requirements associated with the use of these powers which are, essentially, ancillary to s.16 and follow from the making of the Scheme.
24. S.106 HA 1980, which was relied on for the making of Schemes and Orders **a) d) e) f) and g)**, provides as follows (so far as relevant):

S.106(1) – *“Provision may be made by an order made by the Minister under this subsection or under section 10 above (orders for trunk roads) for the construction of a bridge over or a tunnel under any specified navigable waters as part of a trunk road”.*

S.106(4) – *“Provision may be made by an order under section 14 above (roads that cross or join trunk or classified roads) or section 18 above (supplementary orders relating to special roads) – (a) for the construction of a bridge over or tunnel under specified navigable waters as part of a highway which is to be altered or constructed in pursuance of the order); (b) where the order authorises the highway authority by whom it is made to provide a new means of access to any premises from a highway, for the access to be provided by means of a bridge over specified navigable waters and for the construction of the bridge”.*

S.106(5) – *“Parts I and III of Schedule 1 to this Act have effect as to the making of an order under subsection (1) above, Parts II and III of that*

³ Though the convention throughout the inquiry has been to refer to the scheme – proposing arm as “*Welsh Government*” and the Scheme-confirming arm as “*Welsh Ministers*”.

Schedule have effect as to the making of a scheme under subsection (3) above and Schedule 2 to this Act has effect as to the validity and date of operation of any such order or scheme”.

S.106(7) – “References in this section, in relation to any order or scheme, to specified navigable waters are references to such navigable waters (whether the sea, a river or other waters) as may be specific in the order or scheme”.

25. S. 107 HA 1980 provides as follows:

(1) Before making or confirming an order or scheme which provides for the construction of a bridge over or a tunnel under navigable waters, the Minister shall take into consideration the reasonable requirements of navigation over the waters affected by the order or scheme.

(2) an order or scheme which provides for the construction of such a bridge shall include such plans and specifications as may be necessary to indicate the position and dimensions of the proposed bridge including its spans, headways and waterways, and in the case of a swing bridge shall contain such provisions as the Minister considers expedient for regulating its operation.

(3) an order or scheme which provides for the construction of such a tunnel shall include such plans and specifications as may be necessary to indicate the position and dimensions of the proposed tunnel, including its depth below the bed of the navigable waters.

(4) if objection to an order or scheme proposed to be made or, as the case may be, to an order of scheme made and proposed to be confirmed, is duly made in accordance with Schedule 1 to this Act by

the Environment Agency, the Natural Resources Body for Wales or any navigation authority on whom notice is required to be served under paragraph 3 or, as the case may be, paragraph 11 of that Schedule, on the ground that the bridge or tunnel is likely to obstruct or impede the performance of their functions under any enactment, or to interfere with the reasonable requirements of navigation over the waters affected by the order or scheme, as the case may be, and the objection is not withdrawn, the order or scheme, as the case may be, shall be subject to special parliamentary procedure.

26. S.326 HA 1980 grants the power of variation which is being exercised in relation to the existing M4. By s.326(2), this power may be exercised in the same way and subject to the same provisions as for making a scheme.
27. Schedule I to HA 1980 lays down procedural requirements in respect of the making and confirmation of schemes under sections 16 and 106 and orders under sections 10, 14 and 18. Decisions under sections 14, 16, 18 and 125 involve the determination of civil rights within the meaning of Art.6 to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”); the procedural protections afforded by Schedules 1 and 2 to the Highways Act ensure compatibility with the Convention⁴. These procedural provisions have been followed in relation to public notice and the holding of the inquiry⁵. Human Rights are dealt with in greater detail later in the closing statement.
28. Schedule 1 paragraphs 8 and 15 provide for the Minister to confirm scheme/s and order/s with or without modification. Where s/he proposes to

⁴ R(Alconbury Developments) v. Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [2001]WLR 1389

⁵ WG 1.1.1: Matthew Jones Proof, para. 6.20

confirm schemes or orders subject to modifications, and the modifications will, in his/her opinion, make a substantial change in the scheme or orders, s/he must notify anyone who appears to him/her likely to be affected by the proposed modification/s and give him/her an opportunity to make representations on them which s/he must then consider.

29. There are many minor Modifications which have been proposed mostly to mitigate practical difficulties which individuals have brought to WG's attention after publication of the Scheme. All such Modifications have been presented to the Inquiry and are published on the Inquiry website. They are listed in ID242. Modifications in the minor category have all been the subject of discussion with relevant landowners and have, in many instances, led to whole or partial withdrawal of objections. The consultative process leading to the Modifications in this category has formed an important part of the work undertaken by WG to ensure that the interference with individuals' human rights rendered necessary by the Scheme is as limited as possible and, hence, proportionate and justifiable under the Convention and domestic Human Rights legislation.
30. A few Modifications are of wider interest and have also been the subject of evidence and discussion at the inquiry.
31. Scheme Modification 1 is proposed to the draft Scheme, changing the layout of the Docks Junction and link road and the designation of Glan Llyn Link road. Both, instead of being special roads, would be trunk roads and are therefore removed from the draft Scheme via a modification, and are added to the Line Order by a modification of that Order. This Modification was proposed and published on 5th September 2016, before the start of the

- inquiry, was the subject of consultation with statutory and other bodies and written evidence and discussion at the inquiry. No objections specifically to Scheme Modification 1 or the Line Order modification have been made, however general objections to the Scheme and the proposed junction strategy have been made since the publication of these two modifications.
32. Modification 2 is proposed to the Amendment (No.2) Scheme (item **g** above). It modifies the earlier Scheme by increasing the size of Junction Cut from 11m to 13.5m. In other words, it reduces the total amount of narrowing formerly proposed so that the inhibition to shipping would be less. This revised proposal reflects the work done since September 2017 by WG and ABP to assess and address the risk of large ships colliding with the proposed motorway bridge, as confirmed orally at the public inquiry by Andrew Tait QC on behalf of ABP⁶ and in writing by WG and ABP by means of ID/239, presented to the inquiry on 21.3.2018, which introduced the necessary Modifications⁷. WG's view is that a width of junction cut of 13.5m does not raise unacceptable safety concerns. In addition, the powers of ABP, a statutory harbour authority are underpinned by a range of national legislation which places statutory responsibility on ABP to ensure navigation safety within harbour limits. As a result, in due course, further mitigation measures would be implemented by ABP.
33. Associated Modifications are proposed to the Supplementary No.3 and No.4 CPOs (CPO Modification 77A and 80) and these will be listed below in the CPO section of these submissions; they were presented to the Inquiry on the same day as the Modification to the Scheme).

⁶ On 31 January 2018
⁷ Submitted 21.3.2018

Representations were not sought and were not required by the legislation for the reasons set out in ID/239, namely:

(i) the publication of updated evidence on the part of the Welsh Government on 20 December 2017, when the possibility of the widening of the width of junction cut to 13.5m from the original 11m was explained in some detail;

(ii) on 25 October 2017, the Welsh Government published a supplement to the Environmental Statement which contained its risk assessment of the proposed widening of junction cut from the original proposal;

(iii) all port related tenants and occupiers, in addition to the usual statutory and other consultees were provided with a copy of that evidence;

(iv) the publication of the Supplement to the Environmental Statement was advertised;

(v) no response has been received and not withdrawn raising the potential widening of junction cut to 13.5m from 11m as a ground of continuing objection; and

(vi) the Welsh Government scheme evidence update was read in and subjected to questions of clarification at the public inquiry over two days on 27 and 28 February 2018.

34. Modifications have also been proposed for the draft Side Roads Order. SRO Modification 5 amends the layout of the Side Roads proposals for Bencroft Lane,⁸ east of Magor. This modification was published on 5 September 2016 and included in the accompanying ESS Supplement 19,

⁸ Bencroft Lane was also incorporated as part of the supplementary CPO

⁹ CD 2.4.4

- before the start of the inquiry and sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees, and has been the subject of written evidence and discussion at it.
35. SRO Modification 17 amends the side roads proposals around Newport Road roundabout, west of Magor, to accommodate the eastbound off-slip proposed in the Supplementary No.2 Scheme Order published on 21 March 2017. SRO Modification 17 was sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees. This modification was also published on 21 March 2017 with an accompanying ESS Supplement (No.3)¹⁰ and has been the subject of amended Proofs of Evidence and of discussion at the inquiry.
36. The third, referenced as SRO Modification 18, amends the Order so as to permit a new means of access into land south of the former Llanwern Steelworks to enable vehicles to enter that land for the purpose of environmental mitigation, the details of which have been the subject of extensive discussion with NRW and RSPB and are set out in the draft Bird Protection and Mitigation Plan¹¹. The only persons likely to be affected by the proposed Modification are Newport City Council (“NCC”) as Highways Authority for the road from which access would be taken and Tata Steel as the owner of the land to be served, together with two statutory undertakers, National Grid Electricity Transmission and Western Power Distribution, and also SURF Telecom ¹² who have overhead lines in the vicinity. All these parties have been made aware of the proposed Order (and an associated Modification to the CPO) and have signified in writing that they do not object. There is therefore no need to publicise the Modification any further).

¹⁰ CD 2.5.1

¹¹ PID187a revised

¹² SURF Telecom are not a statutory undertaker.

- The effect of including this land as essential mitigation for cranes (and other wildlife) is described in the Bird Protection and Mitigation Plan which is environmental information before the Inquiry.
37. As noted above, two further changes to the Scheme were published before the inquiry. Firstly, a Supplement, making provision for temporary restrictions over the navigable channels of the Rivers Ebbw and Usk during construction, was published on 5th September 2016, the objection period ending on 17th October 2016. Barry Woodman outlined the proposed method of construction in his proof¹³ and oral evidence, and this is described in the Buildability Report.¹⁴
38. Secondly, by an Amendment to the draft Scheme¹⁵, published on 14th December 2016 with an ESS (No.2), the height of the proposed crossing of the Usk was raised by a minimum of 1.54m. This amendment was made in response to information received from ABP after publication of the draft Scheme to the effect that water in the docks is currently maintained at a height of 7.74m (AOD), which is greater than the design height used by WG. ABP also informed WG of their intention to provide new outer lock gates at the entry to South Dock which would, together with associated changes to the other lock gates, enable ABP to raise the dock water level to 8.40m (AOD). ABP's proposals are in response to anticipated climate change and Paul Canning assesses their robustness in the light of Government climate change guidance, concluding that the proposed crest level of 8.41m AOD reasonably accounts for predicted climate change.¹⁶

¹³ WG 1.6.1 pp.78-84

¹⁴ Buildability Report, ES Vol.3, Appx 3.1 (Doc 2.3.2)

¹⁵ Pursuant to s 16, 17, 19 and 106 HA 1980

¹⁶ WG 1.16.1 pp.40-41; see also Jonathan Vine, WG 1.221 Sections 4.1 and 4.2 for navigational implications.

Taking account of this proposed change and navigational requirements, WG accordingly published amended bridge proposals on 14th December 2016, the period for objection closing on 31st January 2017. The proposed Amendment ensures that the Scheme takes proper account of climate change and the operational requirements of the Docks.

39. Before moving on to address the statutory considerations and tests in relation to the Schemes and Orders under HA 1980, followed by the Compulsory Purchase Orders (“CPOs”), it will be convenient to summarise the position in relation to Newport Docks.
40. ABP objected to the Highway Schemes and Orders and to the CPO, insofar as they related to its statutory undertaking at Newport Docks. They also submitted representations under the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (“ALA 1981”) to the Secretary of State for Transport on the basis of the “*serious detriment*” which they claimed would be caused to their undertaking by the proposed acquisition. Five ABP alternatives (nos. 13 to 17) were proposed.
41. Discussions, which had been in progress before publication of the Schemes and Orders, continued between WG and ABP for the rest of 2017 into early 2018. These discussions eventually bore fruit, in the form of agreement to a proposal from WG comprising (in outline):
 - a) physical changes to and in the vicinity of the Junction Cut to limit the size of ships able to go through it, whether intentionally or not, with supplementary further safety measures;
 - b) physical changes to the docks to provide upgraded berthing facilities in South Dock to mitigate for the reduction in usability of the North Dock as a result of the narrowing of Junction Cut;

- c) the construction of a swing bridge at Junction Cut to address severance issues at the Docks as a result of the Scheme;
- d) provision for supplementary mitigation measures to ensure the continued operation of the Docks (e.g. extra cranes);
- e) provision for ABP and WG to use their best endeavours to relocate port tenants affected by the Scheme to regenerated Docks land to the south of South Dock, supported by a Port Relocation Plan setting out, in principle, how this could be achieved.

42. By their letter of 20 February 2018 to the inspectors, ABP stated: *“on the basis of the agreement reached with the Welsh Ministers, all of the objections and representations that have been submitted on behalf of ABP to the Secretary of State under section 16 of the 1981 Act and to the WG in relation to the Highways and Compulsory Purchase Order insofar as the proposed M4 Relief Road scheme impacts upon ABP’s Port of Newport, were formally withdrawn by a letter dated 2 February 2018”*.¹⁷
43. ABP’s Statement to the Inquiry¹⁸ states: *“Welsh Government initiated extensive discussions with ABP, concerning principally the impacts of the M4 proposals on marine safety, port operations and customers of the Port. This eventually resulted in an offer by WG of a package of measures which is designed to mitigate the serious detriment that would be caused to the Port by the M4CaN scheme and which WG has reflected in its further evidence to the Inquiry in December 2017. The evidence submitted by WG on 20 December 2017 in relation to the Port, indicated that, “Since the publication of the original draft Orders, the WG has also held discussions*

¹⁷ PID/196

¹⁸ Op.cit.

with ABP regarding their operations at Newport Docks and are now proposing to provide the following works to address the impacts of the Scheme a) the phased creation of approximately 303m of new quay on the north side of South Dock, b) Refurbishment of 250m of quay on the south side of South Dock (at the eastern end of the Coal Terminal), c) provision of a moveable bridge to facilitate mobile harbour cranes, other port equipment and HGVs to cross the extended Junction Cut from west to east (and vice versa) of South Dock with associated new roadway to connect into existing port roads, d) preparation of areas of land and provision of premises to facilitate the relocation of ABP, tenants and occupiers of the port that are affected temporarily and permanently by the scheme, including site preparation, new buildings, hardstanding and infrastructure”.

44. Agreements were signed to give effect to these arrangements on 2 February 2018. These agreements address the following matters:

a) the provision of various Port mitigation measures detailed in a Settlement Agreement.

b) a Deed of Indemnity and Insurance from WG to ABP, recognising that the construction, operation, maintenance and use of the motorway and the bridge through Newport Docks may give rise to new risks to operations in the Port and that certain risks may exist to users of the motorway as a result of the operation of, and activities at, the Port.

c) an Access Agreement granting WG rights of access to the Port to carry out various activities before, during and after construction of the M4 Relief Road – for example pre-construction ground investigations,

construction of the motorway bridge and junction and post construction bridge condition monitoring.

45. WG witnesses presented evidence to the inquiry explaining the proposed physical measures at the Docks, the plans for relocating existing tenants, the effects for shipping and the landside functions in the Docks, arrangements and proposals for delivery of the measures and relocations, including consideration of subsequent consenting processes, environmental assessment and implications, financial / economic implications and the relationship to Welsh and UK policy for docks and integrated transport infrastructure. Clearly this was significant new evidence and therefore arrangements were made for witnesses to read it in, taking questions of clarification from the Inspectors and from objectors to the Scheme. Some objectors commented in writing on the proposals for the Docks and these comments were addressed in written rebuttals. All those who submitted written representations on this new evidence were given the opportunity to attend the inquiry, present evidence and cross examine WG witnesses on their rebuttals.
46. More detailed reference will be made to this evidence below¹⁹ and the statutory questions under s.107 HA 1980 addressed there.
47. We turn now to the remaining statutory tests laid down by the HA 1980 in respect of the Highways Schemes and Orders.
48. S.16(8) HA 1980 provides that before making or confirming the Scheme, the Minister “*shall give due consideration to the requirements of local and national planning including the requirements of agriculture*”. This statutory

¹⁹ Para. 5.7.8

requirement has been addressed primarily through the evidence of John Davies MBE and Julia Tindale and by means of the separate Listed Building Consent (“LBC”) inquiry.

49. The phrase “*the requirements of planning*” is not defined and it sets up no answering echo in Town and Country Planning legislation although the specific mention of agriculture reflects the favoured position of this land use in planning legislation which derives from the immediate post Second World War era. National policy now sets out clearly how to balance agricultural and other interests in planning decisions. Planning permission is not required for any of the elements of the Scheme although authorisation will be required in order to implement some of the proposals for reorganisation in the Docks which are now the subject of agreement with ABP. It is envisaged that such authorisation will be achieved using ABP’s statutory powers and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (“GPDO”). These proposals have been the subject of EIA and SIAA in the context of this Inquiry and will be subject to further such assessment as necessary as part of the statutory prior notification procedures under the GPDO. Listed Building Consent is required to authorise demolition of the Grade II Listed Woodland House (known locally as ‘Magor Vicarage’ – henceforth “Magor Vicarage”), which lies on the line of the Scheme.

LOCAL and NATIONAL PLANNING

50. The Scheme straddles two Local Planning Authority (“LPA”) areas, Newport City and Monmouthshire County Councils. The development plans for both have, for many years, protected the Scheme’s route following service by WG and its predecessors of TRIII notices. The object of this procedure is to avoid causing unnecessary blight by means of referral of potentially conflicting planning applications. The procedure also ensures that the Scheme line shows up on searches so that intending purchasers of land are not caught unawares. This latter “*requirement of planning*” is relevant to consideration of Gwent Wildlife Trust’s (“GWT”) position insofar as their objection is based upon their status as a statutory objector by virtue of their ownership of land on the Scheme line in the vicinity of their Magor Marsh Nature Reserve. It is fair to assume, having due regard to the requirements of planning and their Newsletter dating from the same time²⁰, that they purchased the land in knowledge of the Scheme.
51. Both Local Development Plans (“LDPs”) accordingly protect the route.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

52. The legal status of national planning policy in England has recently been clarified by the Supreme Court in Suffolk Coastal DC v Hopkins Homes Ltd; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East BC [2017] UKSC 37 where it was held that the power of the Minister to formulate and adopt national planning policy is derived, expressly or by implication, from the Planning Acts which give him overall responsibility for oversight of the planning system.²¹ In Wales, planning policy is formulated and published

²⁰ ID 74 which was put to Mr Bakere in cross examination by MEQC

²¹ Per Lord Carnwath paras 19-20

- by the Cabinet Secretary for Energy, Planning and Rural Affairs on behalf of the Welsh Government.
53. The legal position in Wales is almost identical, the one exception being the Wales Spatial Plan which the National Assembly for Wales was required to prepare by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.²² That document sets out a strategic framework to guide future development and policy interventions in Wales. It emphasises the importance of connections between Cardiff, Bristol and London and internationally in order to attract inward investment and a high-skilled, high-paid work force. Importantly, this statutory document also identifies the need to alleviate congestion on the M4 around Newport as a key strategic issue. All other planning policy and guidance is issued on the basis explained in Suffolk Coastal.
54. As a general principle, planning law does not prescribe that national planning policy is to be followed in decision making. Decision makers, even in the planning sphere, are not obliged “*slavishly to adhere*” to policy.²³ Therefore, whatever the phrase, “*requirements of local and national planning*” in s.16(8) HA 1980 means, it should not be taken to import a rigid adherence to policy as though it were statute, since that would run counter to the way in which the Town and Country Planning system is operated. “*Due regard*” is a matter for judgment, but cannot sensibly mean applying planning policy more vigorously than those making planning decisions. It is also important to remember, as Mr John Davies MBE pointed out, that the decisions on Schemes and Orders here are not

²² See S.60; this Plan is due to be replaced by the National Development Framework but this is not programmed to be completed before March 2020: CD 5.2.7 para. 2.1

²³ City of Edinburgh Council v Secretary of State for Scotland [1997] UKHL 38 per Lord Hope, citing Lord Guest in Simpson v Edinburgh Corpn 1960 SC 313, 318.

- being made under the Planning Acts, whereas national planning policy is directed towards planning decision makers.
55. National land use policy is set out in Planning Policy Wales (“PPW”) edition 9 (November 2016), supplemented by Technical Advice Notes (“TANs”). Some of the TANs significantly predate PPW. PPW reflects the sustainable development principle of recent Welsh environmental legislation, whereas the older TANs do not. John Davies MBE reviewed the Scheme against PPW (9), also having regard to TANs where relevant.
56. Importantly, PPW (9) specifically refers to and considers the implications of the Well Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (“FGA 2015”) and the Planning (Wales) Act 2015 (“PWA 2015”) which cross refers to it. PPW (9) reminds us that Wales remains one of the few nations in the world to have enshrined the sustainability principle in law.²⁴ Now, it states, s.2(2) PWA has enacted a statutory purpose for planning in Wales. S.2(2) provides as follows:

(2) “the function must be exercised, as part of carrying out sustainable development in accordance with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, for the purpose of ensuring that the development and use of land contribute to improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales.”

57. PPW (9) specifically sets out the Government’s policy under the 2015 legislation insofar as relevant to planning in the context of the seven well-being goals. It sets out that the basic goal of sustainable development is: to

²⁴ CD 5.1.12

“enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising the quality of life of future generations”.²⁵ The document then points the reader to the definition of sustainable development in FGA 2015:

“Sustainable development” means the process of improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales by taking action, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, aimed at achieving the well-being goals. Acting in accordance with the sustainable development principle means that a body must act in a manner which seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’

PPW records that development plans are statutorily required to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development²⁶.

58. Accordingly, whilst it notes that further guidance will be published, there can be no doubt that PPW (9) is fully informed by the sustainability principle of FGA 2015, setting out its implications for planning policy at a national level.
59. A draft version of PPW edition 10 is now undergoing public consultation. Mr John Davies MBE has considered the draft document, albeit that little

²⁵ Para 4.1.1 PPW (9)

²⁶ For forthcoming LDPs, a sustainability duty is contained in the Planning (Wales) Act 2015. The adopted Newport LDP was prepared under the duty in s.39 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is summarised above

weight can currently be placed on it²⁷, concluding that “*there is nothing in the consultation draft...to indicate that [Welsh Government’s] choice of the published scheme as the best means to address...problems is in conflict with emerging planning policies or the fundamental principles of decision making*”.²⁸ This conclusion is justified for reasons set out in his review, in particular, by the continuing recognition in the draft document of the balancing of the four elements of sustainability (economic, social, cultural and environmental) considerations to be undertaken in planning decisions – notably, they are to be given equal “*consideration*”, but there is no policy (or legal) requirement to give them equal *weight*.²⁹ This specific feature of the draft document is important in the light of objectors’ claims that the Scheme contravenes the sustainable development principle set out in the FGA 2015 and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016. It is also important to note, as did John Davies MBE in his initial proof, responding to criticism of the WG’s Sustainability Review, that the sustainable development principle has not arrived out of the blue with the FGA and PWA 2015.³⁰ This recent legislation and guidance issued under it expand and develop the concept in practical terms, but they did not invent it. Work on projects, such as M4CaN, begun before those Acts took effect, is not invalidated.

60. Obviously a major Scheme such as M4 CaN touches many of the topic chapters within PPW (9). John Davies concluded that the Scheme:

²⁷ In terms of the “requirements of planning”, it is well settled in planning practice that little weight can be placed on draft policy at an early stage of its development and that the weight to place on different material considerations is a matter of judgment for the decision maker. Much of the new draft document is in very similar terms to the extant PPW and this continuity of apparent policy direction can be noted, as well as the areas where development of the sustainability principle is suggested

²⁸ PID 218 John Davies MBE’s response, para.10

²⁹ Draft PPW para.2.24

³⁰ CD 5.1.16, para. 1.11

"meets the WG's planning policy objectives that seek to support economic and employment growth alongside social and environmental considerations within the context of sustainable development."

61. He also acknowledged that the Scheme:

"would conflict with planning policies in respect of cultural heritage, landscape, ecology and nature conservation, as well as the 'respect for environmental limits'"

62. WG called subject- specific expert evidence on all of these matters which Mr Davies read and heard. Ecological evidence and the listed building inquiry are dealt with in later sections of these submissions, but it is convenient to summarise the general landscape and cultural heritage evidence here.

63. Landscape and Visual Impact ("LVIA") and Historic Landscape ("ASIDOHL") appraisals were carried out and reported in the ES. Subsequent ESS have provided and assessed further information at each stage of Scheme modification and in relation to the proposals for the Docks.

64. Mr Rawlings acknowledged in the ES and his evidence that, by reason of the route of the road passing through the northern edge of the two parts of the Gwent Levels Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest ("LOHI") it would have an effect of Large significance; there is the potential for buried archaeological remains to be present, although a certain amount of survey has been undertaken already and there are proposals for more to be done in advance of construction. He also acknowledged direct and indirect

adverse impacts upon the Llanfihangel Rogiet Conservation Area (“CA”), giving rise to an effect of Moderate significance. He and Ms Longford, the Conservation Officer for MCC agreed, however, that the effect on the CA of moving Magor Vicarage would be to preserve its character or appearance. This matter is dealt with fully below under the Listed Building Inquiry and Mr Rawlings’ assessment of significance of effect obviously changed considerably when considering a removal rather than demolition. The Scheme has been designed to enable retention in situ of the Devil’s Quoit standing stone at Undy although there would be changes to its setting, which Mr Rawlings assessed as being of Large significance. There would be indirect effects of Moderate significance on a further Scheduled Ancient Monument (a mediaeval moated site at Undy) and a number of listed buildings. The most significant of these is the Grade 1 listed Transporter Bridge. A number of unlisted historic buildings in the Docks would be demolished and the route would go across the site of a Second World War barrage balloon tether at Nash.

65. Where possible, mitigation had been achieved by design in terms of vertical alignment – keeping the road low in the landscape - appropriate landscape planting, reflecting the character and ecological features of the Levels, and use of low noise surfacing. Two of the water treatment areas are located to the north of the route, outside the LOHI. Bespoke measures for Devil’s Quoit, the barrage balloon site and, latterly, Magor Vicarage also demonstrate sensitivity to cultural heritage concerns, within the constraints of the route. The Cultural Heritage Mitigation Plan provides for recording in

advance of demolition and for study / watching brief of the historic back-fen areas traversed by the new road.

66. In his written evidence and in the ES and ESS, Mr Rowson identified the effects of the Scheme across its different phases of construction and operation. He recognised that the Scheme would have a permanent effect on the landscape and appearance of the LOHI and on the landscape at the undesignated Castleton and Magor extents of the Scheme. Landscape impacts would, in different places, range, at Years 1 and 15, from Neutral to Large Adverse. In the case of visual impacts, planting would be starting to achieve mitigation. He described the consultative design process, in which the interests of the SSSI were to the fore, the “*overarching principle*” being to minimise landtake there. Through discussion with NRW and the local authority landscape architects, a consensus emerged that, rather than trying to hide the road with uncharacteristic landscaping, the approach should predominantly be grassland planting, allowing long views into the Levels and preventing the shading of the characteristic reens and ditches. He used the video flythrough to illustrate his evidence, to aid understanding for all. He had been fully involved, with other team members, in working up the Environmental Management Plans (“EMPs”) which are vital to a full understanding of the Scheme and its impacts. Unsurprisingly perhaps, these appeared to be new territory for some objectors, but they must be borne fully in mind when considering all the environmental issues which arise. The final version of the EMPs, at the close of the Inquiry, is contained in the September 2016 ES Supplement (ESS1) Figure R2.6 (all 16 sheets), supplemented by further changes in the March 2017 ES Supplement

(ESS3) Figure TSR2.6 (sheets 12 & 13, east bound off slip at Magor), and the August 2017 ES Supplement (ESS4) Figure August 2017 2.6 (sheets 5, 6 & 16 changes to Docks Way Link Road), together with those changes set out in PIQ025 (updated sheets 8 & 9 with respect to the lighting of the main line at Glan Llyn), PID 032 (updated sheets 13 & 14 clarifying vegetation lost opposite Bovis site SAH6) and PIQ 075 (landscaping detail of borrow pits). However in accordance with Commitment 203 WG, through detailed design, will continue to develop the environmental and landscape design with NRW. That design would be recorded in the final EMPs which would also include all CPO modifications and supplements as well as blighted land accepted into the Scheme.

67. Messrs Rowson and Rawlings were not challenged by NRW or Cadw on their conclusions. A SOCG on Cultural Heritage and Landscape and Visual Effects (“CHALAVE”) was signed by WG and NRW.³¹ Cadw are not an objector to the Scheme. In his Closing on behalf of NRW, Richard Wald referred to the three matters not agreed in CHALAVE. No (i), potential use of CPO powers for offsetting cultural heritage impacts was a mystery to the WG at the time and Mr Wald was not able to assist the inquiry in this regard. NRW were offered the opportunity, after Mr Wald had closed, to clarify in writing what they mean. This they did in a letter to Welsh Government from Justin Amos dated 26th March 2018 in which NRW referred back to its original objection letter of 4th May 2016 which stated at paragraph 5.2.2 *“We welcome the proposal to take forward an integrated programme of historic landscape analysis in order to offset some of the*

³¹ ID / 155

impacts on the historic landscape. We recommend that interpretation of and access to the physical historic landscape should also be considered, given the significant adverse effects on the Gwent Levels Registered Landscape. We would expect these proposals to be taken forward within the Statement of Commitments.” “In relation to the above”, Mr Amos continued “NRW’s advice has only been that WG should consider providing or making available additional land, including possibly on a multi-functional basis (e.g. land already owned by Welsh Government and/or land identified as ecological mitigation land under the M4 CaN scheme) to help offset the likely significant effects of the M4 CaN on the Gwent Levels Registered Landscape”. WG has taken on board those recommendations via Commitment 74 which commits it to undertaking an integrated programme of historic landscape analysis, whilst Commitments 204 and 205 refer to a multifunctional approach to future land use.

68. With regard to No.(ii), Dr Ireland explained that the ASIDOHL had been agreed by NRW and that this assessment fully acknowledges the reens and ditches as an important element of the historic character of the Levels. The undisputed Buildability Report, Cultural Heritage Mitigation Plan and SSSI mitigation plan leave no room for serious doubt as to the depth of WG’s understanding and intentions with regard to the reens and ditches. No. (iii) is a matter of judgment; evidence has been given as to their nature and appearance, there is no objection from Cadw and where possible, they have been located outside the LOHI. Mr Wald acknowledged that he had not called evidence on landscape / cultural heritage and that NRW’s written

- evidence was therefore entitled to less weight, adding that none of these points is central to their case.
69. At the end of the Inquiry, Mr John Davies MBE reviewed matters and, particularly, the progress made in terms of removing most of NRW's objections. Clearly, the proposal to move rather than simply demolish Magor Vicarage is a further major step forward in terms of cultural heritage considerations. Finally, although the Ecosystems Services Assessment ("ESA") is not a requirement of planning policy, Mr Davies reviewed it and commended it as a useful and even handed way of assessing the Scheme's effects across all the relevant ecosystems, referring to the benefits it predicts over the long term. He concluded that the ESA did not alter the conclusion in his original evidence that, when the extensive mitigation is taken into account, the balance of advantage lies with the Scheme.
70. Moreover, although Mr Rawlings took a precautionary approach to assessing the indirect impact of the new bridge upon the Transporter Bridge, it should be noted that the Design Commission for Wales, with whom WG voluntarily consulted and collaborated at design stage, found the design for the new bridge to be elegant and well considered, forming an intriguing pair of structures with the Transporter Bridge. Mr Rowson considers that the new bridge would be generally beneficial in visual terms, particularly in medium to distant views where its scale, form, design and location within the landscape can be more fully understood. Mr John Davies MBE considered these matters carefully in the round, agreeing with Mr Rawlings that there would be some diminishing of significance for the

Transporter Bridge as a result of the new bridge crossing the Usk further to the south, but pointed out that the ability to appreciate the Transporter Bridge from elevated views would be greatly increased and, with it, the significance and appreciation of it. There are, therefore, pros and cons and doubtless the inspectors will have their own opinions formed on site. In terms of assessment, however, WG has adopted a precautionary approach.

71. A particular area of importance in the policy context is flood risk. This is covered in PPW 9 (2017) Chapter 13 and TAN 15 (2004)). The latter is still extant, although the WG has started a review of it.

72. The technical details of the extent and potential consequences of flood risk for the Scheme are all agreed with NRW and summarised below. In terms of national policy, Mr John Davies MBE concludes that the Scheme is not in accordance with the general policy of WG articulated in PPW and TAN 15 that development should be directed away from areas of flood risk. The line of the proposed motorway is largely in a C1 area with a small area of C2. He notes, however, that PPW recognises that there will need to be exceptions to the overarching policy objective and it singles out essential transport and utilities infrastructure in this regard. PPW 13.3.2 provides that such infrastructure should:

- be constructed so as to remain operational even at times of flood;
- result in no net loss of flood plain storage;
- not impede water flows; and
- not increase flood risk elsewhere.

73. PPW 13.4.1 introduces the following further tests for new development in areas of high flood hazard:

- new development can be justified in that location;
- new development would not result in the intensification of development which may itself be at risk; and
- new development would not increase the potential adverse impacts of a flood event.

74. TAN 15 also imposes tests for development in Zone C2. These are that:

- i. its location in zone C is necessary to assist, or be part of a local authority regeneration initiative or a local authority strategy required to sustain an existing settlement; or
- ii. its location in zone C is necessary to contribute to key employment objectives supported by the local authority, and other key partners, to sustain an existing settlement or region; it concurs with the aims of PPW and meets the definition of previously developed land (PPW fig 2.1); and
- iii. the potential consequences of a flooding event for the particular type of development have been considered, and in terms of the criteria contained in sections 5 and 7 and appendix 1 found to be acceptable.

75. PPW and TAN 15 anticipate that such exceptional developments will be allocated in development plans. As noted above, both of the relevant LDPs protect the line of the Scheme but they do not allocate it as such. This is one example in which “due” consideration of “planning requirements” must be interpreted in context. This national road Scheme is being brought forward under Highways Act rather than Planning powers³².
76. It has been demonstrated, through WG’s evidence, that the Scheme is essential in the national interest and the Programme for Government makes a commitment to an M4 relief road as part of its “*United and connected*” theme. The national strategy Prosperity for All, published alongside WG’s revised well-being objectives under FGA 2015 s.3(2)(a), requires a significant improvement to the M4 around Newport³³. This nationally significant infrastructure scheme transcends the local authority level and it would obviously be impossible for a local authority to deliver a venture of this scale. The road is required to sustain the SE Wales region and, through it, the nation as a whole. The local authorities through whose areas the Scheme principally passes – NCC and MCC - support it, as do Cardiff, Caerphilly, Rhondda Cynon Taf and Neath Port Talbot Councils.³⁴ Other supporters, reflecting a range of economic, social and cultural / sporting interests, include organisations such as Newport Civic Society, Monmouthshire Local Access Forum, Wales and West Utilities, Network Rail, Cardiff Airport, Gwent Police, the Freight Transport Association, the Port of Milford Haven, Confederation of British Industry Cymru, South

³² Doc 5.1.11
See all the Proofs of Evidence of John Davies MBE and, specifically on Prosperity for All, his Scheme Evidence Update, WG 1.23.5

³⁴ ID131

Wales Chamber of Commerce, Institute of Directors Wales Division, Welsh Rugby Union, Welsh Football Trust, Institution of Civil Engineers, Wales Cymru Retired Engineers Group, TATA Steel and St Modwen Developments. The last representor, which submitted expert planning evidence to articulate its recognition of the need for the Scheme and the environmental, social and economic benefits that it would bring, is particularly significant in the context of the adopted planning strategy for Newport. In this respect, Mr Gent,³⁵ an experienced town planner with a detailed knowledge of the M4 corridor, gives a more detailed exposition of the central role of the Glan Llyn development in delivering the brownfield regeneration strategy of Newport LDP, as alluded to by Mr John Davies MBE.

77. TAN 15 (2004) does not specify which “*aims of PPW*” it refers to and it must be remembered that the PPW which applied at the time was different from the current one. In particular, the current version of PPW includes the following guidance, drawn from TAN 23: Economic Development (2014):

“Local planning authorities are required to ensure that the economic benefits associated with a proposed development are understood and that these are given equal consideration with social and environmental issues in the decision-making process, and should recognise that there will be occasions when the economic benefits will outweigh social and environmental considerations.”³⁶

78. PPW 9 was updated specifically to translate into policy the sustainable development principle enacted in the recent Welsh environmental

³⁵ Hearing Statement SUP 139

³⁶ PPW para 7.2.2

legislation. It is therefore highly significant that it includes this statement on the weighing of potentially competing considerations. There are many “aims” set out in PPW, the unifying principle being that of achieving sustainable development. As this important paragraph recognises, in some instances the achievement of sustainable development may involve allowing that economic benefits should outweigh certain other considerations.

79. As Mr John Davies MBE points out, it would be impossible for the PPW exception of essential transport infrastructure to meet the TAN criterion of unobstructed floodplain. To the extent that there is inconsistency, “*due consideration of the requirements of planning*” should afford greater weight to the modern PPW, drafted in the context of current legislation.

80. The last of the TAN 15 criteria concern flooding consequences:

- no flooding elsewhere
- Scheme to be flood free in a 0.5% (1:200 year) event
- flooding up to 600mm acceptable beyond the 0.5% (1:200 year) event

81. In line with the advice in TAN 15, WG’s engineers have liaised extensively with NRW’s flooding team. As a result, there is agreement on all relevant technical matters.³⁷ The broad statements of common ground are:

(i) Following the recent completion of the Tabbs Gout and Portland Grounds Flood Risk Management (FRM) schemes, the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels tidal defences currently (year 2017) have a 0.1% Annual

³⁷ ID/048 Flood Risk Statement of Common Ground

Exceedance Probability (AEP) Standard of Protection (SoP) against breach or greater, relevant to the Scheme. The only exceptions to this are near Stephenson Street on the River Usk (overtopping in the 10-3.3%AEP event), Goldcliff Pill (overtopping in 0.5-0.1% AEP event), between Coldharbour Pill and Sudbrook Point (piping breach in the 20-0.5%AEP events; wave, tidal overtopping and/or breach in the 0.5-0.1%AEP events); and small-scale works where tidal defences are only slightly lower than recommended and over a short length (subsequently referred to as small-scale works).

(ii) Following construction of the Stephenson Street Scheme (submitted to the Welsh Government for funding under its Coastal Risk Management Programme with subsequent allocation of funds for “Stephenson Street Risk Management Scheme” in the WG’s draft 2018-19 Budget³⁸) and any schemes relating to the locations noted above, the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels tidal defences will have a 0.1%AEP SoP in 2030, relevant to the Scheme.

(iii) NRW has responsibility for ongoing localised small-scale works (consisting of inspection, maintenance and addressing locally lower or weaker sections of defence) on the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels. These works are funded by the NRW annual maintenance budget.

(iv) With regard to fluvial and pluvial flooding there would be no increased flood risk as a result of the Scheme and hence no conflict with PPW or TAN15.

³⁸ PID 205 para.3.51

- 81A. With regard to tidal flooding, the Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan 2 (SESMP2), which was agreed by Welsh Ministers on 26th November 2014, sets the preferred policies for the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels shoreline as 'Hold the Line' for the next 100 years. The importance of SMPs is emphasised in WG's first draft Marine Plan, published in draft in December 2017. This is a statutory document being produced pursuant to the duty in s.51 Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. Of course, as it is in draft, it can carry only limited weight, but it shows the direction of policy being to carry forward the SMP approach in a cross-cutting way, as its sustainable response to the issues of climate change. The draft states that SMPs provide important context for decision making by setting out the preferred policies for specific areas. Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels are shown as being subject to the "Hold the Line" policy.³⁹
- 81B. The Severn Estuary Flood Risk Management Strategy (SEFRMS) recommends a programme of improvements to the tidal flood defences for the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels that is independent of the Scheme and would provide a 0.1% AEP SoP over the next 100 years. Two of the three priority schemes identified in the SEFRMS on the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels have been completed i.e. Tabbs Gout and Portland Grounds; with Stephenson Street, Newport currently at project appraisal stage with a view to be implemented in the short term. Any further schemes related to the overtopping and breach locations in NRW (2016a) would also be justified and recommended by the SEFRMS, thus providing the necessary

³⁹ See Doc 5.1.5

- protection to 2030. Implementation of this programme beyond 2030 would protect the Levels to a 0.1% AEP SoP over the life of the M4 Scheme.
82. Moreover, NRW are satisfied that the implications of climate change have been appropriately assessed for the lifetime of the Scheme using a period of 100 years;⁴⁰ that the Scheme satisfies the acceptability criteria in TAN 15 for fluvial and pluvial flooding; and that it would not cause any unacceptable impacts from fluvial flooding elsewhere.
83. With regard to tidal flooding, two temporal scenarios need to be considered. The first covers the period to 2025 (at the latest). By 2025, certain relatively minor works of flood protection will have been completed. It is agreed with NRW that, from completion to 2030, the new road would comply with the requirements of PPW and TAN 15 not to increase flood risk or the consequences of flooding.⁴¹
84. The second period is from 2030 onwards. The sole issue between WG and NRW on flooding turns on the appropriate assumption to make about this period with regard to implementation of the “*Hold the Line*” policy approved by the Government within the Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan 2 (“SESMP2”).
85. The pertinent facts are agreed.⁴² SESMP2 is a Shoreline Management Plan, prepared in accordance with DEFRA guidance in the context of coastal environmental powers and duties. The lead promoting body in Wales is NRW though there is a steering group comprising also relevant local authorities, the English Environment Agency, DEFRA and WG.⁴³

⁴⁰ Op-cit para 5.1.7

⁴¹ Op cit para 5.1.11

⁴² See ID/048 and Gary Purnell cross examination (ME QC)

⁴³ John Davies MBE, re-examination

86. The current Plan was agreed by WG. It includes preferred policies to “*Hold the Line*” for the Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels for the next 100 years.

“*Hold the Line*” is defined in the DEFRA guidance as:

“Hold the existing defence line by maintaining or changing the standard of protection ... to improve or maintain the standard of protection provided by the existing defence line.”

87. Agreement by WG in November 2014 signifies that WG consider the policy to be a sustainable one, a stance recently reaffirmed by inclusion of the Stephenson Street Scheme in the Budget and Wentlooge and Caldicot Levels in the draft Marine Management Plan under this designation.

88. The Benefit to Cost Ratio (“BCR”) of the policy was 31 in relation to the Caldicot Levels (the only area of concern to NRW in this regard). Mr Purnell said that the BCRs for the Levels were the highest for a long term project that he has ever encountered. The more recent budgetary and policy developments are, therefore, entirely what one would expect. Moreover, he agreed, the BCR is likely to go up with the passage of time and would certainly do so if M4 CaN were built. By virtue of the Natural Resources Body for Wales (Establishment) Order 2012, Art 8, NRW, in considering whether or not to exercise any power conferred on them, are obliged to take into account the likely costs and benefits of exercising or not exercising that power i.e. BCRs. Mr Purnell agreed that these BCRs would be a “*very material consideration*” for NRW in deciding whether or not to exercise their powers to implement SESMP2⁴⁴ and that it would “*probably*

⁴⁴ Cross examination (ME QC)

be very favourable in getting the scheme delivered in the future".⁴⁵ The physical consequences of failing to implement the policy in the longer term would be catastrophic. The whole of Newport, Cardiff, the main railway line, a vast amount of housing, industry and energy infrastructure would be submerged. In WG's submission, it is inconceivable that any future Government would countenance risks of such magnitude remaining unchecked. Therefore the only tenable assumption to make for the purposes of evaluating policy compliance is that SESMP2 will continue to be implemented, as has started already under Severn Estuary Flood Relief Management Scheme ("SEFRMS").

89. NRW's position is, apparently, that such an assumption should not be made unless and until WG commits its successors to funding for the next 80 years or so. Clearly, no government can commit its successors to policy or expenditure on policy implementation in that way⁴⁶. The analogies drawn by NRW with ongoing maintenance for mitigation measures in other infrastructure projects and in the Schedule of Environmental Commitments are inapt. These Commitments provide assurance that the physical impacts of the Scheme will be met as it is constructed and operated and requirements imposed on Development Consent Orders similarly relate to impacts of those projects. The physical impacts of failing to implement the Hold the Line policy would be incurred irrespective of the M4 CaN. Mr Wald found it "*curious*" that WG relied on the gravity of effects of potential post 2030 flooding in the absence of implementing the SEFRMS; with respect,

⁴⁵ Re-examination (RW)

⁴⁶ This is a matter of democratic common sense and not based on the earlier suggestion in correspondence based on the impermissibility of fettering an administrative discretion. That legal principle is not necessary in order to support the validity of WG's approach

this comment misses the point, which is that it is inconceivable that “*Hold the Line*” would cease to be the order of the day, but none of this has anything to do with M4CaN. Save for the agreed fact that the new road would create an even stronger case for funding the policy in the future, it is irrelevant. Characterising the matter as one of finance versus safety in NRW’s Closing simply did not do justice to the evidence, including admissions made in cross examination by their flooding witness, which were reviewed above. NRW’s approach is counter-intuitive and should not be adopted as an assumption for the purposes of assessing policy compliance.

90. In relation to s.16(8) HA 1980 and “*the requirements of national planning*”, however, it is pertinent to note NRW’s agreement that, once the short term works have been undertaken (by 2025 at the latest), there would be no conflict with national planning policies in the longer term on the basis that future funding does occur to comply with WG’s “*Hold the Line*” policy and recommendations.⁴⁷ WG’s strong submission is that it is inconceivable that the “*Hold the Line*” policy or better would not be achieved in the period from 2030 onwards.
91. On WG’s case, there is therefore a short period of non-compliance with TAN 15 up to 2025 at the latest, before the local flood defence works are done. Dr Canning has, at NRW’s request, modelled the practical implications of this non-compliance on the basis of NRW’s most up to date data, in the 0.1% (1:100 year) + climate change event. Mr Purnell agreed the results of this modelling,⁴⁸ which may be summarised as follows:

⁴⁷ Op cit para 5.1.13
⁴⁸ Cross-examination (ME QC)

- In 2018, with existing tidal defences, the M4CaN would cause up to 25 property detriments and 86 property betterments in the 0.1%AEP event. The detriments consist of 0.01 – 0.08m increased flood depth to properties already experiencing 0.18 – 2.42m flood depth. The betterments consist of 0.01 – 0.15m decreased flood depth to properties already experiencing 0.17 – 0.83m flood depth.
- In 2018, with the Stephenson Street scheme (excluding raised defence east of the railway line), the M4CaN would cause up to 23 property detriments and 38 property betterments in the 0.1%AEP event. The detriments consist of 0.02 – 0.24m increased flood depth to properties already experiencing 0.03 – 1.98m flood depth. The betterments consist of 0.02 – 0.31m decreased flood depth to properties already experiencing 0.21 – 0.69m flood depth, and 26 properties completely removed from flooding (decreased from 0.15 – 0.45m flood depth).
- In 2025, with Stephenson Street scheme (including raised defence east of the railway line), Goldcliff Pill and Coldharbour Pill to Sudbrook Point works, the M4CaN would cause no property betterments or detriments, up to the 0.1%AEP event.

- In conclusion the modelling work indicates that with the identified tidal defence works being constructed by 2025, the M4CaN would not increase the numbers of properties that would already flood in 2019 or 2025 without the M4CaN in place.

92. It is notable that no new properties which would not already be subject to flooding would be affected by flooding as a result of M4 CaN.

LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION

93. In recognition that the “requirements of planning” include listed building consent (“LBC”), an application for the demolition of Grade II Listed Woodland House (known locally as ‘Magor Vicarage’) was submitted to Monmouthshire County Council (“MCC”) as LPA on 1 September 2016, and validated by MCC on 9 September 2016. The application was called in by Lesley Griffiths AM for her own determination on 22 December 2016. The reason given for the call-in was:

“The application for listed building consent is inextricably linked with the major proposal to construct the M4 relief road which is being determined by the West Ministers as a Roads Order. This in itself satisfies one of the criteria for call-in set out in paragraphs 76-77 of Circular 61/96, being a matter related to a decision being taken by the Welsh ministers. Additionally a justification for the demolition is its requirement for the construction of the ‘M4 Corridor around Newport Scheme’,

which in the Cabinet Secretary's view may also raise issues of exceptional significance or controversy".

94. S.6 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 makes it a criminal offence to demolish a listed building without authorisation. S.8 provides for the giving of such authorisation, as follows:

- "(1) Works for the alteration or extension of a listed building are authorised if—*
- (a) written consent for their execution has been granted by the local planning authority or the Secretary of State; and*
 - (b) they are executed in accordance with the terms of the consent and of any conditions attached to it.*
- (2) Works for the demolition of a listed building are authorised if—*
- (a) such consent has been granted for their execution;*
 - (b) notice of the proposal to execute the works has been given to the Royal Commission;*
 - (c) after such notice has been given either—*
 - (i) for a period of at least one month following the grant of such consent, and before the commencement of the works, reasonable access to the building has been made available to members or officers of the Royal Commission for the purpose of recording it; or*
 - (ii) the Secretary of the Royal Commission, or another officer of theirs with authority to act on their behalf for the purposes of this section, has stated in writing that they have completed their recording of the building or that they do not wish to record it; and*

- (d) *the works are executed in accordance with the terms of the consent and of any conditions attached to it.*
- (3) *Where—*
 - (a) *works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension are executed without such consent; and*
 - (b) *written consent is granted by the local planning authority or the Secretary of State for the retention of the works,*
the works are authorised from the grant of that consent.
 - (4) *In this section “the Royal Commission” means—*
 - (a) *in relation to England, the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England; and*
 - (b) *in relation to Wales, the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales.*
 - (5) *The Secretary of State may by order provide that subsection (2) shall have effect with the substitution for the references to the Royal Commission of references to such other body as may be so specified.*
 - (6) *Such an order—*
 - (a) *shall apply in the case of works executed or to be executed on or after such date as may be specified in the order; and*
 - (b) *may apply in relation to either England or Wales, or both.*
 - (7) *Consent under subsection (1), (2) or (3) is referred to in this Act as “listed building consent”.*

95. As acknowledged in WG’s evidence to the Listed Building Inquiry, such applications are subject to s.16 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“LBCAA”) which provides that special regard is to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the listed

building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Caselaw has established that these words mean that there is a presumption against harming a listed building “of considerable importance and weight”.⁴⁹

96. By making the Listed Building Application and calling it in for determination, WG and the Welsh Ministers, respectively, have observed the listed building procedural planning requirements. Whilst there is a strong presumption against harm, the evidence has demonstrated that its demolition is essential. This case is exceptional, given both the need for M4 CaN, its national significance and the lengthy and detailed work undertaken to arrive at the Scheme and test alternative alignments which would not involve demolition. As Mr Matthew Jones explained, in order to accommodate the preferred route and junction strategy while avoiding the Gwent Levels SSSIs where practicable, the alignment needs to run parallel to the A4810 to the west of Magor, tying in to the existing M4 to the north west of the settlement. To fit the alignment in, between the A4810 and the residential properties to the north of Magor, while meeting design standards and not causing serious economic impacts to the Brewery and Wales One Business Park, it is impossible to avoid the listed building⁵⁰. TAN 24⁵¹, and, indeed, the legislation itself, recognises that there can be occasions when other considerations will outweigh impacts to heritage assets. The TAN accepts that alterations to the historic environment are inevitable and can be the result of, amongst other things, the need to respond to social,

⁴⁹ Barnwell Manor Wind Energy v East Northants DC, English Heritage and the National Trust [2014] EWCA Civ 137.

⁵⁰ See Jones Proof WG 1.1.6 Section 4

⁵¹ ID/077 Doc 3, para.1.8

cultural, economic and technological changes; plainly, this approach is relevant here. Mr Smith pointed out that his Green Route would avoid the Vicarage; this submission raises wider considerations which are dealt with elsewhere in these submissions. In short, after its appraisal during the Highway Inquiry, WG submits that the Green Route is not a satisfactory alternative way of meeting the need for the Scheme. Legislation and policy require a balance to be struck.

97. In striking this balance, Mr Rawlings followed the assessment in the ES and treated the magnitude of impact due to outright demolition of the Vicarage and its coach house/stable as Major, with a consequent Large Adverse significance of effect. In reaching this judgment, he had regard to the listed status of the building, albeit at Grade 2 (the lowest listing grade)⁵². He identified the significance of the building as deriving principally from its architectural qualities and association with a distinguished architect with some associative values derived from connection with Magor church. Ms Longford, the LPA's Conservation Officer, agreed with this assessment of value and significance.

98. It is now the case, however, that very substantial mitigation for the demolition is proposed. WG have made a Commitment⁵³ to relocate the Grade 2 listed Magor Vicarage to a suitable location, subject to the outcome of the Magor Vicarage Public Inquiry and grant of planning permission and LBC (if the latter is required) by MCC. Such a location has been identified on land next to the Old Court, Llanfihangel. This is a site which WG has accepted that it will acquire on account of blight and it would

⁵² Rawlings Proof WG 1.9.4 Section 5

⁵³ ID 231 Commitment 207

be available early in the Project so that the listed building and its coach house could be carefully dismantled and re-erected there. Consideration has been given to practical considerations such as drainage and the building could be satisfactorily accommodated. Mr Rawlings explained that, as most of the significance of the building lies in its architecture, fixtures and fittings, the proposed solution would enable much of the building's heritage significance to be preserved. Whilst the building would obviously be moved from its existing location in Magor, he did not consider that it had a strong relationship with the church or the settlement, partly because of the circumstances of its construction relatively remote from the church and partly because of surrounding roads and landscaping which mean that there is no visual relationship with the church. In terms of distance from the motorway and noise, the new position would be better because further away from the motorway and its slip roads. Ms Longford said that she agreed with Mr Rawlings' assessment.

99. Whilst MCC cannot pre-judge the outcome of these proposed applications, officers have worked collaboratively with WG to examine the options and they have confirmed that, notwithstanding its location outside a settlement boundary within a Green Wedge, the very exceptional circumstances of this case mean that the Old Court site *“could in principle be considered favourably as an exception to LDP policies”*.⁵⁴ This confirmation and WG's Commitment, together with the manifest conservation advantages, mean that substantial weight can be given to the mitigation proposal, although all recognise that it would not be appropriate to impose a Grampian condition

⁵⁴ ID/204 second document para. 15, confirmed orally on 16.3.18 by Mr Hand, Director of Planning Monmouthshire County Council

because delivery of the consents is not in WG's complete control. Turning to the effects upon the receiving environment, Mr Rawlings and Ms Longford both considered that the character of Llanfihangel Rogiet Conservation Area would be preserved. As the Conservation Officer explained, the area, when designated, was considered a fine example of a detached farming community; in spite of the residential conversions to which Mr Hand referred, in her opinion that character assessment remains valid and she did not consider that Magor Vicarage would have a detrimental impact, such that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. Nor did she consider that there would be any adverse effect on the settings of the existing listed buildings in the vicinity. Mr Rawlings agreed with this assessment and demonstrated that careful thought has been given to detailed siting already, taking advantage of existing vegetation. Cadw have been consulted; they do not oppose the listed building application and have not commented on the proposed relocation. Mr Smith asserted the opposite and, whilst the strength of his feeling cannot be denied, his disagreement with the expert witnesses was not supported by analysis.

100. Drawing together heritage matters, WG submits that the following conclusions can be reported to the Welsh Ministers:

- i. That demolition of the Grade 2 listed building is physically necessary to enable the Scheme to go ahead on an alignment which occupies as little of the Gwent Levels SSSIs as possible; alternative routes at this point have been considered and rejected on the basis of excessive impacts on residential and employment properties.

- ii. That the Scheme is necessary and desirable, for all the reasons explained in the main Public Inquiry.
- iii. That the statutory / policy presumption against loss or damage to the significance of the listed building is outweighed by the need for the Scheme.
- iv. Notwithstanding the overriding case for demolition, WG has responsibly explored the mitigation option of relocation; the solution proposed is supported by MCC, subject to proper caveats, and would enable the fabric of the listed structure to be transferred to an appropriate new setting.
- v. Much of the building's significance as evidenced by the listing description and Mr Rawlings' professional assessment, now lies in its physical features rather than its setting; the relocation proposal, if implemented, would therefore enable much of the building's significance to be preserved.
- vi. The achievement of relocation lies outside WG's control, so it would be inappropriate to impose a Grampian condition on the LBC. WG has made a Commitment to pursue relocation.
- vii. Weight should be given to the proposed mitigation in view of the SOCG agreed with MCC; this proposal, and the exercise underlying it, are in line with the principles of the FGA 2015, as Mr John Davies MBE has demonstrated.
- viii. Mr Green explained that an initial survey in February 2017 revealed that the Vicarage and its coach house / stable provide bat habitats. Subsequent surveys over 26 days and nights in May and June 2017

confirmed that there is a small number of common pipistrelles roosting by day under the porch roof. This is not a maternity roost. Similarly, despite a large number of old bat droppings in the coach house / stable, he considers that this structure provides a day and night roost for a small number of lesser horseshoe bats. Discussion of potential mitigation has taken place with NRW, who have agreed with the principle of providing mitigation by means of a bat house, subject to there being appropriate arrangements in place for its long term management, maintenance and monitoring. These measures are likely to be required in connection with the granting of a licence under the Habitats Regulations. Proposed conditions are agreed, including one which provides for such future maintenance etc. and, on this basis, NRW do not object to the listed building application⁵⁵ Furthermore, there are relevant Commitments which have been proposed in the Highways Inquiry. Other draft conditions are unremarkable and are set out in the SOCG with MCC.⁵⁶

101. Accordingly, WG submits that LBC should be granted for demolition of Magor Vicarage in this exceptional case.

THE REQUIREMENTS OF AGRICULTURE

102. Mrs Tindale's proof gives details of the agricultural resources and land take. There is no dispute about the figures.⁵⁷
103. Mrs Tindale also explained, during presentation of her main evidence and in the sessions devoted to examining the Schemes and Orders in detail,

⁵⁵ ID/102 Note on Future management of Bat Mitigation Measures and letter 19.6.17

⁵⁶ ID/102

⁵⁷ Reference 2.4.4 ES Supplement September 2016 Volume 2, Figures R15.7 (ALC) and R15.8 (Farm Holdings)

her engagement with farmers before and after making the Scheme. Many of the Scheme's features and several of the proposed Modifications are designed to reduce impacts on farming operations as much as possible. A number of individual farmers' objections remain and these are dealt with in the evidence, with references set out in the attached Annexes 1 and 2. In all instances, the effects of the Schemes/Orders engage the individual human rights of farmers, because of interference with their property and/or homes. This important consideration, which is distinct from the general public interest in agriculture expressed through planning policy, is dealt with in further detail later in the closing statement.

104. Consultants on behalf of WG carried out a comprehensive appraisal of the farm holdings affected by the Scheme, which formed part of the ES (March 2016). WG representatives have consistently liaised with landowners and their agents throughout the development of the Scheme, the submission of draft Orders and through the period of the Inquiry. Wherever possible, refinements to the Scheme were incorporated into the development of the draft Orders to reduce, as far as possible, potential impacts on individual farm holdings. Since the submission of draft Orders and statutory objections, further detailed discussions have led to the development of proposed Modifications to address remaining concerns, wherever possible.⁵⁸

105. Impacts on agriculture generally are also considered in the ESA, which recognises the role played by agricultural land to be lost as a result of the

⁵⁸ Evidence in ID007d updates on those relevant matters.

- Scheme. The loss of the relevant “services” performed by that land are monetised and duly taken into account in the overall evaluation.
106. WG have clearly given due consideration to the requirements of agriculture in working up the Scheme and presenting it to the scrutiny of Public Inquiry.
107. Mr John Davies MBE put the effects on best and most versatile (“BMV”) land (i.e. Grades 1, 2 and 3A) into their planning policy context. PPW states that BMV land should only be developed where there is an overriding need and land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable or has an environmental value which outweighs the agricultural considerations. Where BMV land has to be used, development should be directed to land of the lowest grade. Therefore, planning policy recognises that society may have needs more pressing than the desirability of preserving even BMV land. There is no absolute “*requirement*” to do so.
108. In this case, more than 80% of the land take overall comprises non-agricultural land or non BMV agricultural land. Serious efforts have been made to reduce land take and to work with farmers to mitigate the operational effects of the road, such as severance. Mr John Davies MBE, having considered the effects on agriculture in its policy context, concluded that the evidence has demonstrated “*an overriding need to address the traffic, economic and social problems caused by the serious deficiencies of the M4 around Newport*”. We invite the Inspectors and the Welsh Ministers to agree that the impacts upon agriculture do not outweigh the need for the Scheme, having given the matter “*due consideration*”.

PLANNING BALANCE

109. PPW covers many specialist topics and the TANs expand on them. Town and country planning is a practical discipline. Whilst it is policy led, planning law recognises that “*other material considerations*” must always be taken into account and may outweigh policy presumptions.⁵⁹ In giving “*due consideration to the requirements*” of planning, the decision maker under s.16 HA 1980 must bear in mind the nature of the planning process. As Mr John Davies MBE repeatedly explained in his written and oral evidence, there is a balance to be struck here between beneficial and adverse impacts. All the guiding legislation recognises that this is the stuff of decision making in the environmental sphere, although there has been considerable reluctance in some quarters to recognise this fact during the Inquiry.⁶⁰ Mr John Davies MBE weighed all relevant matters within the wider context of the EWA 2016, FGA 2015 and the PWA 2015, which embed the sustainable development principle into decision making generally, both in the planning and the highways sphere. He also considers the specifics of local and national planning policy and concludes:

- i. that the Scheme is fully in accordance with a number of national planning policies;
- ii. that where conflicts exist, the benefits of the Scheme in relieving the existing problems associated with the M4 around Newport are sufficient to justify an exception in this particular case.⁶¹

⁵⁹ S.70 Town and Country Planning Act 1990; s.38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

⁶⁰ Eg. RSPB correspondence (OBJ0030); FG C’s reps (OBJ0024); Woodland Trust (OBJ0271) : Mr Barnes proof (OBJ033) and cross examination

⁶¹ Proof (WG 1.23.1) para 249

110. Save for the “*Hold the Line*” policy issue, on which he was cross examined by NRW, Mr Davies was not directly challenged on his conclusion, though it is accepted that many objectors profoundly disagree with his assessment of where the balance lies between the negative effects of the Scheme, which WG’s documentation and witnesses have candidly admitted, and its benefits which Mr Davies regards as outweighing the harms. Of course, one would not expect a forensic challenge of this sort from local people, such as Mrs Picton MBE and Mr Smith, but it is noticeable that no such assault has come from the numerous counsel employed by GWT, nor was there any attack on the overall need for the Scheme by leading counsel for Roadchef; neither of these objectors called any professional planning evidence. Roadchef support the principle of the Scheme and object simply in relation to its design at Junctions 23/23A.
111. GWT and the Future Generations Commissioner, rather than leading planning evidence of their own, concentrated on locking horns with WG over its interpretation of the FGA 2015 and Mr Byrne asked Mr John Davies MBE if he was prepared to keep his mind open to change in the light of the unfolding evidence at the inquiry. Mr Davies agreed that his mind was open and he has conscientiously followed the entire inquiry process, written and oral, throughout. He has updated his evidence in the light of policy and other developments, drawing his assessment to a conclusion in his final sustainability appraisal of the Scheme.⁶² He was made available for cross examination / inspectorial questioning on each occasion, including

⁶² Doc 1.23.7

presentation of his final assessment.⁶³ Without in any way seeking to usurp the judgments of the Inspectors or Ministers, it is the case that, given his distinguished career within the Planning Inspectorate, Mr Davies' comprehensive consideration of the Scheme in the light of policy and all the evidence is entitled to considerable respect and weight.

DRAFT COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS ("CPOS")

112. Five CPOs have been made in order to deliver the Scheme. They are:

a) The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

This authorises the acquisition of land for the construction of the special road and improvement of highways comprised in the Scheme, the provision of new means of access comprised in the Side Roads Order, the improvement of the Motorway, construction of new highways and slip roads comprised in the Line Order, construction of works on watercourses in connection with the above, the provision of buildings and facilities in connection with the construction, use and maintenance of the special and trunk roads, use in connection with the works and the mitigation of adverse effects in connection with the existence or use and the highways. The

⁶³ An opportunity taken up, on the final occasion, by Mrs Picton MBE (OBJ 0203) and Dr Varley (OBJ 087)

Order was published on 24 March 2016. The period for making objections closed on 4 May 2016. The Order was made under sections 239, 240, 246, 250, 260 HA 1980 and section 2 and paras 1(1)(b), (3) and (4) of part 1 of Schedule 2 Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (“ALA 1981”). Procedural requirements and protections for those whose land is being expropriated are provided in the ALA 1981. Here again, human rights are engaged.

b) The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Supplementary Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

The Order was published on 5 September 2016 to authorise acquisition of land for the construction of the realigned Bencroft Lane and for the realigned outfall from a proposed Water Treatment Area. The period for making objections closed on 17 October 2016. The Order was made under sections 239, 240, 250, 260 and paras 1(1)(b), (3) and (4) of part 1 of Schedule 2 ALA.

c) The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Supplementary (No 2) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

The Order was published on 21 March 2017 to authorise compulsory purchase of additional land for the Magor Eastbound offslip as part of the Scheme. The period for making objections closed on 10 May 2017. The Order was made under sections 239, 240, 260 HA and paras 1(1)(b), (3) and (4) of part 1 of Schedule 2 ALA.

d) The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Supplementary (No 3) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

The Order was published on 25 May 2017. This authorises the acquisition of extra land for bridge protection measures within Newport Docks. The period for making objections closed on 20 June 2017. The Order was made under sections 239, 240, 250, 260 HA and paras 1(1)(b), (3) and (4) of part 1 of Schedule 2 ALA.

e) The Welsh Ministers (The M4 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) to West of Junction 29 (Castleton) and Connecting Roads and the M48 Motorway (Junction 23 (East of Magor) Connecting Road) and the London to Fishguard Trunk Road (East of Magor to Castleton) Supplementary (No 4) Compulsory Purchase Order 201-

The Order was published on 22 August 2017. This authorises the acquisition of additional land for the construction of amended bridge protection measures in Newport Docks. The period for making objections closed on 13 September 2017.

The Order was made under sections 239, 240, 260 HA and paras 1(1)(b), (3) and (4) of part 1 of Schedule 2 ALA.

113. As with the Highways Schemes and Orders, so with the CPOs, modifications have been proposed. In many instances, these reflect the processes of refinement through discussion referred to above in the context of the Highways Schemes and Orders and they are relied on as part of the evidence to justify the confirmation of CPOs as proportionate and compatible with the human rights of those to be expropriated.⁶⁴
114. Three particular modifications merit specific comment here. These are Modifications 77A and 80, amending the third and fourth Supplemental Orders respectively (items **d**) and **e**) above) and Modification 79 modifying the main Order (item **a**) above).
115. Modifications 77A and 80 amend the earlier Supplemental Orders to reflect the ability to reduce the land take for narrowing of the Junction Cut consequent upon the agreement between ABP and WG that 13.5m is acceptable, taken together with the other safety measures proposed.⁶⁵
116. Modification 79 includes the land south of the former Llanwern Steelworks land which is required for environmental mitigation. The rationale for this is set out, in brief, in ID/243 and, in greater detail, in the draft Bird Protection and Mitigation Plan.
117. S.14 and Sched.1, para.5 ALA 1981 authorise the Minister to confirm a CPO with modifications if all "*persons interested consent*". In the case of the Junction Cut, the relevant interested person is ABP, which consents, as

⁶⁴ See ID 243

⁶⁵ Set out in ID 239

set out above. In the case of the TATA land, there are four such persons – Tata, National Grid, WPD and SURF Telecoms.

118. ALA 1981 includes several protective provisions relating to particular classes of land which are of relevance.
119. S.16 ALA 1981 provides as follows:

“16.— Statutory undertakers' land excluded from compulsory purchase.

(1) This section applies where the land comprised in a compulsory purchase order includes land which has been acquired by statutory undertakers for the purposes of their undertaking and on a representation made to the appropriate Minister before the expiration of the time within which objections to the order can be made he is satisfied that—

(a) any of the said land is used for the purposes of the carrying on of their undertaking, or (b) an interest in any of the said land is held for those purposes and the representation is not withdrawn.

(2) The compulsory purchase order shall not be confirmed or made so as to authorise the compulsory purchase of any land as to which the appropriate Minister is satisfied as aforesaid except land as to which he is satisfied that its nature and situation are such—

(a) that it can be purchased and not replaced without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking, or

(b) that if purchased it can be replaced by other land belonging to, or available for acquisition by, the undertakers without serious detriment to the carrying on thereof, and certifies accordingly.”

S.16(1) representations were submitted in response to the first CPO by ABP and WPD.

120. ABP also made objections and s.16 representations in respect of the second, third and fourth Supplemental CPOs. By the end of the inquiry all relevant representations and the associated objections to the CPOs had been withdrawn.⁶⁶ There is therefore no need for any separate reporting under s.16. However, it is important to note the special status afforded to statutory undertakers within the statutory scheme for compulsory acquisition of land, to set into context certain criticisms levelled by objectors⁶⁷ of WG's decision to expend substantial sums of money to resolve the impacts at the Docks. These comments were not substantiated and pay no regard to s.16 which affords a high level of protection to the interests of statutory undertakers.
121. There are no outstanding objections to the Highway Schemes or Orders or their enabling CPOs from any statutory undertaker.
122. S.19(1) ALA 1981 provides as follows:

“(1) In so far as a compulsory purchase order authorises the purchase of any land forming part of a common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment, the order shall be subject to special parliamentary procedure unless the Secretary of State is satisfied—

(a) that there has been or will be given in exchange for such land, other land, not being less in area and being equally advantageous to the persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and to the public, and that the land given in exchange has been or will be vested in the persons in whom the land purchased was vested, and subject to the like rights, trusts

⁶⁶ Details are set out in Annex 1.

⁶⁷ Most notable, CALM and GWT

and incidents as attach to the land purchased, or

(aa) that the land is being purchased in order to secure its preservation or improve its management

(b) that the land does not exceed 250 square yards in extent or is required for the widening or drainage of an existing highway or partly for the widening and partly for the drainage of such a highway and that the giving in exchange of other land is unnecessary, whether in the interests of the persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights or in the interests of the public,

and certifies accordingly.”

123. The Scheme requires and the main CPO covers the acquisition of s.19 land in the form of:

- (a) a strip of Registered Common Land running along the eastern foreshore of the River Ebbw; and
- (b) the northern part of the Green Moor Lane allotment site.

124. Exchange land is to be secured, also by way of CPO pursuant to sections 239(5) and 240(6) HA 1980, which expressly authorise the purchase of exchange land in such circumstances. Mrs Tindale described the proposed exchange in her written and oral evidence, pointing out that there would be small gains in area in order fully to mitigate the land take in terms of quality as well as quantity⁶⁸. Landscape and Visual and Noise and Vibration effects were assessed by Messrs Rowson and Evans respectively.⁶⁹

Consultation has taken place with the Open Spaces Society and Magor

⁶⁸ Proof WG 1.10.1, paras 7.35 – 7.37; 7.39 – 7.40.

⁶⁹ Proofs WG 1.8.1 and WG 1.14.1

and Undy Community Council, neither of whom object to the specific proposed arrangements, although the Community Council does object to the Scheme overall and supports the Blue Route.

125. WG accordingly submits that the recommendation to the Welsh Ministers should be that they can certify that the statutory requirements of s.19(1)(a) are satisfied.

126. Circular 14/2004 "*Revised Circular on Compulsory Purchase Orders*" sets out the principles to be applied when considering a CPO. In order to confirm a CPO the decision maker has to be satisfied that:

- there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest;
- this justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected;
- the acquiring authority has a clear idea of how it is intending to use the land it seeks to acquire;
- the acquiring authority can show that all necessary resources to carry out its plans are likely to be available within a reasonable timescale; and
- the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by an impediment to implementation.

127. The next sections of these Submissions address the criteria laid down in the CPO circular. In doing so, they will also provide the material to justify confirmation of the Highways Act Schemes and Orders.

COMPELLING CASE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Transport Need

128. The Scheme is proposed because of the manifest inadequacies of the existing M4 between Magor and Castleton. It is WG's case that the evidence heard at this Inquiry proves that there is a pressing problem demanding of a solution, that the only practicable solution is one which involves an increase in road capacity and that the Scheme is preferable to the various alternatives which have been considered.
129. In this section, we will focus on the first question; namely, whether there is a pressing problem which demands a solution. The existing road was designed and built as the Newport by-pass in the mid to late 1960s and does not meet modern motorway design standards. It has many lane drops and lane gains, resulting in some two lane sections, an intermittent hard shoulder and frequent junctions⁷⁰. Congestion arises with monotonous regularity during peak hours with the Brynglas Tunnels presenting a particular bottle neck⁷¹. That bottleneck is aggravated by the proximity of junctions which can lead to vehicles queuing to leave and access the motorway. GWT and Cycling UK assert that the problem is simply a peak hour or, perhaps more accurately, a peak period problem⁷². This section of the M4 is, so it is suggested by GWT, no different to any other motorway or trunk road in the UK in which a degree of peak hour congestion has to be tolerated. That, however, is a bare assertion which is undermined by the

⁷⁰ See ID 18 for the detail in respect of hardshoulders and their absence

⁷¹ See the heat chart in BW revised proof (WG 1.2.6) page 15/Table 3.3

⁷² In traffic modelling peak period is a 3 hour period, one in the morning and one in afternoon

evidence adduced. Mr Bryan Whittaker, who has some 38 years of relevant professional experience, states that he has not come across another road which experiences congestion caused by incidents on such a frequent basis as this section of the M4. The data from the Traffic Wales Unit for 2015 showed that there were 82 incidents unrelated to peak hours congestion or one incident every 4 or 5 days⁷³. The impact of relatively mundane incidents, such as a routine breakdown, in terms of traffic flow is significant precisely because of the sub-standard design of the existing road such as the absence of hard-shoulders. This was a point corroborated by the police⁷⁴: a broken down vehicle can cause mayhem because it cannot be maneuvered on to a hard-shoulder. Mr Whittaker's evidence is further corroborated by the statistical analysis for the relevant section of the road which was brought to the inquiry's attention by Mr Tim Gent on behalf of St Modwen Developments (see PIQ 91, the INRIX report). During the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 the Brynglas Tunnels experienced approximately 4 traffic jams per day⁷⁵. There were, moreover, incidents whose impact went way beyond peak period congestion – a traffic jam of some 14 miles and a queue lasting 8 hours⁷⁶. In short, as well as the regular and predictable fact of congestion⁷⁷, there are frequent but wholly unpredictable incidents which can give rise to very lengthy delays causing widespread congestion on the broader network. These more serious

⁷³ See BW proof (WG 1.2.6) at page 20/para 3.5.3

⁷⁴ See the email dated 8 March 2017 from Dave Matthews the Traffic Management Advisor to Gwent Police, supporter 207

⁷⁵ These will include peak period congestion and inter-peak incidents

⁷⁶ The 14 mile tail back may or may not have been the queue coinciding with the Wales v Ireland rugby match mentioned by Eddie English in his evidence on 23 March.

⁷⁷ Even the peak hour congestion is, however, unpredictable. See Figures 13.9 to 13.13 pages 17-19 of BW proof (WG 1.2.6). We shall return to this point in more detail when addressing the economic problems caused by the status quo.

incidents lead to gridlock within Newport as set out by those who have sent letters supportive of the Scheme⁷⁸. In short, the M4 is neither a reliable nor a resilient network. That something ought to be done in respect of this problem is a long-standing policy of WG and, before it, the Welsh Office. We will set out in short form the history below. A proper appreciation of that history together with an analysis of the latest evidence as to traffic flows and volumes shows that the GWT's critique of this Scheme as something out of the 1960s playbook to be facile.

130. The original M4 was built in the 1960s with two lanes in each direction. Over time the existing M4 has been widened and re-configured⁷⁹. The first assessment of the need for a new road was undertaken in 1990 as part of the South Wales Area Traffic Study (WG 4.1.1). The authors of that Study accurately foresaw that, in the absence of a comprehensive solution in the form of a new road, the conditions which have become all too familiar to road users in this part of Wales would simply continue and worsen. Whilst the details of recent assessments underpinning the Scheme are different from those in that early Study, the basic problems and choices identified are similar.

131. In June 1993 (WG 4.1.11) and July 1994 (WG 4.1.17) documents were published by the Welsh Office stating that routes to the north of Newport and along the coast or near to the coast had been assessed and rejected as options, for reasons set out in the reports. There was a consultation in 1993 in respect of three routes to the south of Newport which, unlike this

⁷⁸ See BW's evidence re the wider impact of incidents (WG 1.2.6) pages 20 – 22/para 3.6. Those attending the Inquiry had first hand experience of the gridlock caused in Newport when there is an incident on the M4 on 8 March 2018.

⁷⁹ Most of the M4 was widened to three lanes, save for the Tunnels, in the early 1980s (WG 4.1.17, para 1.5), junctions 29 to 32 to the west were widened between 2007 and 2010.

Scheme, ran to the south of Magor. As a result of that consultation, the Welsh Office decided to consult on a route to the north of Magor⁸⁰. Following a second consultation the Welsh Office published a report in July 1995 expressing a preference for a route passing to the north and not the south of Magor (WG 4.1.19).

132. Little progress was made after 1995, save for modifying the route in 1997 to cater for the LG development, until the WG undertook a comprehensive route review which led, in 2006, to the preferred route being aligned further to the north to reduce the impact upon the Gwent Levels SSSIs (WG 4.2.4-4.2.7). Consultations were conducted as to strategic objectives in 2006 and 2007 but in 2009 the Deputy First Minister announced that the plans for a new motorway to the south of Newport were not to be progressed as a motorway would be unaffordable. Significant roadworks were undertaken between 2009 and 2011 on the existing road between junctions 24 and 28 which consisted of resurfacing, the installation of a concrete central barrier and the necessary infrastructure to implement the Variable Speed Limit (VSL) system⁸¹. The VSL and associated works alleviated some of the difficulties experienced but they were not a substitute for a comprehensive solution to the problems of the M4. Therefore, in September 2010, WG launched a comprehensive engagement programme relating to the M4 Corridor Enhancement Measures (M4 CEM). This considered more than 100 possible measures in packages including network improvements, travel planning, demand management and alternative modes of transport. Following appraisal and option sifting in accordance with the then adopted

⁸⁰ (WG 4.1.17, paras 8.1 and 8.3)

⁸¹ It is for this reason that we do not have traffic flow data for the M4 between 2009 and 2011, Whittaker Figure 3.1, page 6

Welsh Transport Planning and Appraisal Guidance (WeITAG) there was a public consultation opening in March 2012 (WG 4.3.5). Consultation took place on four options including a dual carriageway in broadly the same corridor as this Scheme (option A), options involving the enhancement of the SDR⁸² (options B and C) and widening of the existing M4 (option D). These various options were considered in the context of a package of measures consisting of public transport improvements and complementary measures called Common Measures e.g. to encourage the use of public transport, active travel etc. The M4 CEM consultation was commended by the Climate Change Commission for Wales as ‘a good example’ of engaging a wide range of stakeholders in a position paper on Transport whose lead author was Professor Whitmarsh⁸³. She confirmed in cross examination that she stood by that commendation. The upshot of the consultation and the appraisals undertaken in light of the consultation was that a dual carriageway to the south of Newport along what became known as the red route provided the best solution.

133. In 2013, however, discussions between WG and UK government with regard to finance meant that motorway options became financially feasible. Accordingly, a WeITAG appraisal was undertaken comparing the red route dual carriageway with the black route and purple route motorways and published in the WeITAG report of June 2013 (WG 4.3.15). The main differences between the purple and black routes pertained to the path over the Usk and Newport Docks. The purple route went to the north of the Docks and across the Docks Way Landfill site. The WeITAG report

⁸² But not the steelworks road which is the other component of the Blue Route

⁸³ Climate Change Commission for Wales, June 2012 PIQ 78

recommended progressing with the black route as the preferred route. In due course WG announced and published a draft Plan which, following a period of consultation and Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”), was adopted in July 2014.

134. Having reached this stage in the chronology it is perhaps worth exploring the position of some of the main protagonists in this inquiry to the question of whether this section of the M4 was a problem in need of a pressing solution. In December 2013, the Institute of Welsh Affairs published a report authored by Professor Stuart Cole entitled ‘The Blue Route: A cost effective solution to relieving M4 congestion around Newport’⁸⁴. The paper was sent to the relevant Welsh Minister Mrs Edwina Hart on 9 December 2013 by a number of NGOs including GWT and Friends of the Earth Cymru⁸⁵. Accordingly, GWT and Friends of the Earth Cymru were, at that stage, commending the IWA report⁸⁶.

135. In terms of there being a problem in need of a solution ‘The Blue Route’ stated:

“There is a consensus that additional capacity is required to cope with peak period traffic congestion on the M4 around Newport. There are three main reasons:

- *The Brynglas Tunnels on the M4 directly to the north of Newport are an acute pinch-point, reducing a six-lane motorway to four*

⁸⁴ On 12 July 2013 Wildlife Trusts Wales wrote to WG to say that Professor Stuart Cole had been commissioned to prepare a paper. Professor Cole gave evidence to the Environment and Sustainability Committee on 6 November 2013 (see WG’s December 2016 Appraisal of the Blue Route (WG 6.2.35) page 9/3.1.1 to 3.1.3)

⁸⁵ See Appraisal of Blue Route (WG 6.2.35) page 11/3.1.7

⁸⁶ James Byrne is acknowledged for his assistance with regard to site knowledge and peer review, page 23 of ‘The Blue Route’.

lanes. There have been many instances when there have been closures due to traffic incidents at this spot. For instance, in July 2011 the M4 was closed for two days after a lorry caught fire in the Brynglas tunnels. Nearby structures – the Usk Bridge to the east of the Tunnels and the canal bridge to the west – accentuate the difficulty of any road-widening project.

- *There were faults in the original design of the Newport northern by-pass/northern distributor road, later linked to the M4, including the lack of a hard shoulder for some of its length. This reduces its capacity for current traffic volumes.*

- *The M4 is used by local traffic as a local distributor road for short journeys within the local urban area.⁸⁷*

136. In oral evidence, Professor Cole confirmed what was implicit in ‘The Blue Route’⁸⁸ which is that his report was informed by actual traffic data along this section of the M4 up to and including 2012. The factors identified in the above quotation remain pertinent. Indeed, due to the significant growth in traffic since 2012⁸⁹ the problems are more acute than they were when the report was published and, just as importantly, more acute than had been anticipated. Professor’s Cole prediction in respect of traffic flows of a “low percentage increase but with the current plateau demand pattern

⁸⁷ Extract from page 5 of ‘The Blue Route’

⁸⁸ Figure 6 at page 17 of ‘The Blue Route’

⁸⁹ See Bryan Whittaker’s revised proof (1.2.6) pages 5-6, Tables 3.1 & 3.2

continuing for some time”⁹⁰ has not come to pass. The acknowledgment in 2013 of a problem in need of a solution fundamentally undermines the proposition, if such is advanced by GWT and others, that there is no need for a significant investment of some form to alleviate the current and future problems afflicting this section of the M4.

137. Certain economic consequences flow from the existing problems along the M4 corridor. As well as the evidence of Mr Steve Bussell cogent evidence was provided by WG’s chief economist Jonathan Price, the CBI and the Chambers of Commerce of South Wales as to the significant economic harm which ensues from the status quo. As we will set out in the section addressing economics none of this evidence was effectively challenged⁹¹. There are, furthermore, human health advantages implied by the Scheme in terms of alleviating noise and air pollution along the heavily population sections of the existing M4.
138. There is, in short, a problem which demands a solution. There is a policy commitment to delivering “a significant improvement to the M4 around Newport”⁹². WG aver that this Scheme constitutes the appropriate solution to that problem. A number of arguments have been adduced by objectors in contesting WG’s case for the Scheme. They include arguments that:
- i. The Scheme is based on erroneous traffic forecasts;
 - ii. Induced traffic has not been properly considered and/or will render the Scheme self-defeating;

⁹⁰ The Blue Route page 21

⁹¹ Professor Calvin Jones accepted, for instance, that the CBI and the South Wales Chamber of Commerce were correct to opine that the Scheme would help their members.

⁹² Prosperity for All, page 21

- iii. Peak car renders a new motorway unnecessary;
- iv. The advent of connected and autonomous vehicles mean that, in future, the existing road will have sufficient capacity;
- v. The UK government's announcement that the prohibition of the sale of diesel and petrol cars in 2040 somehow undermines the case for the Scheme;
- vi. Modal shift in the form of further public transport and active travel provision is a sufficient and better solution;
- vii. The claims that the Scheme will promote the Welsh economy are erroneous and/or illusory and the Scheme may actually hinder the Welsh economy;
- viii. The Scheme is a carbon intensive development contrary to WG's duties under the WFG Act 2015, the EWA 2016 and inconsistent with global agreements re climate change;
- ix. The Scheme's impact on the Gwent Levels is such that the Scheme is contrary to WG's duties under the Future Generations Act 2015, the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and other environmental legislation.

139. We will address each of these arguments in turn. None stand up and they do not, therefore, undermine WG's case that there is an overwhelming case in the public interest justifying the acquisition of land by compulsion. The final objection concerning the FG Act and the other statutory environmental duties will be addressed in a later section.

Traffic forecasts, induced traffic and peak car

140. These matters are closely associated with one another and will be treated together. All are properly the subject of expert opinion. Some elements, moreover, are subject to the Bushell principle. WG relies upon the evidence of Mr Whittaker. GWT relied on a number of expert witnesses who gave opinions on these matters though many seemed to have only a superficial knowledge of the topics and the lead expert was Professor Whitelegg. Cycling UK relied upon Professor Cole and Dr Melia. Others who gave evidence on these included Robert Waller, Pippa Bartolotti and T N D Anderson of Pace Transportation Ltd.

Traffic forecasts

141. The long-term traffic forecasts published by the Department for Transport in 1989 and 1997 predicted a quantum of increase in traffic significantly higher than the increase which actually occurred. It is these forecasts which are relied upon by objectors in support of the proposition that the Scheme relies upon exaggerated predictions of future traffic growth. Mr Whittaker agrees that these forecasts overstated future traffic though he pointed out that DfT predictions do not and cannot take into account fluctuations in growth consequent upon the economic cycle. To that end the impact of the recession of the early 1990s and the more significant depression which started in 2008 on traffic volumes do not, of themselves, constitute a critique of the DfT's forecasts. Mr Whittaker also pointed out, moreover, that the DfT's forecasts did not always over-predict traffic growth. Indeed,

the forecasts in 1980 and 1984 significantly underestimated the traffic growth which was experienced in the 1980s and which no doubt influenced the very much higher estimates reached by DfT in 1989. It is simply factually incorrect, therefore, to state that the DfT always overestimates traffic growth.

142. The Scheme, of course, does not rely on the forecasts of 1989 or 1997. Rather, in accordance with WG policy, the traffic modelling is based on the latest DfT growth factors in the National Trip End Model (NTEM). The data in NTEM is accessible via computer software provided by the DfT called TEMPRO. The PLI was due to commence in November 2016. The evidence and assessments had been prepared based on TEMPRO 6.2 but the inquiry was adjourned in order for WG to consider a revised version of TEMPRO and to produce economic, traffic and environmental reports based on the latest DfT traffic growth factors. Those growth factors provide a lower estimate of future traffic growth. The WG's evidence and reports are based on TEMPRO 7.1 Interim for Wales. On 1 March 2017 TEMPRO 7.2 was published and though there are differences between TEMPRO 7.1 Interim for Wales and TEMPRO 7.2 they are negligible (see PIQ 4). WG's case is based, therefore, on the latest DfT forecasts. In one sense, there is little more to be said. In accordance with established WG policy the Scheme has been assessed against the latest government forecasts and those cannot be challenged pursuant to the Bushell principle. Nevertheless, the allegation that the Scheme is predicated upon exaggerated traffic forecasts was addressed in evidence and cannot go unanswered.

143. Bryan Whittaker explained that the latest NTEM is posited on a fall in trip rates between 2011 and 2016 with trip rates staying constant thereafter⁹³. Trip rates, it should be pointed out, relate to the number of trips undertaken by individuals regardless of the mode of transport – walking, cycling, public transport or private motor vehicle. The growth factors take heed of the fall in trip rates for certain purposes in the period 2003 to 2010 which are apparent from the National Travel Survey e.g. a fall of 6% and 10% in respect of shopping and commuting respectively⁹⁴ and assume that those trends will continue until 2016. The latest NTEM, moreover, though still maintaining a relationship between travel growth and factors such as incomes, costs and population takes into account other factors as well⁹⁵. Insofar as regional accuracy of the growth factors is concerned the NTEM takes into account detailed planning data and that too is a departure from the methodology employed in producing NRTF 89 and NRTF 97⁹⁶.
144. The objectors are therefore arguing against a straw man when asserting that DfT forecasts systematically overestimate traffic growth. The criticism is of NRTF 89 & 97, neither of which plays any role in WG's economic, environmental or traffic case. Furthermore, the NTEM has been very substantially revised in terms of methodology and takes into account recent changes in patterns of work, shopping, car ownership and so on and posits the continuation of such trends beyond 2010. There was not a single specific evidential criticism of DfT's latest forecast.

⁹³ BW revised proof (WG 1.2.6) page 53/9.3.5

⁹⁴ BW revised proof page 52/9.3.4

⁹⁵ BW revised proof page 52/9.3.2

⁹⁶ See POPE page 38/penultimate paragraph

145. It may be useful to say a little at this stage about the National Travel Survey. Mr Waller gave evidence in respect of this towards the end of the inquiry⁹⁷. In his evidence, he identified a number of trends in respect of travel patterns and behaviour. Across a range of metrics travel by motor car appears to have stabilised or decreased and this, so the argument goes, gives rise to the need to be cautious about future traffic volume growth. There are a number of difficulties with what looks, at first blush, to be a plausible and common-sense argument. First, these trends are not new. They are trends which became apparent in the mid 1990s and the early 2000s. If one looked at these metrics in isolation one would have expected traffic growth to have stopped or even reversed. But, in fact, traffic volumes on the M4 have grown consistently since 2011. The inference which Mr Waller and others invite the inquiry to draw from these trends is contradicted by data relating to observed traffic on the M4. Secondly, the Department for Transport is cognisant of these trends and Mr Whittaker has confirmed that TEMPRO 7.2 takes them into account; for example, a decline in trip rates is assumed for 2010 to 2016 with stable trip rates thereafter. In short, there is nothing in the NTS to undermine the core scenario forecast in the M4CaN traffic model.
146. The TEMPRO 7.2 growth factors relate to the years from 2010 onwards. To that end it is possible to ascertain whether those growth factors overestimate actual growth at least for the 6 or 7 year period up to the present day. As to that Mr Whittaker stated that the latest version of the NTEM predicted a growth in traffic on motorways in Wales of 6.9%

⁹⁷ 8 March 2018

between 2010 and 2015⁹⁸. Though no actual data is available for 2010 it is apparent that growth on the relevant section of the M4 for the 5 year period between 2011 and 2016 varies between 6.1% and 14% with a median growth rate of 12.3%. Though the comparison between 2010-2015 and 2011-2016 is not exact it seems clear that the latest NTEM does not overestimate growth on this section of the M4. In conclusion, the proposition that WG's case is based on exaggerated estimates of future traffic growth is demonstrably false: a matter which is established by the incontrovertible actual traffic data available on this section of the road since 2011. It is also, as noted earlier, caught by the Bushell principle.

Peak car

147. This is a variation on the theme that the case for the Scheme is based on exaggerated traffic forecasts. Wales, it is said, is a developed country and there is widespread evidence across the developed world that use of the car has peaked or plateaued. As with the argument that the traffic forecasts were exaggerated, peak car was often deployed as a slogan: the argument was not developed with any clarity or precision beyond citing the name of Professor Phil Goodwin. Mr Whittaker did, however, address the argument in his rebuttal evidence⁹⁹.
148. The starting point in considering peak car is to define it: it is the hypothesis that per capita car use is close to its maximum and may stabilize or turn down. If the population is growing, therefore, traffic will continue to increase. Accordingly, more road capacity will be required to provide the

⁹⁸ PIQ 18, page 6/2.10

⁹⁹ See BW's rebuttal of Prof Cole pages 8-9/3.1.10 – 3.1.12

same level of functionality even if the hypothesis is true. The second point to note is that unqualified assent or dissent to the hypothesis betrays a misunderstanding of both the theory and transportation in general. As Mr Whittaker points out, in a densely urban metropolis such as London per capita car use may well have stabilized. But this Scheme is not situated in London. Across the UK aggregate vehicle kilometres continues to grow and that growth is greater on motorways and rural A roads¹⁰⁰. Of even greater relevance, there has been growth in excess of 2% per annum on this section of motorway since 2011. The vehicular journeys which are being undertaken less frequently tend to be the shorter trips¹⁰¹. The actual local data, therefore, undermines the argument that the peak car hypothesis applies to this section of the M4. Similarly, the broader patterns discerned across the UK in terms of traffic volumes and the National Travel Survey support the proposition that traffic volumes will increase along this section of the M4 and that, absent a solution, the existing serious problems will only get worse.

Induced traffic

149. A considerable amount of heat has been generated by the issue of induced traffic. The question is not whether the phenomenon exists - it does – but rather how significant it might be in quantitative terms in the context of this Scheme. To the extent that it occurs would its consequences be good, bad or indifferent?

¹⁰⁰ BW rebuttal of Prof Cole page 8/3.1.10

¹⁰¹ BW revised proof (WG1.2.6) page 52/9.3.4

150. In GWT's closing much is made of induced traffic. Building this Scheme, it is said, would be self-defeating:

“Evidence from around the globe shows that building motorways to fight congestion doesn't work. Building a motorway to ease congestion has been likened to ‘loosening your belt to fight obesity’. It may provide short-term relief, but soon afterwards the extra road capacity generates more traffic than there was before. In the long term motorways just allow congestion to grow further: they don't reduce it.”¹⁰²

*“Professor Whitelegg stated that any objective assessment of the weight of evidence, both scientific evidence and public policy, would lead inevitably to the rejection of a proposal that claimed economic and social gains from a large item of transport infrastructure. **It would further reject the assertion that such investments could maintain accessibility improvements over time as traffic levels rise and erode the temporary gains made in the few months following the opening of the scheme.**”¹⁰³*

151. The section in bold is a reiteration of paragraph 48 of Professor Whitelegg's proof of evidence. Professor Whitelegg was closely cross examined on that proposition and on his other evidence regarding induced traffic. He did not take the opportunity to resile from what is a demonstrably absurd statement. On that point, and in general, Professor Whitelegg's evidence

¹⁰² page 9 of GWT closing

¹⁰³ page 53 of GWT closing. Italicisation added by the authors of this closing.

was unsatisfactory. The inquiry is invited to prefer Mr Whittaker's evidence in its entirety. Before, however, making further points about the reliability of individual witnesses it is necessary to define what is meant by induced traffic in different contexts and to say something of the various reports referred to by the witnesses. It will become apparent that the term is used differently in different contexts by different people.

152. POPE¹⁰⁴ defines induced traffic as follows:

“Highway improvement schemes can impact upon traffic patterns over a significant area, leading to a number of demand responses. Changes in traffic flows on a road after the implementation of a scheme could be for a range of reasons including:

- *General background traffic growth (that would have happened with or without the scheme);*
- *Reassigned traffic (people changing their route);*
- *Mode change (i.e. switching to or from public transport);*
- *Destination change;*
- *Time of travel change;*
- *Trip frequency increase; and*
- *Generated or new trips (e.g. from different land use patterns)*

In the context of POPE, changes in background traffic growth and reassigned traffic can be identified using observed data. It is not

¹⁰⁴ Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) of Major Schemes

*possible, however, to distinguish between the other reasons for traffic flow changes listed above. For the purpose of this analysis, therefore, additional traffic due to changes in mode, destination, time and frequency, as well as new trips, are considered to be 'induced' traffic."*¹⁰⁵

153. This is also the definition used by the CPRE report¹⁰⁶. A number of things are worth noting in respect of this definition. First, changes in destination may or may not increase the aggregate amount of vehicle kms. If someone who shops in Bristol because they are deterred by congestion from shopping in Cardiff switches to Cardiff once the Scheme is built a trip to Cardiff is induced but the trip to and from Bristol is avoided and there may or may not be an increase in distance travelled – this type of effect is not undesirable per se¹⁰⁷. Secondly, a change in the timing of a trip counts as an induced effect though what would amount to a reversal of peak-spreading would not have any impact on distance travelled or even the route travelled – such a change may be a good thing¹⁰⁸. A change in mode due to a new road would, all other things being equal, be a bad thing on the presumption that the change of mode was from public transport or active travel to a private vehicle. An increase in trip frequency implies, all other things being equal, more vehicle kms. As for new trips due to land use changes even those trips will not unambiguously increase aggregate

¹⁰⁵ Page 53 of POPE

¹⁰⁶ See page 13 of CPRE. The summary is ID 27

¹⁰⁷ In this instance the induced traffic would be good from the point of a view Cardiff shops, bad from the point of view of Bristol shops and good from the consumer's point of view.

¹⁰⁸ Workers are able to travel to work at their preferred time and don't have to get in early just to avoid congestion

vehicle kms because the new trips may be substitutes for trips which are no longer undertaken (and which may be longer or shorter). Accordingly, induced traffic is not necessarily a bad thing from the perspective of aggregate vehicle kms as one has to take into account the trip which is forsaken as a result of the induced trip. And, as the evidence relating to this Scheme shows, vehicle kms cannot, without more, be taken as a barometer for carbon consumption – vehicle kms travelled in less congested circumstances involve less production of carbon. Furthermore, those aspects of induced traffic which are unambiguously undesirable from a carbon/sustainability point of view such as a proliferation of out of town shopping centres are subject to control under the planning system. Induced traffic can also have positive social and economic effects. A person taking up a new employment opportunity as a result of lower travel times will be undertaking an induced trip; but the new job is a benefit both to the person undertaking the trip and to the wider economy. It is accepted, of course, that induced traffic can have disadvantages and may in certain circumstances depress the BCR for a new road¹⁰⁹. The important point is that the topic is complex and the effects have been modelled in respect of the Scheme and taken into account in the economic appraisal.

154. Another point which flows from the above definition and a proper understanding of induced traffic is the one made by Bryan Whittaker under cross examination by Cycling UK¹¹⁰ which is that there is no single and definitive way of measuring an induced effect – the results will depend on the geographical area one considers. For instance, in ID 43 Bryan

¹⁰⁹ Because new or induced motorists add to congestion thereby increasing journey times for those who would have undertaken the trip regardless of the new road.

¹¹⁰ 4 May

Whittaker sets out the induced traffic across a screenline represented by the river Usk and compares the extent of induced traffic under the Scheme (4.2%) and under the Blue Route (3.3%). In the no toll scenario ID 43a the figures are 5% and 3.8% respectively. This represents the extent of the induced traffic across the screenline. What it does not do, however, is capture all of the trips which are forsaken as a result of, for example, a change in destination from B to C¹¹¹. A broader measure of the net impact of the Scheme on vehicle kms is captured by the evidence provided by Mr Whittaker.

155. Table 2¹¹² in Mr Whittaker's proof dealing with the abolition of the tolls sets out the difference in aggregate vehicle kms travelled as between the Do Minimum and Do Something in 2022, 2037 and 2051 in the AM peak, the inter peak and the PM peak over the whole of the modelled area. Under the Do Something scenario that analysis captures the increased vehicle kms as a result of induced trips as well as the decrease in vehicle kms in respect of trips which are no longer undertaken within the modelled area. Importantly, however, it also captures the decrease in vehicle kms in respect of traffic which reassigns from the old M4 to the new road and the new road is 2.8 kms shorter. So there will be a decrease in vehicle kms for all those vehicles who would travel from A to B in any event and have switched from the old road to the new road.

156. The relative scale of these countervailing impacts are shown to some extent in ID 43a. In 2037 the two way AADT across the new Usk crossing under a fixed demand model is 68,878. That is all traffic which has

¹¹¹ Some of those will be captured e.g. if B and C involve crossing the screenline.

¹¹² Page 8 of WG 1.2.6

reassigned from other routes (mostly but not wholly the old M4). To the extent that the traffic is through traffic which has reassigned from the old M4 to the new road then there is a 2.8 km distance saving. The induced traffic over the new Usk crossing is the difference between the fixed demand and VDM AADT which is 6,944. There is induced traffic over the other routes crossing the Usk as well but that provides a flavour of the extent of the induced traffic. Finally, what ID 43a does not do is identify those trips which are forsaken as a result of the Scheme and which did not cross the Usk e.g. shopping or commuting trips from Monmouthshire to Bristol which are replaced by trips to Cardiff.

157. Mr Whittaker has, therefore, provided evidence of the net increase or decrease in aggregate vehicle kms within the modelled area and he has also provided a measure of the induced traffic across the screenline. His evidence rebuts the two discrete critiques of the Scheme based on induced traffic.
158. The first critique is the one quoted in paragraph 150 hereof which is that it will lead to an increase in traffic along the corridor to such an extent that the effort to alleviate congestion by additional road traffic is self-defeating. The second critique is that induced traffic will lead to a significant increase in aggregate vehicle kms and thus to an increase in user carbon. This carbon critique of the Scheme is misconceived unless the focus is on the overall net increase or decrease in vehicle kms. In other words the focus should be on any net increase in aggregate vehicle kms having regard to (i) induced trips, (ii) the impact of reassignment and (iii) the impact of trips which do not take place due to changes in destinations. The witnesses

called by GWT and Cycling UK did not address in their written evidence factors (ii) and (iii) and under cross examination were reluctant to acknowledge the obvious and beneficial implication, all other things being equal, of the Scheme being shorter than the existing M4.

159. Before addressing the two critiques separately it is necessary to make some general observations as to the credibility of the witnesses who gave evidence as to these matters. Neither Professor Cole nor Dr Melia on behalf of Cycling UK nor Professor Whitelegg on behalf of GWT had the professional competence to construct a traffic model of the kind built by Mr Whittaker and his team. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that there was no specific criticism either of the traffic modelling or of the evidence adduced by Mr Whittaker as to the additional vehicle kms or the induced traffic across the river Usk screenline.

Professor Whitelegg

160. In his proof of evidence Professor Whitelegg adopts both strands of the induced traffic critique though the focus is on the first critique. He states that “a large amount of induced traffic will usually have the effect of cancelling or minimizing the travel time savings that have been predicted for a road scheme”¹¹³. Though he does not provide any opinion as to the magnitude of the induced traffic which he foresees he concludes:

¹¹³ Para 32

“For the avoidance of doubt it is my settled view that the decision making process around the M4 relief road cannot be regarded as sound and reliable if it does not follow the findings of the SACTRA 1994 report and the detailed empirical evidence presented in the CPRE, 2006 report “Beyond Transport Infrastructure” report and the detailed review of induced traffic by an acknowledged expert in this field...Induced traffic renders the VFM calculations unsound and undermines the BCR and it would not be the in the best traditions of evidence-based UK decision taking on major investments to proceed with a very expensive project that is based on deeply flawed calculations.”¹¹⁴

161. There is no acknowledgment in Professor Whitelegg’s proof that the M4CaN model is a variable demand model (VDM) and that induced traffic has therefore been taken into account in the traffic results and the BCR. In evidence in chief he stated that SACTRA 1994 was the gold standard and that it was the basis for his critique. In cross examination, however, he was unable to identify the primary recommendation of SACTRA 1994 and when it was suggested to him that it was that variable demand modelling (VDM) should be adopted he was still unable to express his assent or dissent to that proposition. This was a stark illustration of Professor Whitelegg’s lack of familiarity with the core research literature and his ignorance of the work carried out by the experts in the project team. The fundamental recommendation of SACTRA 1994 is for fixed trip matrix appraisals to be

¹¹⁴ Para 37

- abandoned¹¹⁵. That recommendation has been followed in constructing the M4CaN traffic model as would be apparent to anyone who had read the relevant report¹¹⁶.
162. By the time he came to give oral evidence Professor Whitelegg was aware that the model took into account induced traffic¹¹⁷. But he did not take this on board at all in refining or qualifying his critique that the new road would be self-defeating. He was unable to identify any flaw in Bryan Whittaker's model or in his evidence.
163. SACTRA 1994 concluded that *"induced traffic can and does occur, probably quite extensively, though its size and significance is likely to vary widely in different circumstances"*¹¹⁸. It is because induced traffic varies so much that the effect needs to be modelled. And that is what Mr Whittaker has done. Professor Whitelegg's attention was drawn to the capacity of the new road when challenged about the proposition advanced in paragraph 48 of his proof; namely, that the congestion relief provided by the new road would be ephemeral. Whilst he eventually conceded that the capacity of the new road was greater than that of the existing road he did not make the clearly appropriate concession that induced traffic in excess of the magnitude identified in SACTRA 1994¹¹⁹ would not lead to congestion returning to previous levels along the corridor in a matter of months or years. While the model is robust no-one supposes that it is likely to be

¹¹⁵ Page 208, paragraph 15.25 of SACTRA 1994

¹¹⁶ Local Model Validation Report November 2015 (WG 2.3.9)

¹¹⁷ It was a point made by BW in his rebuttal of Professor Whitelegg's evidence page 20/2.3.1/4

¹¹⁸ SACTRA 1994 page 168, paragraph 11.16 and quoted in WG rebuttal of Professor Whitelegg page 19/para 2.3.1/1

¹¹⁹ The average induced traffic figures of 10% in the short run and 20% in the long run are not set out in SACTRA 1994 but have been produced by Professor Goodwin who was a part of the committee who produced the report.

precisely correct. But the level of induced traffic which it forecasts could be wrong by a factor of 10 and the new road would still provide very considerable congestion relief in the long term. In short, we submit that the proposition that the Scheme would be self-defeating as a consequence of induced traffic is demonstrably false. Induced traffic as well as increases in background traffic growth will have an impact in eroding to some extent travel time savings as is apparent from the journey time tables¹²⁰. But these impacts have been quantified and it is clear that background traffic growth is more important than the induced traffic effect because the time savings between Do Something and Do Minimum increase rather than decrease over time.

164. As for the proposition that induced traffic will increase user carbon Professor Whitelegg's reasoning is set out at paragraph 17 where he states:

"...as I show in section 4 of this proof of evidence these greenhouse gases will be larger than those associated with current traffic levels because of the phenomenon known as 'induced traffic'. New roads generate new traffic and this is discussed in s 4"

165. We will not repeat the criticism of Professor Whitelegg's evidence on induced traffic. An equally fundamental flaw is his disregard of the carbon effects of reassigned traffic. Vehicles which reassign from the old road to the new road will travel a shorter distance and hence, all other things being equal, burn less fuel. All other things, however, are not equal because

¹²⁰ See WG 1.2.7 page 14, table 7 for through traffic journey times up to 2051

under the Do Something scenario there will be less congestion and fewer accelerations and decelerations and therefore vehicles will travel in a more fuel efficient manner. The impacts of congestion alleviation compound the savings in terms of distance travelled insofar as reassigned traffic is concerned.

166. In short, neither limb of the induced traffic critique of the Scheme stands up to scrutiny. The notion that the new road would become as congested as the existing road within a matter of months is absurd. Mr Whittaker's model is a variable demand model which takes into account induced traffic and the results for the design year show that the new road will still be free-flowing¹²¹. Similarly, Mr Whittaker has produced tables relating to aggregate vehicle kms, trips and vehicle hours within the modelled area. There are increases in terms of aggregate vehicle kms but they are extremely modest. These tables capture all of the countervailing effects of the Scheme on distance travelled. It is of note that aggregate vehicle hours within the modelled area falls as a result of the Scheme and that is because traffic in the entire area benefits from congestion relief¹²². Mr Chapman's carbon analysis shows that, due to less congestion, the Scheme will result in less user carbon being expended.

Connected and autonomous vehicles (CAVs) and electric cars

167. Many of the objectors have raised the prospect of connected and autonomous vehicles as a technological innovation which will render the

¹²¹ There is a decline in journey times but nothing which suggests that the new road would be blighted by congestion.

¹²² Table 3 at page 8 of WG 1.2.7

Scheme redundant. CAVs are vehicles that drive themselves. If and when all vehicles on the highway network become CAVs then it is anticipated that the capacity of the network will increase because of the lower headway between vehicles¹²³. This was first raised by Professor Calvin Jones and Pippa Bartolotti. Others have adopted the same point including the FG Commissioner. There is a great deal of uncertainty in respect of the rate of progress of this technology and its impact on network capacity prior to all vehicles becoming CAVs. The research is summarized in Mr Whittaker's section of WG's response to the FG Commissioner's first written statement¹²⁴.

168. The impact of CAVs on network performance is anticipated to become much greater as the proportion of CAVs in the vehicular fleet increases. That gives rise to the notion of a tipping point where network performance will increase substantially. The research published by the DfT in May 2016 suggested a tipping point somewhere between 50% and 75%. In terms of relieving congestion that research predicted a 7% improvement in delay with 50% of vehicles being CAVs, with a 40% improvement in delay with a fully automated vehicle fleet. As to when significant penetration may occur Mr Whittaker refers to the paper presented at the European Transport Conference 2016 which summarized the outcome of a 'Delphi' survey of global transport professionals. The mean prediction for when CAVs would reach 10% of the vehicle fleet was 2032, with a prediction for 20% penetration of 2040. With penetration of 20% the experts predicted an increase in network capacity of 10%. While there is a great degree of

¹²³ Headway is the distance between vehicles as they travel. The two second rule would be reduced to a fraction of that if all vehicles were CAVs.

¹²⁴ ISU0024 September 2017, pages 44 to 47

uncertainty the best evidence appears to be that CAVs may increase the carrying capacity of the existing M4 by 10% in 2040; traffic volumes grew by more than that in the 5 year period between 2011 and 2016. In short, CAVs do not provide a solution or even a material part of any solution for the foreseeable future. There is, moreover, a Bushell point here: no doubt because the potential impact of CAVs is distant and uncertain no provision is made in government guidance for predicting any congestion relief as a consequence of CAVs.

Public transport investment and modal shift as a solution or alternative

169. The feasibility of resolving the current problems on the M4 through public transport and active travel measures was explored in detail during the M4 CEM process. In 2013 a public transport appraisal concluded that a doubling of public transport utilization in and around Newport would only remove up to 5% of the traffic from the M4¹²⁵. An updated Public Transport Overview concluded that, with elements of phases 1, 2 and 3 of Metro, and the park & ride scheme at Llanwern the upper bound assessment of traffic extracted from the M4 during the PM peak hour would be less than 4%¹²⁶. This analysis was progressed further to include an assessment of the impact of Rapid Bus Transport in Newport; WG's evidence on the potential for public transport measures to extract traffic from the M4 is set out in ID73. The peak hour abstraction of traffic from the existing M4 is, at most, 5.9%.

¹²⁵ Document WG 4.3.16 cited in Matthew Jones's main proof WG 1.1.1 at page 42/9.1

¹²⁶ The Updated Public Transport Overview is document WG 2.4.19. This is summarised in ID73.

170. This level of relief will not be sufficient to solve the long-term problems of the M4. It amounts to about 3 years' traffic volume growth. The public transport measures which have been assessed in ID73 include all those which are feasible and which bear on east-west traffic. Some of the measures are committed as part of Metro, others are not and are more speculative. WG is committed to Metro which brings significant benefits over and above those which would pertain to the M4. It is, moreover, largely, but not wholly, a package which will facilitate north-south travel and not east-west travel. The response of objectors has been to say that there should be even more investment in public transport and that if there were more investment then the rate of abstraction would be greater. The difficulty with this argument is that increasing the quantum of user of public transport requires provision which is feasible, affordable and which will be attractive to those who would otherwise use the M4. The measures which are already committed parts of Metro are precisely those measures which are the most feasible, attractive to travellers and therefore provide better value for money. No public body would invest first in those measures whose returns are low and leave the most feasible, affordable and attractive public transport measures until a later time. Accordingly, the argument that one should simply increase public transport provision until it is sufficient to solve congestion on the M4 won't do. Provision which is feasible and is attractive to travellers and hence provides decent value for money will become increasingly hard to find once those measures in Metro have been implemented. The law of diminishing marginal returns applies and thus doubling the amount of investment in PT will not double the

amount of patronage or the extent of abstraction of traffic from the M4¹²⁷. During the M4 CEM process the WG looked very closely at the feasibility of solving the problem with public transport measures. The exercise was undertaken again during the course of this inquiry and all measures, both committed and those which are more speculative, which could contribute to solving the problem were assessed. With ambitious assumptions in favour of the efficacy of public transport measures the abstraction is 5.9%¹²⁸. It should also be borne in mind that some of this abstraction is already included in the M4CaN traffic model¹²⁹.

171. The law of diminishing marginal returns was illustrated by the evidence of Ms Bartolotti and Mr Anderson in respect of light rail provision. At first blush, a tram which has many stops between Magor and Castleton has its attractions until one considers the costs of the infrastructure, the ongoing subsidy requirement¹³⁰, the land required and the delays caused by multiple stops which may undermine the attractiveness of the tram. In short, there is no evidence before the inquiry to suggest that there are practicable public transport measures which could take a significant proportion of vehicles from the existing M4. It is easy, moreover, to overlook freight but in practice HGVs are the only viable option in most cases for the movement of goods. The only robust evidence is that adduced by the WG and making all reasonable assumptions in favour of

¹²⁷ See Mr Whittaker's evidence under cross examination from Mr Waller on 20 March 2018 and ID156b subsequently adduced by WG.

¹²⁸ The lower bound figure is 3.2%. See para 13 of ID 73.

¹²⁹ See para 5 of ID 73. The level of abstraction already included in the modelled flows for peak hour PM in 2037 is in the region of 1.2 to 2%.

¹³⁰ Existing rail services in Wales are subsidised by Government; it is likely, therefore, that any light rail/tram service would also require a subsidy

public transport the degree of abstraction is no greater than 6% during peak hours.

Alternatives

172. Twenty nine alternatives have been advanced and examined during the course of the inquiry. A number have been withdrawn¹³¹. Of those which remain the approach which the inquiry ought to take to their assessment is set out in the *Advice for Inspectors – Transport Orders*¹³² at paragraphs 2.50, 2.51, 2.166, and 2.167 set out below:

“2.50 It is not the role of the Inspector to make a recommendation in favour of an alternative proposal. However, the Inspector must understand any alternatives proposed sufficiently well to be able to decide whether they appear to be worth further investigation. An important factor in such decisions will be whether or not the alternative would overcome or sufficiently mitigate some deficiency in the Order proposal that would otherwise render it incapable of passing the statutory tests. Should he or she come to the conclusion that an alternative proposal before the inquiry warrants further investigation as compared with the order proposal, it would clearly not be logical to recommend the making or confirmation of the orders.

2.51 When an alternative route is considered at an inquiry, the promoters should produce an evaluation of the merits and practicability of the alternative proposed, whether it would meet the aims and objectives set for the original scheme, taking into account its comparative impacts on the environment and adjoining owners, and comparative costs. When considering comparative costs, there will usually be an assessment of the cost of the delay, which would follow from considering an alternative scheme. An alternative would no doubt

¹³¹ Those withdrawn are alternatives 8-10 and alternatives 13-17

¹³² ID 240

require detailed design work, followed in all probability by the preparation of new orders and the holding of a new inquiry. The assessed cost of delay is therefore often very substantial. In Smith & Others v SoS for Transport and Barnsley MBC (1995 QBCOF 95/1433 – 4D) the Court of Appeal held that delay and its costs could be a material consideration to be weighed along with all others in considering whether an alternative should be further considered, but that except in special circumstances it should not be regarded as an overriding and decisive factor. Decisions should be based upon what is appropriate in the public interest, and therefore all relevant factors should be taken into account.

2.166 Although the Inspector is not in a position to make a recommendation in favour of any alternative proposal, any such proposal (and any counter-objections to it) must be given due consideration, and its apparent advantages and disadvantages compared with the published proposal. This is because the Inspector will need to advise the SofS/WM on whether the alternative in question appears to warrant further investigation where the Inspector comes to the conclusion that, whilst the original proposal may be justified in principle, the objections made against it are sufficiently overwhelming to lead the Inspector to recommend against it.

2.167 There will then follow an overall judgement on the proposal, together with the reasoning which leads to any recommended modification, bearing in mind the submissions and objections made, any relevant policies and any criteria specified in the enabling Act. “

173. In determining whether the alternatives are worthy of further investigation “an important factor [is] whether or not the alternative would overcome or sufficiently mitigate some deficiency in the Order proposal that would otherwise render it incapable of passing the statutory tests”¹³³. The same point is put in even more forthright terms at 2.166: a recommendation that an alternative appears to warrant further investigation only arises “where

¹³³ Taken from 2.50

- the Inspector comes to the conclusion that, whilst the original proposal may be justified in principle, the objections made against it are sufficiently overwhelming to lead the Inspector to recommend against it”.
174. Accordingly, when assessing the advantages and disadvantages of alternatives, the context must be borne in mind; the fundamental question is whether the objections to the scheme itself are ‘sufficiently overwhelming’ that it cannot meet the statutory tests and that therefore the inspectors should recommend against it. It is submitted that none of the objections to the scheme meet this test.
175. Another important factor is the delay which would be implied by the further investigation of any alternative or alternatives. On the basis that construction inflation does not differ materially from general inflation WG do not argue that the delay would increase the costs of construction. There is, however, a long-standing and existing problem on the M4. Delay in delivery of a solution will mean the prolongation of those problems to the detriment of the Welsh economy and the welfare of those who need to use the motorway. That is a telling factor against all the alternatives.
176. In view of the very many alternatives the inquiry is referred to the assessment in the Alternatives brochure, the rebuttals and responses adduced and PIQs 152, 155, 156 and 230. Detailed submissions will only be made in response to the alternatives which were promoted in person at the inquiry.

Blue Route, Alternatives 1, 2, 23 & 24

177. This is an alternative promoted by Cycling UK. This alternative was articulated in a report prepared by Professor Cole and commissioned by GWT, FoE and others “The Blue Route”¹³⁴. Certainly prior to the inquiry, it was the most prominent of the alternatives. It has been scrutinised by the Assembly’s Environment and Sustainability Committee and formed an important plank of the judicial review challenge heard by Hickinbottom J. It is also a comprehensive alternative to the Scheme: it adopts no part of the Scheme and is not simply a variation of the Scheme along part of its length.
178. Cycling UK adduced expert evidence from Professor Cole and Dr Melia as well as evidence from Dr MacKay and Mr Geffen. The first to give evidence was Professor Cole. Notwithstanding a considerable amount of liaison between Professor Cole and the WG project team as to the best articulation of the Blue Route and the various scenarios set out in the Appraisal of the Blue Route published by WG in December 2016 (WG 6.2.35) there was some confusion as to which variation was advocated by Professor Cole: in chief he introduced the gold, silver and bronze versions. After some discussion, he agreed that scenario 7 was a fair representation of the Blue Route. At the outset of his cross examination he was asked whether he continued to advocate a road based alternative to the Scheme. He prevaricated. Things, he said, had moved on; in 2013 Metro was not within his contemplation¹³⁵. Eventually, he confirmed that he was still supporting the Blue Route. It was apparent, however, that Professor Cole had not revisited the reasoning set out in ‘The Blue Route’ in light of

¹³⁴ See paras 135 and 136

¹³⁵ That was not quite right. Metro is addressed in some detail at page 14 of ‘The Blue Route’

developments and information which had become available since its publication in late 2013.

179. Professor Cole's ambivalence about the Blue Route was a taste of things to come. Mr Geffen was asked whether he advocated the Blue Route. He said that it should be considered only if a package of measures encouraging public transport and active travel would not be sufficient. He then said that he was in favour of modest road proposals, which is hardly an accurate description of the cost and impact of the Blue Route. Eventually, after a brief adjournment, he expressed lukewarm support for the Blue Route. Some clarity was provided by Dr Melia: he was against the Blue Route and, indeed, any road proposal. Dr Mackay supported the Blue Route but had not considered its impact on cyclists or discussed the same with Professor Cole.

180. Reverting to Professor Cole it is instructive to examine his reasoning in 2013¹³⁶. First, he said that there was a consensus that additional road capacity was required¹³⁷. Secondly, he noted the plateauing of traffic along the M4:

"There was substantial growth in the late 1990s, but a levelling off from 2001 with a slight fall to 2012. There is therefore limited evidence to suggest any change from the plateau in traffic flow that has occurred since 2001¹³⁸".

¹³⁶ These points were all put in cross examination

¹³⁷ See above para 135 hereof where the full quotation from page 5 of 'The Blue Route' is provided

¹³⁸ Page 13 'The Blue Route'

181. Thirdly, he thought government forecasts of future traffic growth were too high. Scepticism and uncertainty as to these forecasts was central to his reasoning:

“The primary reason for putting forward the Blue Route is the uncertainty of current traffic forecasts. These look likely to be lower than has been assumed¹³⁹”

182. Professor Cole did, however, address the position should the forecasts be borne out:

“Even with the Department for Transport’s forecasts showing a 20 per cent growth in traffic flow between 2012 and 2030, the Blue Route could satisfy capacity requirements to 2025”.

183. The implication of this statement is that beyond 2025 the Blue Route would lack capacity. This point was addressed at page 16 of ‘The Blue Route’:

“The Institute of Directors Cymru Wales wants a solution to ease congestion on the M4 as quickly as possible. At the same time it says that any scheme has to be ‘future proofed’. Not unreasonably, the business community does not want to see a repeat of the current M4 position in 20 years time. The Blue Route answers this point since, if traffic flow were to rise sharply, it could be upgraded to full motorway

¹³⁹ Top of page 17 ‘The Blue Route’

standard for the whole length.”

184. At that time Professor Cole was addressing a situation which, if he was wrong about traffic growth, was 12 years away.
185. Some 4 or 5 years have elapsed since the publication of ‘The Blue Route’. Professor Cole acknowledged that he had not reconsidered his proposal in the light of developments since 2013. The most recent traffic data available to him at the time of his report were those for 2012. Professor Cole was invited to consider Mr Whittaker’s evidence regarding the MIDAS traffic data for 2011-2016. The median level of growth over that 5 year period is 12.3%. A conservative figure of 11% was put to Professor Cole as to the actual level of growth over 5 years. He was invited to agree that this growth was not the plateau followed by low growth predicted by him in ‘The Blue Route’ and that this information strengthened the case for the Scheme and weakened the case for the Blue Route. No concession was made¹⁴⁰. The data set of 5 years, was, according to the Professor, too short. That stance was, respectfully, untenable.
186. The Professor’s statement that the Blue Route would, should national forecasts be correct, have capacity to 2025 equated to an ability to accommodate a growth of 14% in traffic volumes along the corridor¹⁴¹. As there had already been growth of 11% then growth of even 1% per annum

¹⁴⁰ Professor Cole gave evidence over two days. This point was put to him on the first day. It was put again on the second day on the basis that Professor Cole had not considered the MIDAS data prior to giving evidence and witnesses are understandably reluctant to make concessions on the hoof when they have not had time to reflect. Despite having time for overnight reflection Professor Cole declined again to concede what was blindingly obvious.

¹⁴¹ The arithmetic was put in cross examination and Professor Cole did not quibble with the numbers. To recap, the DfT forecast growth of 20% over 18 years which equates to 1.1% per year. There are 13 years between 2012 and 2025 which equates to traffic growth of 14.4%.

would mean that the Blue Route would reach capacity in 2019. It is not relevant, therefore, whether the growth seen in 2011-2016 was likely to persist for another 5 or 10 years. If it persisted for a year and half the Blue Route would reach the capacity envisaged by Professor Cole in the middle of 2018.¹⁴² Even if growth slowed to 1% per annum capacity would be reached by the end of 2019.

187. Though 'The Blue Route' canvassed the possibility of widening the new road - "if traffic flow were to rise sharply, it could be upgraded to full motorway standard for the whole length" – no evidence was adduced by Cycling UK to support that rather glib observation. In fact, the sharp rise in traffic flow has already occurred. There is no alternative before the inquiry for a full-blown motorway along the line of the SDR and SAR. Professor Cole clarified that the statement in 'The Blue Route' was directed towards the A4810 section of the Blue Route and not the A48 section. He also said that in view of subsequent developments along the SAR he was not positively averring an ability to upgrade the Blue Route to a 6 lane motorway along any part of its length. There is no basis, therefore, for supposing that the Blue Route could be substantially upgraded in light of higher levels of traffic.
188. Mr Sibert's evidence as to the timescale for starting and completing construction of the Blue Route – namely, a start in 2023 and completion in 2027 or 2031 depending on the amount of traffic difficulty which was to be tolerated during construction – was put to Professor Cole. He was not qualified to comment in detail on construction timescales but acceded that

¹⁴² 18 months growth from the start of 2017 at 2% per annum.

- the start date was reasonable and acknowledged that on-line schemes take longer than off-line schemes for obvious reasons relating to traffic management.
189. The Blue Route, if it were ever a sensible option (a variant, Option C, was considered as part of the M4 CEM process and rejected), has been rendered untenable by subsequent events; namely, the growth of traffic along the M4 confounding the prediction for a continuing plateau followed by low growth. The capacity of the Blue Route to abstract significant traffic from the M4 will be exhausted long before it is built. On Professor Cole's original analysis¹⁴³ the Blue Route is not a tenable alternative. That is telling and it is confirmed by the detailed analysis undertaken by the WG project team. That is set out in detail in the December 16 report, the rebuttals of Cycling UK's case and subsequent IDs.
190. The thinking behind the Blue Route was underpinned by a simple arithmetical approach: if one increases the capacity of the SDR/SAR by x thousand vehicles a day then that means that x thousand vehicles a day can be extracted from the M4 thereby solving or alleviating sufficiently the congestion on the M4. For the reasons outlined above, growth in traffic flow means that even when conceived in these terms the Blue Route simply won't work. But individual motorists undertake journeys which suit them; they do not simply transfer from route A (the M4) to route B (the Blue Route) in accordance with best laid plans of transport planners. More importantly in this context, individuals using routes C, D and E etc may populate route B once it is enhanced thereby thwarting the transport

¹⁴³ That analysis was flawed in that it did not quantify the amount of local non-M4 traffic which would populate the Blue Route thereby making it less attractive to M4 traffic.

planners' intention to move traffic from A to B. The latter problem is one of the reasons why the Blue Route will not work and would not have worked even had observed traffic growth been lower. This is illustrated vividly in ID 43a which addresses induced traffic in a no toll scenario.

191. The 2 way volume of traffic along junction 26-25A with the Blue Route in place in 2037 is 88,344. The corresponding figure in the Do Min in 2037 with no tolls is 90,414¹⁴⁴. The level of extraction from the AADT at the Brynglas Tunnels is just over 2,000 and is a reduction of 2.3% in the AADT through the Tunnels. It is not the case, however, that the Blue Route does not attract additional traffic. The AADT over the A48 SDR Bridge in 2037 in the no toll scenario with the Blue Route is 69,263; that compares with around 45,000¹⁴⁵ in the Do Min no toll scenario in 2037. The increase across the A48 SDR Bridge is much greater than the 2070 abstracted from the Tunnels. That is because most of the traffic which will be attracted to the Blue Route will be local traffic abstracted from the local network in Newport, not traffic from the M4. The benefits, therefore, of the Blue Route are largely derived from enhancing the journey times of intra Newport trips and not from solving the problems of the M4. While the BCR of the Blue Route is significantly lower than the Scheme this does not fully capture its disadvantages: that is because most of the Blue Route benefits accrue to local traffic. It does precious little to alleviate the congestion afflicting the strategic traffic along the M4.
192. Over and above the fact that it simply does not address the problems which the Scheme is designed to solve and provides low value for money there

¹⁴⁴ Tables produced by BW on 7 & 8 March 2018 ID 248

¹⁴⁵ This is an approximation from Figure 10.10 of the Traffic Forecasting Report of December 2016 (WG 2.4.13). It is an approximation because Figure 10.10 is based on a half toll.

are a number of other significant disadvantages. As these are addressed at length in the Appraisal of the Blue Route and in evidence they will only be noted in short form:

- i. As the Blue Route does not extract significant traffic from the M4 then it does not produce noise and air quality improvements along the existing M4 while properties alongside the Blue Route would sustain noise and air quality detriments;
- ii. The online nature of construction would cause significant traffic management problems and travel disbenefit during the construction period of 4 to 8 years - these costs have not been quantified and are not reflected in the BCR;
- iii. The Blue Route would sever Newport in two and reduce permeability to non motorised users: ironically it would be worse for cyclists;
- iv. There would be a number of junctions and as the CBI stated in evidence it would be an upgraded local bypass replicating the weaknesses of the existing M4 around Newport.

193. When the main Blue Route case was heard the core scenario was a half toll. The abolition of the tolls, which increases traffic on the existing M4 particularly at its eastern end, strengthens the case for the Scheme. There

is a modest increase in the benefits delivered by the full Blue Route but the increase is significantly smaller as a proportion than the increase in benefits as a result of the Scheme. Accordingly, abolition of the tolls further undermines the merits of the Blue Route in comparison to the Scheme.

194. In conclusion, the Blue Route at £832 million¹⁴⁶ is an expensive scheme, the main advantages of which would accrue to local vehicular traffic. It would provide little relief in terms of congestion on the M4. It was predicated upon two propositions. First, that traffic growth would continue to plateau to be followed by a period of much lower growth. Secondly, that if the SDR and SAR were enhanced traffic from the M4 could be transferred on to the Blue Route in order to fill up the additional capacity on the Blue Route. Incontrovertible evidence as to observed levels of growth on the M4 between 2011 and 2016 show that the first proposition was wrong. The second proposition was based on a simplistic notion of driver behaviour which failed to take account of the fact that when the road network changes drivers change their behaviour. If the Blue Route were built traffic would reassign from the local road network in Newport, leaving little spare capacity or attraction for those travelling on the M4. It is ironic, given the noise made by the Cycling UK witnesses about induced traffic, that the Blue Route is based on ignoring this fundamental point about human behaviour and traffic modelling. Another irony is that the Blue Route would hinder rather than encourage modal shift towards active travel in the urban areas where there is most scope for such journeys. The Blue Route has little to commend it and the ambivalence and, in one case hostility, of

¹⁴⁶ Cost for appraisal of alternative 1 in PIQ 152

those witnesses called to advocate for it is telling. We submit that the report should conclude that the Blue Route in any of its variants does not warrant further consideration.

The Green Route, Alternative 3

195. This is the route advanced by Mr Wynton and Mr Smith. It consists of various changes to the Scheme at the eastern end. The detail is set out in the Alternatives Report, the evidence of Messrs Smith & Wynton and in WG's rebuttal evidence. There is a detailed analysis of the Green Route's BCR in PIQ 155. Unlike the Blue Route, the Green Route would meet most of the TPOs and it would bring significant relief to the M4. By and large it would meet the strategic objectives. It has some advantages over the Scheme in terms of historic landscape and cultural heritage. It also avoids the direct impact on the Llanfihangel Rogiet Conservation Area which is implied by the Scheme. That impact, however, has to be put into context. The land-take impacts upon a field within the conservation area and not on the historic built environment of the village. None of the buildings will be disturbed. Furthermore, a lot of the land to be acquired will be used for soft landscaping and situating an attenuation pond. Mr Rawlins opined that he could not see a justification for revoking the conservation status of the village. While the Green Route is superior to the Scheme in terms of impact on heritage it also heritage disadvantages e.g. the impact on the setting of Dewstowe House. In terms of traffic movements the Green Route enhances access to Magor Services. There are, however, significant traffic

disadvantages which are set out in WG's rebuttal evidence and which were explored during oral evidence. For instance, the access to the B4245 is not as well situated as it is in the Scheme with the consequence that there would be increased traffic on the B4245 through Magor, particularly at the western end. That is because the dumbbell junction between the B4245 and M48 is too far to the east for it to be attractive to traffic from Undy and the west of Rogiet. The access provided to the main M4 is also less direct and impracticable for eastbound traffic. Insofar as environmental matters are concerned the Green Route would have a reduced impact on the Gwent Levels, but the impact on the three westernmost SSSIs is the same as the Scheme. On the other hand, there would be greater tailpipe emissions on the Green Route because it is 950 metres longer and because of congestion at the eastern end.

196. It is submitted that the advantages and disadvantages of the Green Route outlined in paragraph 195 are not decisive either way. There is, however, a significant difference between the initial BCR of the Scheme, 1.69, and the initial BCR of the Green Route, 1.34 and PIQ 155 merits close scrutiny as it explains why there is this difference. The costs of the Green Route are higher because it is longer and involves additional fill requirements. The costs are, however, only a small part of the story; the discrepancy is explained by the more significant difference in the benefits¹⁴⁷. Under the half toll scenario the PVB of the Scheme was £1,573 million versus a PVB of £1,490 million for the Green Route – a difference of £83 million. Under the no toll scenario, however, the PVB of the Scheme becomes £1,822

¹⁴⁷ If one divides the PVB of the Green Route with the PVC of the Scheme the ratio is 1.4; the ratio of the PVB of the Scheme over the PVC of the Green Route is 1.63. Most of the disparity is thus due to the differences in PVB between the two.

million versus a PVB of £1,502 million for the Green Route – a difference of £320 million. The explanation for this big difference relates to the inability of the Green Route to cope with the additional traffic caused by abolition of the tolls. The increase is at its greatest at the eastern end of the Welsh section of the M4. Between junctions 23 and 23A the Green Route provides 6 running lanes of traffic; the Scheme provides 10 running lanes. As is apparent from Table 2 of PIQ 155, by the design year the Green Route is saturated and queues will form in the peak periods adversely impacting on journey times. The Green Route was inferior to the Scheme in a half toll scenario and congestion between junctions 23 and 23A by 2037 was noted in the Alternatives Report as one of the disadvantages of the Green Route. But, as is apparent from the detail in PIQ 155, the abolition of the tolls has significantly increased this disadvantage. The Scheme is decidedly superior to the Green Route even before one considers the disadvantages of delay and uncertainty which would ensue should the Green Route be further investigated.

Junction 23A West Bound On-Slip, Alternative 11

197. This is an alternative promoted by the owners of Magor Services, Roadchef. Unlike all the other alternatives it does not involve deleting any part of the road to be built under the Scheme. It is, conceptually, a supplement or addition to the road rather than an alternative route. While it is quite proper that it is treated as an alternative in terms of being subject to

the tests set out in the *Advice to Inspectors*¹⁴⁸ this distinction is important. Roadchef's case is that the Scheme would be better should the WB on-slip be added. No doubt, it would be better for them. WG accept that the absence of direct unimpeded WB egress on to the new road will deter some customers. But the same is true of the EB egress and that, according to Roadchef, is acceptable. The fact, therefore, that Roadchef might enjoy more trade if the egresses were differently configured does not mean that the Scheme would be improved by reconfiguration: consideration would have to be given to a whole host of factors including, in a world of finite public finance, cost. Whether the Scheme would be improved by the addition of the WB on slip is not, however, the test. The test is whether, without the WB on-slip, there is "some deficiency in the Order proposal that would otherwise render it incapable of passing the statutory tests"¹⁴⁹ or that "whilst the original proposal may be justified in principle, the objections made against it are sufficiently overwhelming to lead the Inspector to recommend against it"¹⁵⁰. We argue below that Roadchef do not come near to satisfying this test.

198. Roadchef adduced evidence from its chief executive Mr Simon Turl, its Business Development Director Dr Ian McKay, and from a traffic and transport consultant Mr Mike Axon. They also relied on hearsay evidence in the form of a letter from one of Mr Axon's colleagues, Professor Pickup, who is a social scientist. Mr Axon advanced the general proposition that Motorway Services Areas ('MSAs') are intended to serve a road safety function, in addition to meeting the demand of the public for convenient

¹⁴⁸ Set out in paras 45 to 49 hereof

¹⁴⁹ Test as articulated in 2.50

¹⁵⁰ Test as articulated in 2.166

services. That general proposition is uncontroversial. It does not establish, however, that the design of the Scheme is such that it presents an unacceptable safety risk without the addition of alternative 11. As to that issue Mr Axon does not advance any case based upon his own expertise. Rather, he relies upon the experience and judgment of Messrs Turl and Dr McKay as to the level of decrease in turn in rates as a result of the Scheme. He also purports to rely upon the observations of Professor Pickup. Properly understood, however, the evidence of Messrs Turl and McKay is not based on their experience or judgment; instead, they adopt a misconceived interpretation of survey research which, itself, did not ask the questions which would appropriately elicit information as to the likely responses of motorists to the changes wrought by this Scheme. Messrs Turl and McKay, for their part, affirm a preference for a signage strategy which is at odds with all of the observations made by Professor Pickup as to human behaviour and decision making. That signage strategy is, moreover, contrary to what would be prescribed if one assumed, for the purposes of strategy and modelling, that individuals are rational and have perfect information. The signage strategy avowed by Messrs Turl and McKay is advanced, it is submitted, to set up the Scheme as a straw man and to make good the question in the Harris Interactive survey about the length of round trips to access the Services. The evidence adduced by Roadchef is thus misconceived in a number of respects and their avowed preference for signing via junction 23 contradicts Mr Whittaker and Mr Bussell's model of individual behavior as well as that advanced by Professor Pickup. As their evidence is unconvincing it is perhaps

unsurprising that so much reliance is placed in closing upon what the Road Safety Audit says in respect of problem 95. The inquiry has not, of course, heard from the authors of the Road Safety Audit. While there is no doubt as to their expertise it is submitted that if their reasoning was unimpeachable Roadchef would have adduced evidence replicating and making good that reasoning. That evidence has not been adduced because, notwithstanding the standing of the authors of the Road Safety Audit, the reasoning therein is, in significant respects, fallacious. We will analyse what is said in the Audit to make good this claim. First, however, it is useful to look in more detail at the evidence adduced by Roadchef to make good what is said herein about it being misconceived.

The survey

199. Harris Interactive conducted a survey in 2016 of customers visiting Roadchef. The survey was conducted over two distinct periods, one to assess holiday season traffic the other to survey a typical month. Question 21a asked:

“If stopping at this Motorway Service in future required a round trip from the M4 of just over 2 miles passing through two junctions, how likely would you be stopping here?”

200. Question 21b is in identical terms save that the round trip is 4.5 miles instead of 2 miles. When Mr Turl and Dr McKay adduced their first proofs of

evidence the WG had not added the EB off-slip to the scheme. Absent the EB off slip, EB traffic would have to travel to junction 23 and then carry out a round trip between junctions 23 and 23A to get to and from the Services. In respect of that journey question 21 was broadly fair. An EB motorist would have to pass through junction 23 twice in order to access the Services as well as passing through junction 23A itself (the latter of course is always a feature of any off-line MSA). The round trip was also broadly 4 miles¹⁵¹. It was also a round trip in the true sense of that phrase i.e. a journey where one departs from the main-line and then returns to the same point on the main-line. The question, however, no longer applies to EB traffic because of the addition of the EB off-slip. It was, moreover, never an appropriate question in respect of WB traffic. That is because ingress and egress WB will be more or less the same under the Scheme as it is now. Ingress will differ only insofar as motorists have to take the free-flow connection from the main M4 to the trunk road dual-carriageway between junctions 23 and 23A. Roadchef do not complain about the ingress and it is submitted that the free-flow junction WB at junction 23 can be disregarded in terms of the attractiveness of the Services. Thereafter, the egress which a rational agent would follow is via the reclassified M4. That much is apparent from Table 4 of the SoCG. In round terms the additional time occasioned by a WB visitor to the MSA is 4 minutes if one goes via the reclassified M4, 5 minutes via the SAR and Glan Llyn junction, and 6 minutes if one goes via junction 23. The egress advocated by Roadchef is therefore the slowest. Furthermore, it is the only option which involves a

¹⁵¹ From Table 2 of the SoCG the round trip is 3.9 miles. The round trip under the status quo is 0.1 miles. So the additional round trip is 3.8 miles.

'round trip'. From the point of view of the rational motorist, therefore, the egress will always be via the reclassified M4. This does not involve any round trip, additional to the one of 0.3 miles which is already experienced¹⁵². So any question about travel WB which implies a round trip is wrong if motorists are rational agents. Furthermore, the additional distance occasioned by a visit to the Services is 2 miles; 1.7 miles because the reclassified road is longer than the Scheme and 0.3 miles which is simply the distance along the slip roads and gyratory as per the status quo. The net additional distance is thus 1.7 miles.

201. The question then becomes whether the question is fair and appropriate if one rejects Mr Whittaker and Mr Bussell's rational agent model of human behaviour in favour of some conception based on Professor Pickup's letter. To that end it is useful to identify and list those insights drawn from the field of behavioural economics which impact upon the desirable or likely egress¹⁵³. These are his insights¹⁵⁴:

- i. Travel speed was a better variable at predicting driver choice than travel time (para 9);
- ii. Maintaining a slower but constant speed is perceived as better than stop start driving even if the latter takes less time (para 10);
- iii. Humans tend to minimize cognitive effort (para 11);

¹⁵² The WB round trip is 0.3 miles rather than 0.1 miles EB because the motorist has to travel further around the roundabout.

¹⁵³ As Mr Bussell notes in his rebuttal of the Supplementary Evidence of Mr Axon and Dr McKay none of this is new and, ironically, the paper by Unal et al cited by Pickup concludes that "as far as transport planning goes, we tend to agree with de Moraes Ramosa et al that it currently still provides the best framework for travel demand simulation and forecasting" – see para 3.1.9 of Mr Bussell's rebuttal.

¹⁵⁴ The paragraphs of Professor Pickup's letter are not numbered. Numbers have been added to identify the paragraph where the proposition/insight is to be found.

- iv. Humans tend to satisfice rather than optimize and take shortcuts in their decision making (para 12);
- v. A generalized cost approach disregards the salience and influence of 'perceived effort' or 'hassle' on a journey. For instance, an increased number of junctions to navigate will be salient to that decision making (para13);
- vi. Drivers are more likely to revert to something they know rather than travel a new route of which they have no knowledge (para 15);
- vii. A further aspect is the perceived and unexpected 'diversion' and 'disruption' leaving the services.....Where drivers are unfamiliar with the trip, simplicity to return to the motorway after stopping would be the preferable option, though not the option that might be recommend by their navigation system – this will confuse (para 19).

202. The implications of these insights were explored with Roadchef's witnesses. For instance, it was put to Mr Turl that in attracting visitors ease of ingress is more important than ease of egress. Notwithstanding the fact that even a rational agent will regard ingress as often more important than egress¹⁵⁵ Mr Turl refused to acknowledge that ingress will usually be a more important determinant of turn in rates. In that regard, his evidence was unconvincing. Dr McKay, by contrast, accepted that usually ingress is more important than egress in terms of attracting custom¹⁵⁶. It was put to Dr McKay that WB egress via the reclassified M4 was not, as he stated in his main proof of evidence, difficult, tortuous and counter-intuitive. It is

¹⁵⁵ For example if a rational agent is hungry or in need of a comfort stop or just tired the ease of access is more important than the egress because s/he is more refreshed on exit than on entry.

¹⁵⁶ His concern was that first time users would not return having experienced the egress.

identical to the current egress. Dr McKay agreed that the adjectives were inappropriate as a description of WB egress via the reclassified M4 either now or with the Scheme in place. Professor Pickup's insight that people prefer moving to stopping and starting and will avoid junctions if possible all militate against signing via junction 23 or the SAR and in favour of signing via the reclassified M4, all points accepted by Dr McKay as general propositions. The Roadchef preference for signing via junction 23 was set out in their main proofs which were served in February 2017. Professor Pickup's letter post-dated that decision, so it was made without the benefit of his insights. Dr McKay said that the decision to suggest signing via junction 23 had been re-confirmed by the Board of Directors. But Professor Pickup's letter was not discussed at that Board meeting and the only directors aware of its contents were Dr McKay and Mr Turl. It is apparent, therefore, that Roadchef has not heeded the letter which is relied upon.

203. Professor Pickup's insights relate to the human desire to avoid hassle and cognitive effort and to make decisions based on rules of thumb. One very obvious rule of thumb when travelling from A to B is that one should keep travelling towards B. That is why people don't like travelling in the opposite direction to their ultimate destination; it feels wrong. Where going in the wrong direction is actually the quickest route a person may suffer from cognitive dissonance – they believe that they should travel towards their destination but they also believe that they should choose the quickest route – and the clash of these two beliefs may be uncomfortable. But in this instance, there is no clash – the quickest egress is also the one which moves in the direction of the ultimate destination. Similarly, there is no

conflict between the quickest route and the desire to avoid stop start conditions and traffic lighted gyratory at junction 23. Finally, the conflict between satellite navigation directions and the signed route only arises if one takes the perverse decision to sign via the counter-intuitive and irrational route i.e. via junction 23.

204. In short, as Mr Whittaker says in his rebuttal, the solution suggested by traffic modelling and behavioural economics align. Professor Pickup's insights can be relevant where the two ways of modelling or assessing aggregate human behaviour pull in different directions. Where they align - where the quickest route is the same as the hassle free, familiar, intuitive route - then the debate is academic. Against all of this Dr McKay relies upon the proposition that motorists don't like 'local roads'. But the reclassified M4 is not 'a local road' in any meaningful sense. It will be a trunk road, a fast and uncongested dual carriageway not dissimilar to the dual carriageway between junction 24 and Monmouth. Dr McKay acknowledged that he had not one scrap of evidence in support of this supposed aversion to local roads. It is unevidenced and, moreover, wholly contrary to the approach set out in Pickup's letter.

205. After this lengthy diversion into the field of behavioural economics we revert to whether question 21 is a fair or appropriate question in respect of WB egress. The answer is that it is not: both the rational and intuitive egress from the Services is via the reclassified M4. There is not, therefore, any round trip.

206. Even if there were a round trip of 2 miles (and the additional diversion is 1.7 miles) the percentage who said that they would not stop was 32%. A further

25% said that they would try not to stop and would only do so if necessary. It would make no difference to 24% of respondents and 16% would be dissuaded to some extent. Even on the figures for 4.5 miles and assuming that there was a round trip one cannot get to the 80% figure posited by Turl/McKay and adopted by Mr Axon.

207. Roadchef's case on the proportion of customers travelling along the new M4 who would be deterred from accessing the Services is, therefore, wholly misconceived. It relies on a survey which asks the wrong question. Even if one puts that aside, and we submit that the nature of the question means that the survey is not persuasive at all, Messrs Turl and McKay have wholly misconstrued the results. Mr Axon simply adopts their conclusions without exercising any independent judgment. He pays lip service to his colleague Professor Pickup's insights but fails to note that at least in the context of WB traffic and this Scheme the prescriptions of the traffic modeller and behavioural economist point in the same direction; the debate between those two approaches are thus academic and irrelevant. Both suggest that Roadchef's preferred signing strategy is a nonsense; the inference to draw is that it has been adopted with a view to strengthening the case for the WB off slip.

208. Notwithstanding all of this, WG accept that the absence of a WB off-slip will deter some customers. It will deter those, however, where the decision to stop or not is marginal i.e. those who don't need to stop. Those who need to stop include those who are tired. There is a similar marginal deterrent effect in the EB direction. There will always be a time penalty when visiting an MSA, whether on or off-line. Under Do Minimum the penalty is basically

1 minute¹⁵⁷. With the Scheme in place it increases to 3 minutes EB and to just over 4 minutes WB¹⁵⁸. There is an additional penalty both EB and WB and the difference between the EB and WB penalty is much smaller than the difference between the penalty between Do Minimum and Do Something for EB travel. Roadchef have dropped their alternatives relating to junction 23 which impact upon EB travel and thus regard that as acceptable from a safety point of view. It is difficult to see how the extra minute WB can lead to the conclusion that the Scheme is unacceptable from a safety point of view in one direction when it is acceptable insofar as the other direction of travel is concerned.

209. Due to the weaknesses in its own evidence Roadchef rely to a great extent on the Safety Audit Report. We now turn to that.

Safety Audit Report – problem 95

210. The Summary of the problem reads as follow:

“Change of access to the existing motorway service area could lead to collisions on the local road network.”

211. The auditors foresee a potential for collisions on the local road network because they envisage motorists egressing via the SAR and Glan Llyn junction:

¹⁵⁷ Table 4 of SoCG. It is less than a minute EB, slightly more than a minute WB.

¹⁵⁸ Table 4 of SoCG. The exact figures are EB AM 3:17, PM 2:51; WB AM 4:11; PM 4:17

“However, the exit from the rest area to continue westbound on the proposed M4 would require users to negotiate seven roundabouts and re-join at the Glan Llyn junction. This may adversely affect the safety of the existing local road network as different types of traffic would be using it.”

212. Neither the WG nor Roadchef are advocating a signing strategy which directs WB visitors to the Services to return to the new road via the SAR. That route is not the one which would be recommended by satellite navigation because it is not the quickest¹⁵⁹. It is unlikely, therefore, that WB motorists leaving the Services would take the SAR. The problem foreseen by the auditors will not arise and in this respect the point made by the auditors is a bad one.
213. The auditors note, without comment, the possibility of WB egress via junction 23 but say nothing about egress via the reclassified M4. They paid no heed, therefore, to the most obvious and likely mode of egress. That, too, is a weakness in their reasoning.
214. This error appears to have played a part in at least one of the substantive conclusions reached by the auditors:

“In addition, the more complex routes to re-join the mainline may confuse unfamiliar road users and this could lead to nose-to-tail or side-swipe collisions at junctions with other road users on the local road network (including NMUs) as they look for confirmation of their

¹⁵⁹ See Mr Whittaker’s evidence and table 4 of the SoCG.

route”

215. WB egress via the reclassified M4 does not involve any complexity over and above the status quo.
216. As for the attractiveness of the Services the auditors expressly make the point in respect of EB and WB traffic: “in both directions the journey to the rest area is likely to be less appealing to the majority of users on the proposed M4 mainline”. No distinction is drawn by the auditors between WB and EB traffic. But Roadchef accept that there is no safety objection to the Scheme with regard to EB traffic. In any event, the auditors’ recommendation is to mitigate the problems which they identify by adopting a clear signing strategy and it has been confirmed that the Services will continue to be signed from the motorway and to that end will remain motorway services.
217. MSAs fulfil a road safety function because they provide motorists with a place to rest and/or to take a coffee or other stimulating drink. The Department for Transport’s Road Safety Research Report 57¹⁶⁰ looked at 682 crashes of which 181 were considered to be sleep-related crashes SRCs. They analysed crashes which occurred before and after MSAs to see whether there were reductions after MSAs. The results are set out in paragraph 3 of the Executive Summary:

“Within these 16 km sections, a total for 355 RTCs were prior to the MSAs, and 304 were afterwards. This 14% reduction was

¹⁶⁰ Appendix A of Ben Sibert’s Roadchef rebuttal

not statistically significant. When these RTCs were sub-divided into SRCs and non-SRCs, there were 108 SRCs prior to MSAs and 84 afterwards. This 22% decrease was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that MSAs were associated with some crash reduction, but only with this type of RTC as all other non-SRCs showed a non-significant 11% drop. Moreover, there were large differences between MSAs in all these respects, with about half the MSAs seeming to have little or no beneficial effect on RTCs or SRCs”

218. There is therefore an association between MSAs and the reduction of SRC but the evidence is not compelling with half of the MSAs having little or no beneficial effect. As for distance between MSAs:

“The distance between adjacent MSAs in relation to this having an effect on the incidence of crashes showed no clear relationship (e.g. SRCs did not necessarily increase with distance apart)¹⁶¹”

219. SRCs are a problem on motorways because, as noted by an earlier DfT report, Road Safety Research Report 52, sleep related crashes tend to occur under monotonous driving. Mr Sibert has assessed the motorway on either side of Magor. He states:

¹⁶¹ Para 5 of the Executive Summary

“For a significant distance either side of Magor, I would describe the M4 motorway as far from monotonous. From junction 18 for the A46 to Bath through to junction 33 for the A4232 to Cardiff West (49 miles) the M4 motorway with the Scheme has numerous features to keep drivers interested and alert such as changes in level, varying topography, curving alignments, vistas, major interchanges, major bridges, cities and numerous (13 with the proposed Scheme) junctions”

220. There is a contrast with the section of the M4 east of junction 18 whereupon the conditions become monotonous until Reading.
221. Mr Sibert’s qualitative assessment of the nature of the road either side of Magor is corroborated by his quantitative analysis of the historic accidents along this road:

“3.2.12 I have reviewed the accident data contained within the M4CaN Traffic and Collisions Report 2016 (Doc. 6.2.16) which shows that over a period of 11 years, 13 accidents are reported where sleep was recorded as at least one factor of causation. Of these accidents, 12 are recorded as slight and one serious with none recorded as fatal. This 13 in number represents 2% of the total 658 personal injury collisions recorded. The one serious crash represents 8%, noting that it is a very small data set.

3.2.13 Compared to the conclusions presented in RSRR 52

which reports that SRCs account for overall 17% of road traffic crashes (RTCs) with a range of 3% to 30% this data for the M4 around Newport is at the very bottom end of the range of SRCs as a proportion of RTCs”

222. The Scheme will change the nature of the route between Magor and the next Services at Cardiff Gate and that must be borne in mind when looking at historic data. The road will have a better alignment and while this is generally beneficial in terms of RTCs it can be a disadvantage in terms of SRCs because a straight road, absent other factors, is monotonous. But as Mr Sibert pointed out there will be views of Newport and of the large and illuminated Usk bridge. The travel time between Magor Services and Cardiff Gate will, moreover, be reduced as the Scheme road is both shorter and quicker. Furthermore, as pointed out during cross examination of Mr Axon, it is only in respect of this stretch of the road that there could be any additional risk of accidents.
223. As Mr Sibert pointed out while there is statistical evidence of there being a positive relationship between MSAs and reducing SRCs there is no evidence whatsoever in respect of distances between MSAs or the relative attractiveness of MSAs, however that may be defined.
224. Roadchef rely upon English guidance expressing a preference for on-line rather than off-line MSAs, Circular 2/2013. This, however, does not advance Roadchef's case for a number of reasons. First, it does not apply in Wales and as Dr McKay agreed there has never been a policy in Wales in support of on-line MSAs. Secondly, as a matter of fact, none of the

MSAs in Wales are on-line. Thirdly, Magor is already an off-line MSA and thus the Scheme does not change its nature. Fourthly, there is no statistical evidence to support the proposition that on-line MSAs do more for reducing SRCs than off-line MSAs. Fifthly, the evidence adduced by Roadchef as to the greater turn in rates for on-line MSAs is unconvincing for a number of reasons. Mr Bussell has shown that an on-line MSA can have very convoluted access arrangements but still maintain very high turn in rates e.g. Norton Canes. Mr Bussell's analysis of the distance which customers are required to travel shows that there is no reliable correlation between ease of access and turn-in rates. There is also a high degree of variability in turn in rates within each category i.e. some online services have very low turn in rates. Finally, Mr Bussell points out that until the 1980s the vast majority of MSAs built were on-line services; from 1980 onwards the vast majority have been off-line services. Consequently, the on-line services are likely to enjoy better locations with higher levels of passing long distance traffic, whilst off-line services also tend to face more competition. These factors are the likely explanation for the higher turn in rates for on-line services. In short, Roadchef's case confuses correlation with causation.

225. WG's witnesses have looked at the detail of the access arrangements in the WB direction and also assessed the nature of the road either side of Magor. On the basis of that assessment they have concluded that the access arrangements are appropriate. As compared to EB access there is just an additional 1 minute penalty for taking a detour to the MSA. In other respects, the position WB is better than EB: there is no need to negotiate a

signalized gyratory in order to rejoin the mainline¹⁶² and the next MSA, Cardiff Gate, is much closer than the next MSA in the EB direction, Leigh Delamere. Overall, it is submitted that there is little difference between WB access and EB access. The latter is acceptable and so, it is submitted, is the former. The Roadchef case depends on there being a need for WB customers to have to undertake an U-turn to egress via junction 23. Few motorists, it is submitted, would take that route for reasons already outlined. Furthermore, while WG would clearly consult Roadchef in terms of the final signage strategy the obvious strategy is to inform motorists of the quickest egress via the reclassified M4. Reliance is placed by Roadchef on the Road Safety Audit. The auditors, however, assumed that WB egress would take place via the SAR and Glan Llyn junction. That will not be the signage strategy and the observations made by the auditors as to conflict with local traffic do not therefore apply. The auditors did say that the Services would be rendered less attractive to motorists. But that observation was made in respect of traffic in both directions and the recommendation was to mitigate this factor by way of a clear signage strategy.

226. In short, it is submitted that the WB access arrangements are, like the EB access arrangements, acceptable having regard to the Services' safety role. To the extent that the access arrangements render the Services less attractive then those customers who will be dissuaded are likely to be discretionary visitors and not those who need to stop due to fatigue. There is the additional point that there is very little time penalty in terms of ingress

¹⁶² Significant in terms of people's preferences for moving over stop start

and that is a further reason for concluding that there is no unacceptable safety risk.

227. During the course of the inquiry reference has been made to the decision of the Secretary of State for Transport and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government of 18 December 2008 in respect of the A46 Newark to Winderpool Improvement. In that case the inspector recommended confirmation of the orders but suggested at least 4 modifications which would require re-designing the scheme and making supplementary orders. The decision letter states¹⁶³ that the Secretaries of State accept the recommendation that further consideration should be given to the design of the road in these four areas and directs the Highways Agency to re-consider the design in these areas. The decision letter acknowledges, however, that the statutory processes in respect of any Supplementary Orders could not be pre-judged. Indeed, the decision letter acknowledges that the outcome of the Highways Agency's further design work could not be foreseen. It must be the case, therefore, that the A46 decision is based on the proposition that the existing design was acceptable but that it would be prudent to further investigate the inspector's concerns to see if an acceptable design could be improved. Had the decision makers taken the view that the existing design was unacceptable then it would not have been appropriate to confirm the orders as there cannot be a compelling case in the public interest to take anyone's land if the purpose for taking that land is to build an unacceptable road.

¹⁶³ Paragraph 25 of the decision letter

228. As stated at the outset the WB on-slip is a supplement to the Scheme and not an alternative in the conventional sense. The issue for the inquiry is whether the arguments advanced by Roadchef are such that the inquiry should conclude that the Scheme does not satisfy the statutory tests because the design in respect of the Services is unacceptable. That issue should be resolved decisively in the Scheme's favour; the access arrangements for the Services are appropriate. If, contrary to these submissions, it is concluded that the design is unacceptable then, as set out in the *Advice to Inspectors* at 2.50 "it would not be logical to recommend the making or confirmation of the orders". As the WB on-slip is a potential supplement to the Scheme the level of use of the Services and any safety implications consequent upon that could be kept under review by WG once the Scheme is operational. It is a matter for the inspectors as to whether any recommendations or observations are made as to advisability of keeping this supplement under review. The primary issue, however, is whether Roadchef have met the demanding test of showing that the access arrangements to the Services mean that the Orders are incapable of passing the statutory tests. This is a binary question and for the reasons set out above we submit that Roadchef's case falls considerably short of meeting the test.

Mrs Picton's Tunnel, Alternative 26

229. A tunnel between junctions 23 and 29 which follows broadly the line of the Scheme¹⁶⁴ was assessed quantitatively as alternative 20. The cost of alternative 20 was assessed at just under £10 billion; its PVB is £1,177 million which is substantially lower than the Scheme's PVB, largely because it has no intermediate junctions and thus provides reduced accessibility to Newport. The BCR of alternative 20 is 0.16. Mrs Picton's tunnel, alternative 26, is shorter and is on a different alignment and bypasses junctions 24 to 26. The cost has been assessed at just under £5 billion. Due to the late stage at which it was submitted there is no quantitative BCR for this tunnel. It is, however, very expensive and the user benefits which it would deliver would be below those of alternative 20 as it does not provide any additional capacity east of junction 23A or west of junction 27. Junction 28-29 is currently the most trafficked section of the existing M4 while the eastern section will become much more heavily trafficked as a result of the abolition of the tolls. The evidence with regard to the potential for congestion between junctions 23 and 23A has already been addressed when looking at the Green Route. The Green Route has more capacity than the Do Minimum through junction 23A and thus the congestion is likely to be worse along that section of the M4 under the tunnel alternative than it is with the Green Route. Though there is no quantified BCR this tunnel has been assessed as providing very poor value for money, an assessment which is robust.
230. The tunnel would avoid any impact upon the Gwent Levels which is its main, perhaps only, advantage. It is hugely unaffordable and constitutes

¹⁶⁴ The tunnel is straighter and therefore shorter.

very poor value for money. It is untenable as a possible solution and does not merit further consideration.

Mr Waller's package of measures, Alternative 28

231. Mr Waller advocates a package of public transport measures, the closure of some junctions of the M4 to deter its use by local traffic and some on-line widening of the M4. It is not a criticism of Mr Waller to say that the package has evolved and that there isn't a specific and definitive package of measures to assess. WG has responded to this alternative in PIQs 156, 156a, 156b and this week in PIQ 156c. WG has attempted to assess the range of measures which might be advanced e.g. a range involving some limited improvements to Newport roads and widening limited to the Tunnels to a package including the full Blue Route and online widening in accordance with Alternative 19. The alternative was advanced a long time after the start of the inquiry and there is no quantified BCR for it. In any event, as there is a considerable element of public transport investment which is neither specified nor costed the M4CaN model could not be used to reach a definitive BCR.
232. The inquiry heard evidence on this alternative on 20 March 2018 and it is not proposed to reiterate in detail the contents of PIQs 156 – 156c. In terms of the public transport measures the primary difficulty with Mr Waller's package is that one cannot simply invest a certain sum of money in order to achieve a set amount of modal shift. Mr Whittaker has assessed an ambitious package of measures in ID 73 and the level of abstraction of

traffic from the M4 is 3.2% - 5.9% in the PM peak depending on the lower and upper bound assumptions. Though Mr Waller does not accept the point¹⁶⁵ the inquiry is invited to conclude that the measures which have been assessed are those which have the best potential for extracting traffic from the M4. Certainly, it has not been suggested by any objector that Mr Whittaker should have assessed alternative measures instead of those encompassed within his assessment. Thus, while there may be other potential forms of public transport investment the ones which have been assessed by WG are the better ones.

233. We refer to the earlier passage dealing with public transport and modal shift, paragraphs 169 to 171. The low-lying fruit is contained in the Metro package. Further efforts to abstract more traffic from the M4 will be increasingly difficult. Whilst it is appreciated that Mr Waller does not have the resource to formulate his own public transport package a team of transport professionals have assessed the scope for modal shift as part of the M4CaN Scheme. Furthermore, a team of professionals also assessed the potential for modal shift as part of the solution to M4 congestion during the M4 CEM process. In both instances, it was concluded that the scope for modal shift along the east-west corridor was modest. Mr Waller's statement that public transport measures would extract 12% of traffic from the M4 is mere assertion. There is every reason to suppose that achieving greater abstraction than the figures envisaged in ID 73 will become increasingly expensive and ineffective.

¹⁶⁵ See his response to PIQ 156b at para 6 e.

234. As for junction closures, that will largely shift motorists to other junctions on the M4 and/or lead to more congested local roads. The disbenefits of junction closure have been assessed in the Alternatives Report as Alternative 22. Those junction closures actually resulted in more traffic on the M4 because motorists had to travel further on the M4 in order to access Newport. Junction closure is thus positively harmful.
235. In terms of online widening Alternative 19 involves increasing capacity between junction 25 and junction 29, including the Tunnels. The benefits of that are very modest in comparison to the cost with a BCR in the no tolls scenario of 0.15. The benefits fall as a result of the abolition of the tolls because the road becomes congested east of junction 25. PIQ 156b sets out the journey times in 2037 under Alternative 19. They are much slower than current journey times and the Do Minimum journey times in 2022. Mr Waller accepts that there is a current problem which needs to be addressed, albeit he says that it is exaggerated. Congestion under Alternative 19 in the design year would be significantly worse than it is at the moment. Mr Waller asked Mr Whittaker about the fact that during the peak PM levels of traffic along the M4 west of junction 24 drop slightly in 2037 under Do Minimum as a result of the abolition of the tolls¹⁶⁶. Mr Whittaker explained that there was an element of redistribution i.e. more people travelling over the bridges rather than towards Cardiff, that congestion east of the Tunnels means that motorists were reassigning on to local roads and that slow traffic resulted in a smaller flow through the Tunnels. He explained that there are thousands of links in the model and

¹⁶⁶ See tables at ID 248.

that tables cannot be produced for all of those links. He was clear, however, that abolition of the tolls increased the need for extra road capacity. The point Mr Waller seeks to draw, however, from the tables at ID 248 is that abolition of the tolls decreases congestion on the most heavily trafficked sections of the M4. For the reasons provided by Mr Whittaker that is not a proper inference. Motorists reassign due to the fact that the queues start sooner further east. This was explored in greater detail when discussing the Green Route. Journey times in the Do Minimum increase due to the abolition of the tolls¹⁶⁷ and online widening, of whatever variety, is insufficient to stop congestion from getting worse by the design year. Mr Waller says, of course, that he is not committed to Alternative 19. Indeed, west of junction 25 he favours increasing the capacity of the Tunnels and employing a smart motorway. The benefits of such measures cannot be greater than the benefits of Alternative 19 and are likely to smaller.

236. Of the individual components of Mr Waller's package one is positively harmful (junction closing), one provides very poor value for money (online widening) and the third is incapable of achieving the substantial reduction of traffic on the M4 which is required (public transport investment). In PIQs 156a and 156b it is explained that these elements will compete to an extent against each other. However significant or insignificant that effect may be, it is not the case that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. There are other significant weaknesses to Mr Waller's package; for instance, it will not provide the resilience and reliability provided by the Scheme nor the fall in tailpipe emissions provided by the new road. Accordingly, despite the

¹⁶⁷ See BW WG 1.2.7 tables 6 and 7

many thoughtful points made by Mr Waller during the course of this inquiry his alternative is not worthy of further consideration. WG is already committed to Metro and those elements will be progressed but they do not remove the need for the Scheme and do not therefore constitute an alternative to it.

The economic need for the Scheme

237. The inquiry heard evidence from the CBI, the Chambers of Commerce of South Wales, the WG's chief economist Mr Jonathan Price, Mr Tim Gent on behalf of the developer of the Glan Llyn project and Mr Eddie English in support of the Scheme on economic grounds. Many others submitted their support in writing¹⁶⁸. The CBI and the Chambers of Commerce had consulted their members; a clear majority were in favour of the Scheme. The survey conducted by the Chambers of Commerce distinguished between the responses of its members from different parts of South Wales. Interestingly, the strongest support for the Scheme came from the Swansea Bay Region. The Chambers of Commerce stated that the congestion around Newport was a bigger impediment to trade and business growth than the tolls because of the element of unpredictability and unreliability. The lack of reliability and resilience had adverse impacts on a whole host of businesses: haulage and distribution; hotels, stadia and

¹⁶⁸ The WRU referred to the recurring frustration of visitors to the Principality Stadium as a result of M4 congestion in the Newport area. Network Rail SUP0206 stated: "I am fully supportive of the WG's proposals for the proposed M4 Corridor around Newport. I believe the project will deliver significant benefits to people, communities and business; ensuring this key transport corridor is able to serve the needs to the twenty-first century Wales". Other significant transport supporters include Cardiff Airport and the Port of Milford Haven.

others concerned with convening events; tourism; while all sorts of businesses stated that people tried to avoid holding meetings in Wales because of the Brynglas Tunnels. The witnesses from the CBI were also keen to show that the support for the Scheme came from their members throughout Wales and not just those in the South East. The CBI made the point that the impediment was not only a problem in terms of the transfer of goods and gave the example of the semi-conductor business located east of the Tunnels which suffered because many of its employees were based in Cardiff and were caught by the congestion. This is important evidence. It illustrates that the Welsh economy is already suffering as a result of congestion, incidents and unreliability along the current road. The congestion damages the perception of Wales as place in which to do business; it can also deter new investment from existing domestic businesses as well as from inward investment. While Mr Bussell's evidence reflects these points it is important to note that they are largely not quantified within the Adjusted BCR¹⁶⁹. The Adjusted BCR does not, therefore, capture all of the likely economic benefits of the Scheme.

238. The Initial and Adjusted BCR of the Scheme is based on the traffic model. The Initial BCR is based only on the direct transport benefits of the Scheme. The Adjusted BCR takes into account wider economic benefits. While the quantification of wider benefits is subject to a greater degree of uncertainty the Initial BCR fails to capture a range of important economic benefits. Accordingly, the Adjusted BCR provides the more realistic measure of overall value for money. Mr Bussell has used the traffic model

¹⁶⁹ See Mr Bussell's proof WG1.3.1 page 13/3.28 and the discussion of non-quantifiable economic consequences paragraphs 5.74 to 5.89.

results and the costs of the Scheme in order to calculate figures for the BCR. He states that he has complied with the guidance in WebTAG. No specific criticism has been sustained that Mr Bussell has made any error in applying the guidance specified in WebTAG and/or the Green Book. One of the experts called by objectors, Professor Whitelegg, professed to a detailed knowledge of WebTAG and he did not criticise the application of the methodology¹⁷⁰.

239. Economic evidence has been adduced in opposition to the Scheme by four witnesses with relevant expertise – Professor Whitelegg, Professor Jones, Professor Cole and Dr Melia. Mr Waller also advanced a critique based on the value of time which Professor Jones also referred to. The inquiry is referred to the detailed rebuttal statements adduced by Mr Bussell in response to the GWT and Cycling UK cases.

240. In terms of costs the methodology adopted by Mr Bussell was criticised as follows. First, it was said that he had not taken proper account of construction inflation, which was said to exceed the general rate of inflation. Secondly, it was said that the costs should have included the VAT payable in respect of Scheme. Thirdly, it was said that large projects typically exceed their budgets and that the true costs were likely to be significantly higher than those included in the BCR calculations. These points were all made by Professor Jones who was the first of the economists to be cross-examined. As for construction inflation it was apparent that he had simply adopted a figure provided by Professor Cole. He agreed that he had no expertise either in terms of national, regional or construction sector inflation

¹⁷⁰ Professor Whitelegg did question whether enough options had been investigated at the outset. But he had not participated in M4 CEM and in any event this criticism had nothing to do with the assessment of the BCR.

and had no challenge to what Mr Bussell said about construction inflation in his rebuttal. In effect, the first criticism was abandoned.

241. As for VAT, Professor Jones sustained his objection. He said that the VAT would be paid to the UK government. Professor Jones took a Welsh perspective in this regard. But when addressing the fact that the Scheme might cause investment to move from England to Wales he took an UK perspective and said that such locational impacts did not confer any real economic benefit. His position was wholly inconsistent. Others have, however, made the same point with regard to VAT so it needs to be addressed. The argument is fundamentally flawed. Not only is the inclusion of VAT contrary to the applicable guidance; it is also illogical when regard is had to the fact that the BCR is a measure of social or economic welfare. From a national welfare perspective the payment of VAT is not a true cost: it is a transfer from the developer of the road to central government. If VAT were included it would result in inconsistent and arbitrary appraisals: the value for money of a particular road project would depend on whether it was being promoted by local, Welsh or UK government. BCRs are used as a ranking tool and it would be irrational for the same road to be appraised more highly only when it was promoted by the UK government.

242. It was not entirely clear whether the third criticism was abandoned by Professor Jones. It was clear, however, that the evidential foundations of the critique could not be sustained. Professor Jones was not aware of the fact that the contract was an early contractor involvement (ECI) contract. Nor did he appreciate that the research which he cited pre-dated the common adoption of ECI contracts.

243. The updated position in terms of Scheme cost and the budget allocation for risk and optimism bias is set out in ID 184. The cost of the Scheme at Q4 2015 prices inclusive of risk and optimism bias allowance is £1,320.8 million.
244. In terms of the calculation of benefits the inclusion of monetised wider benefits is prescribed by WebTAG. Furthermore, there is no evidential basis for concluding that Mr Bussell has done anything other than apply the guidance properly. That, in one sense, is an end of the argument insofar as the productivity/agglomeration benefits are concerned. These issues, however, go beyond the calculation of the BCR and therefore will be addressed. It was Professors Jones and Whitelegg and, to a lesser extent, Dr Melia who took issue with the proposition that the Scheme would lead to agglomeration benefits. The relationship between transport investment and the economy has been addressed comprehensively in the Eddington Report¹⁷¹ published in 2006 and more recently in the Venables report published in 2014¹⁷². Both were commissioned by government. Neither Professor Jones nor Professor Whitelegg referred to either report in the proofs. Professor Jones was not aware of either report when he wrote his proof of evidence. Professor Whitelegg said that he was familiar with them, or at least the Venables report but his guiding light was SACTRA 1999. Dr Melia cited Eddington but only read parts of Venables because Mr Bussell referred to it in his rebuttal.
245. The evidence of Professors Jones and Whitelegg was deeply unimpressive. The former said that agglomeration effects did exist but that

¹⁷¹ The Eddington Transport Study. The case for action: Sir Rod Eddington's advice to government (WG 6.3.2)

¹⁷² Transport Investment and Economic Performance 2014 Venables et al (WG 6.1.23)

they were not applicable in South Wales. He said that the Scheme did not increase the size of Cardiff or Bristol and therefore there were no productivity effects. He also said that Metro would not increase productivity. Finally, he said that Cardiff was a government town and that he could not think of a recent start-up in Cardiff. These comments were all unsupported by any research or reference to the economic literature. They also failed to understand the relationship between transport and economic mass. A better road or rail link does not literally increase the size of a city but by making travel easier and quicker it allows a greater number of workers to congregate thereby enhancing economic density and increasing productivity. Professor Whitelegg averred that, as a geographer, he was obsessed with economic density but stated that roads could not lead to greater economic density. He observed that he was fed up with attending meetings at business parks which were the antithesis of business density. Professor Whitelegg simply failed to engage with the literature at all. He insisted that a paper which he had written was scientific but refused to apply the same description to the Eddington and Venables reports. Dr Melia was asked about the detail of the Venables report. The Venables report is unambiguous about the reality of user benefits and productivity benefits consequent upon increases in economic density. It is with respect to the third causal relationship – between transport and investment and employment – that the Venables report says that “the topic is quite complex, potentially ambiguous, and lacking a good evidence base”¹⁷³. These investment and employment effects are not included in the Adjusted

¹⁷³ Top of page 3 in the Executive Summary (WG 6.1.23).

BCR. For reasons which are difficult to fathom Dr Melia was reluctant to accept that the evidence for the relationship between transport and economic density/productivity was robust and he appeared to conflate productivity effects and investment effects. Be that as it may, Dr Melia agreed that, unlike the authors of the Venables report, he was not an economist¹⁷⁴. Similarly, it was apparent that Professors Jones and Whitelegg did not have appropriate expertise to comment on the economic effects of transport investment; their lack of familiarity with the leading research was merely a symptom of a more fundamental problem.

246. The other major area of dispute in terms of the effects of the Scheme relates to the two- way road argument. This is the proposition that an area may lose out economically as a result of better transportation links with a more prosperous area. It was mentioned by many but the main proponent was Professor Cole and the inquiry is referred to Mr Bussell's detailed rebuttal of his evidence.

247. A number of preliminary matters ought to be noted with regard to the two-way road argument. First, it does not simply apply to roads. Trains, boats, cycles and even pedestrians travel in two directions. It is an argument, therefore, against ease of transport or certainly ease of transport over long distances. If it is correct, it applies to the electrification of GWR as much as it does to the Scheme. Secondly, it is a protectionist argument. Thirdly, it is contrary to WG policy which is to encourage trade and economic interaction with the rest of the UK, Europe and the wider world. Fourthly, it is inconsistent with the recent UK policy decision and the long standing WG

¹⁷⁴ His university has an economics department and he is not a member of it; he is a member of the Geography and Environmental Management department.

policy aspiration to remove the tolls on the Severn Crossings: as one of the witnesses for the CBI observed, the logic of the two-way road argument is not just to keep the tolls, it is to demolish the crossings. Fifthly, it is profoundly pessimistic about the ability of the Welsh economy to compete. Sixthly, it fails to acknowledge that trade is not a zero-sum game. Collectively, trade between two regions will increase economic welfare. Seventhly, it ignores the interests of consumers; if consumers move their custom from a local firm to one in an adjacent region as a result of a road scheme then the consumers are better off. Eighthly, even if the two-way road argument is correct, it would have to outweigh the consumer benefits as well as the productivity benefits consequent upon better intra region economic mass in order for there to be a net economic cost as a result of the Scheme. Finally, the Welsh business community, who may be assumed to have their own interests at the forefront of their minds and not those of Welsh consumers, are in favour of the Scheme. Either they are deluded or the two-way road argument is incorrect.

248. These points were put to Professor Cole in cross examination. He was asked, in particular, whether he agreed with the separate points identified by Mr Bussell as features of the two-way road argument at paragraphs 3.4.4 to 3.4.10 of his rebuttal statement. Despite some ambiguity he agreed with most of them. Importantly, he conceded that the argument was contrary to long-standing and unambiguous WG policy. It was put to him that there was clear evidence that the Severn Crossings had been a good thing for the Welsh economy. There was a certain lack of clarity as to Professor Cole's response but the upshot was that he was not positively

disagreeing with Mr Bussell's assessment that the Crossings had been positive for the Welsh economy; an assessment based on the studies cited by Mr Bussell in his rebuttal. It is submitted that the inquiry should dismiss the two-way road argument. The experts who advanced the argument did so with little conviction or robust evidence. Mr Bussell, by contrast, looked at it in detail, both in terms of empirical studies and in terms of economic theory. The better view is that improved connectivity is a force for convergence rather than divergence – see the research by Venables and Rosewell in respect of HS2¹⁷⁵. But in any event the two-way road argument is clearly contrary to policy and contrary even to the stance of those who advocate for better public transport.

249. The Adjusted BCR is 2.29. A number of objectors have said that the Scheme is a low or medium value scheme. These remarks are made on the basis of the categorisation of value employed by the Department for Transport. The categorisation has no status or applicability in Wales. Nevertheless, Mr Bussell explains in his rebuttal to Cycling UK that the value for money categories are based on the Adjusted BCR and can, in appropriate cases, take into account non-monetised wider impacts. It is clear, therefore, that if this Scheme were in England it would be categorised as a High value project¹⁷⁶.

250. The Adjusted BCR is based on the traffic model. The traffic model deals with normal conditions and cannot be used to replicate the incidents which lead to extraordinary queues and the gridlocking of the wider road network in Newport. Nor does it deal with the disadvantages of a lack of journey

¹⁷⁵ Cited by Mr Bussell at paragraph 3.4.5 of his rebuttal of Cycling UK's evidence.

¹⁷⁶ Steve Bussell rebuttal of Cycling UK, paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.8

time reliability i.e. the need for motorists to assume a worse case and thus to leave too early resulting in dead waiting time. In PIQ 164 Mr Bussell has considered the likely scale of these additional benefits. There is a degree of uncertainty given the lack of an established methodology. If the Adjusted BCR is revised to take into account these resilience and reliability benefits it increases to 2.63. There is a spurious precision to the figure but it gives a flavour of the significance of these additional benefits.

251. In conclusion, the current problems on the existing M4 impose a penalty on the Welsh economy. The Scheme will increase productivity within the study area and boost trade within Wales and between Wales and the wider world. These productivity and competition effects will be enjoyed even by those who do not travel along the corridor. The two-way road argument is wrong, a counsel of despair and, in any event, contrary to policy. The argument advanced by Mr Waller and Professor Jones as to the need for local values of time is also contrary to policy and caught, thereby, by the Bushell principle. But it also wholly contrary to the FG Act as the adoption of local values of time would favour investment in prosperous areas at the expense of those which are deprived, often partly as a result of poor transport links. The WG does not pretend that a new road is a panacea. But good and reliable transport links is an essential part of the policy mix required in order to grow the Welsh economy. The M4 is the gateway to two thirds of the Welsh economy. It has been a recognised problem for some 25 years. The economic case for the Scheme is, it is submitted, compelling.

Carbon

252. The WG is subject to duties in respect of tackling climate change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions under Part 2 of the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and under the Future Generations Act 2015. The WG have conducted a detailed and comprehensive assessment of the carbon implications of the Scheme. That has been led by Mr Tim Chapman who has also presented the evidence to the inquiry. Mr Chapman is singularly qualified to address this topic, having an established track record and expertise in promoting low carbon construction. He states that the Scheme is essentially carbon neutral. That, he says, is quite unique for a new road. In essence, it is because the road is a bypass of a pre-existing bypass which is longer and suffers from congestion. Traffic which therefore reassigns from the existing road to the new road will inevitably emit less carbon. The new road will, however, induce more traffic but this has been modelled and the savings generated by the shorter and more economical journey along the new road will more than compensate for the additional vehicle kms. Mr Chapman has calculated the capital carbon cost of all the construction work, and revised upwards that estimate to take account of the works at Newport Docks. He has done so by assessing the carbon cost of each element of the construction.

253. The user carbon has been calculated by reference to VISSIM which is able to take into account the carbon implications of accelerations and decelerations and is not limited to an assessment based on average speeds. Due to the modelling complexity the VISSIM analysis has been limited to the existing M4 and the new road. That renders the assessment a

conservative one. The new road attracts traffic not just from the old M4 but also from the local road network. Equally, the reclassified M4, which will be less congested,¹⁷⁷ will also attract journeys from the local network. As is apparent from PIQ 37 the SATURN modelling suggests that there will be carbon savings on the wider network. These savings, however, have not been included in the carbon neutrality calculation. Another conservative feature of the assessment relates to the fact that the VISSIM analysis is based on normal driving conditions. It does not, therefore, take account of the adverse carbon implications of extraordinary congestion which results from incidents and accidents. As confirmed by Mr Whittaker the existing road is blighted by such incidents whose effects are aggravated by the absence of a continuous hard shoulder. It is reasonable to expect that the Scheme and the reclassified road will be less likely, in aggregate, to suffer from these incidents. Furthermore, when these incidents do occur the network will have much greater resilience: traffic will reassign from the impeded road to the incident free road and while congestion could be expected it will be much less significant than the congestion which afflicts Newport when there is an incident under the Do Minimum.

254. Following Mr Chapman's evidence in chief and primary cross examination by GWT and others there have been three developments which have an impact on the carbon assessment. First, the UK government decided to abolish the tolls. Secondly, the UK government announced that the sale of new petrol and diesel cars would be prohibited from 2040. Thirdly, the agreement between ABP and WG resulted in a delay in the opening year to

¹⁷⁷ And more accessible due to the reopening of a junction

2024 and a commitment to carry out substantive works at Newport Docks which would impact on capital carbon. Mr Chapman has dealt with these matters in two updated proofs issued in December 2017 and in his rebuttal of Cycling UK's revised evidence in March 2018. He has assessed qualitatively the abolition of the tolls; it is likely to increase the tail pipe emissions savings occasioned by the Scheme. He has also qualitatively assessed the government's announcement with regard to electric cars; it is likely to decrease the tail pipe emissions savings occasioned by the Scheme thereby postponing carbon neutrality. In terms of achieving the carbon targets under the 2016 Act quicker de-carbonisation of private vehicles is a good thing. The delay in opening year will not make any real difference: it will postpone the carbon neutrality year by 2 years but only to reflect the delay in the commencement of the user carbon savings. Finally, the capital carbon of the works in Newport Docks has been assessed at 57,000 tonnes. That will postpone carbon neutrality by 4 to 5 years. In Mr Chapman's judgment the revised carbon neutrality date of 2078 remains conservative.

255. It was suggested during the inquiry by some objectors that the fact that carbon neutrality would be reached beyond 2050 was inconsistent with the duty under the 2016 Act to cut emissions by 80% by 2050. GWT make a related point in their closing speech where it is said that incurring either half a million tonnes or a million tonnes of capital carbon will not help the WG reduce carbon emissions by 80% by 2050¹⁷⁸. Both criticisms betray a fundamental misunderstanding of the 2016 Act and indeed the UK's

¹⁷⁸ Page 12 of GWT's closing

Climate Change Act 2008. The 2050 target relates to emissions in that year. The capital carbon associated with the Scheme will be incurred by 2024. It will not, therefore, have any bearing on the 2050 target. The Scheme itself will make a positive contribution towards the 2050 target and all interim targets and carbon budgets post-dating 2024 because user carbon is lower under Do Something than it is under Do Minimum.

256. GWT adduced evidence from Professors Whitelegg, Whitmarsh and Anderson. Professor Whitelegg took issue with Mr Chapman's analysis in terms of capital carbon and user carbon. In respect of the former he applied a top down estimate based on the correlation between capital expenditure and capital carbon. He cited a paper dated May 2015 from four academics at Leeds University at Annex 1 of his proof. On the penultimate page of that paper it is said:

“Bottom-up estimates of embodied emissions are often preferred owing to their greater specificity and reduced dependence on monetary proxies. However, two principal barriers prevent a bottom-up estimate in this instance: the lack of emissions data for certain infrastructure categories; and the presence of aggregated/unspecified expenditure data in the NIP”

257. This passage was put to Professor Whitelegg. The Leeds University paper was concerned with calculating the capital carbon of all planned national infrastructure projects in the UK. In that context, a top down approach was understandable given the barriers to undertaking a bottom up estimate

identified in the quoted passage. But it is quite clear that in assessing a single project a bottom up estimate is preferable. Professor Whitelegg would not, however, accept that Mr Chapman's assessment of capital carbon was more likely to be correct. He stuck to his guns as he did with the claim that the new road would quickly become congested. He said that he would like to discuss the matter with Mr Chapman and that it was not a matter for cross examination. It is submitted that Mr Chapman's methodology is the correct one; expenditure is only a rough guide to capital carbon and top down assessments are only appropriate where there is paucity of detailed information. Insofar as user carbon is concerned Professor Whitelegg was reluctant to acknowledge the advantages of the Scheme insofar as user carbon was concerned; namely, that it was short and would alleviate congestion.

258. Ironically, Professor Anderson also gave an estimate for the capital carbon of the Scheme. He too criticized Mr Chapman for the methodology and suggested that it was insufficiently rigorous. However, his estimate was in the region of a quarter of Mr Chapman's assessment and one eighth of Professor Whitelegg's. Clearly it is not possible for Professor Whitelegg and Professor Anderson to be correct. We submit that both are wrong. They employed high level estimates and came to radically different figures. Mr Chapman, by contrast, undertook a detailed and bottom up estimate which takes account of the particular characteristics of the Scheme. We invite you to accept his evidence as to capital carbon and user carbon in its entirety.

259. The main thrust of Professor Anderson's evidence was that carbon emissions had to decrease by 12 to 16% per annum if the objectives of the Paris Agreement were to be met. He agreed that reductions at that rate would mean that Welsh emissions of carbon would fall way below the 2050 target of 20% of 1990 levels. He also agreed that the 2016 Act was enacted after the Paris Agreement. The relevant policy and legislation is therefore the targets and budgets set under the Environment (Wales) Act. To the extent that the Paris Agreement as construed by Professor Anderson mandates much greater reductions in carbon emissions than it is the targets under the 2016 Act which prevail. In short, Professor Anderson's advocacy of rapid decarbonisation beyond that required by the 2016 Act is not a matter for the inquiry as it offends the Bushell principle.
260. Professor Whitmarsh's evidence did not descend into the quantification of effects. She said, however, that the Scheme was inconsistent with the obligations on WG under the FG Act to promote a low carbon economy. She also claimed that there was no evidence of the integrated thinking required to abide by the sustainable development principle. It became apparent, however, that though based in Cardiff University, the Professor had little knowledge of the Scheme and was unaware of the junction strategy which had been informed by the desire to promote modal change at Glan Llyn and at Severn Tunnel Junction. While she expressed the view that park & ride schemes could have perverse consequences she did welcome the facilitation of the use of park & ride and conceded that there was evidence of the kind of integrated thinking which she advocated. Her

evidence did nothing to undermine Mr Chapman's evidence or, indeed, that of Mr Davies MBE.

261. In conclusion, we submit that the Scheme is effectively carbon neutral. In that sense it is rare, if not unique, in terms of road building projects. It is wholly consistent with WG's duties under the 2015 and 2016 Acts.

Design / Land take

262. Mr Sibert demonstrated by means of detailed plans the need for each individual plot in the CPOs in order to construct the Scheme and the mitigation works in the Docks.

263. Dr Ireland, supported by other members of WG's ecology team, Mr Graham on water quality and Mr Rowson on landscape, demonstrated, by means of the detailed Environmental Mitigation Plans ("EMPs") which land was included in the CPOs for such purposes and justified the need for it. As noted above, they explained how the line of the road had been kept low in the landscape to minimise visual impact and located as far north in the Levels as possible to minimise SSSI land take and avoid the LOHI, in compliance with duties under s.28G Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 ("WCA 1981"), EWA 2016 and the FGA. Minimising land take is also relevant in terms of the proportionality considerations arising under the CPO circular.

264. As recalled above, Mr Rowson used the 'flythrough' video simulation as a visual aid. Mr Matthew Jones explained that this innovative resource was developed for use in the public consultation process and it included the

- facility for members of the public to zoom in on their own homes or areas of particular interest, to understand in 3D how the Scheme would affect them; this was one of the techniques used to help members of the public to understand the project and the implications for them and their property.
265. There is no objection to the need for or design of the bridge resilience measures in the Docks which are to be enabled by the Supplementary CPOs. Messrs Sibert and Finlay (deputising for Mr Woodman) explained how the protection measures would be constructed, using a marine jack up platform to drive sheet piles. The platform could be brought in by sea via South Lock and Dock.
266. The land taken from ABP and its tenants beneath the proposed bridge deck would be offered back in the form of lesser interests / rights, on terms consistent with ensuring safety of the motorway and proper access for the WG's highway maintenance teams. Mr Sibert's evidence was supported by fire risk assessments carried out by specialists in the field. The approach has therefore been to minimise the degree of interference with property interests and with business operations.
267. Mr Sibert also explained the proposals for a swing bridge to meet the severance point raised by ABP and several of their tenants. Inclusion of this feature would facilitate a perimeter access route around South Dock, along with a new Private Means of Access, also provided for within Supplementary CPO No.3. The bridge would be capable of accommodating ABP's mobile cranes, thus reducing the need otherwise to provide extra cranes by way of mitigation. There is a local precedent for such a swing bridge operating successfully at Cardiff Docks.

268. There was no real challenge to Mr Sibert on these points, but he explained the details to Mrs Picton MBE when she understandably sought clarification.¹⁷⁹
269. Remaining objections from tenants¹⁸⁰ must be considered in the light of the fact that WG's agreement with ABP requires it to use best endeavours to achieve a relocation of most significantly affected tenants to the south of South Dock or alternatively to make minor alterations to premises, especially those located alongside the proposed Docks Way link. The exception is the business of Jewsons Limited and St Gobain Limited who will remain in situ in North Dock. They will be provided with alternative areas of land during construction in order to mitigate impacts and land will be returned with lesser rights in order to enable them to use land underneath the motorway bridge for storage of timber. A mechanism therefore exists for meeting the tenants' practical requirements by means of suitable relocation, all parties having a clear incentive to do so. In the event that accommodation cannot be reached, then the tenants would be compensated on normal statutory principles. Given the overriding need for the Scheme, this clear mechanism for seeking to achieve, with their consent, practical reinstatement and the availability of statutory compensation in the last resort, the proposed land take is justified and proportionate.
270. Island Steel are also located adjacent to North Dock and are supporters of the scheme.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Inquiry 28.02.2018 supplemented by PIQ/166

¹⁸⁰ The identities of whom are set out in Annexes 1 and 2

¹⁸¹ SUP0220

Air Quality and Noise

271. The inquiry has heard evidence from Dr Michael Bull in respect of air quality and Mr Philip Evans in respect of noise. These two fields are matters for expert evidence and none of the objectors have adduced their own expert evidence. Both witnesses gave their evidence in a straightforward and knowledgeable manner. Their evidence is unchallenged and you are invited to accept it in its entirety.
272. The Scheme provides net benefits in terms of noise and air quality. That is because the Scheme reduces the traffic on the existing M4 by about one half (and around three quarters for the heavier polluting HGVs). The existing M4 passes along and in some sections through the north of Newport. The Scheme, by contrast, passes through a predominantly rural and lightly populated area.
273. In terms of noise, Mr Evans concludes that while there are some who suffer a noise detriment, much greater numbers enjoy a benefit. On the whole, he concludes that there is a clear net benefit in terms of noise with the Scheme. The average decrease is -1.2 dB per property across the 20,708 properties in the opening year. Put another way, there is approximately a 57,500 'dB people' improvement as a result of the Scheme in the opening year¹⁸². There will be adverse impacts during the construction phase but these can be mitigated to acceptable levels. Most of the detriment occurs in the Gwent Levels which generally enjoys lower levels of noise though it does not, in Mr Evans's judgment, qualify as a tranquil area. It is acknowledged and accepted, of course, that benefits to others will be scant

¹⁸² See paragraph 2.4 of WG 1.14.5

consolation to those who will suffer a detriment, including for example the Llandevenney Residents, who gave evidence to the inquiry. Mitigation measures such as noise barriers where practicable, expedient and appropriate having regard to landscape and visual amenity considerations will be employed, but Mr Evans gave evidence to the effect that they would not be considered in that location. Furthermore, whilst the new road will be built with a thin road surface system which is relatively low noise, there will be residual impacts on some properties. That is an inevitable result of a road scheme of this nature and the detriments must be weighed against the significant benefits of the scheme.

274. The picture is much the same in respect of air quality. Air quality would generally improve in the more populated areas reducing overall exposure to air pollutants but inevitably deteriorate in areas alongside the proposed new section of motorway. However, no exceedance of air quality standards would be expected and air quality would particularly improve in the areas that are currently the most polluted including the Air Quality Management Areas. These AQMAs are adjacent to the existing M4. In terms of human health, therefore, the Scheme has an overall beneficial impact.

275. It must be acknowledged that there will, however, be detriments to some properties. The changes in traffic flows from the removal of tolls results in predicted NO_x concentrations being above 30µg/cubic metre at the two receptors located closest to the proposed M4 in the Gwent Levels - St Brides SSSI. As compliance cannot be assessed within 5 km of a motorway, this does not represent an exceedance of the air quality limit value. The critical loads for nitrogen deposition are not exceeded at any

receptor modelled within the Gwent Levels - St Brides SSSI (or on the Caldicot Levels SSSIs). There is, therefore, no unacceptable ecological impact and overall the effects of the Scheme in terms of air quality and noise are beneficial. Where there are detriments, these must be weighed against the significant benefits of the Scheme.

Delivery of National and Local Policy Objectives

276. The review of planning policy and national strategy above and, in particular, the evidence of Messrs John Davies MBE, Mr Matthew Jones and consideration through the CEM process and examination of alternatives at this inquiry, substantiate the need for the Scheme in order to give effect to national policy as set out in the Programme for Government. Supporters of the Scheme give voice, in practical terms, to the need from the perspective of those living, working, running businesses, services and organisations in South Wales.
277. WRU state that *“we attract a significant spectator base when hosting significant events at the Principality Stadium and it is currently a recurring frustration of our visitors to deal with the M4 congestion that occurs in the Newport area. We believe that only the Black Route can provide the solution that is required”* ¹⁸³.

¹⁸³ SUP0214

278. The WG Chief Economist Jonathan Price said, *“a new, more efficient M4 would have the potential to greatly improve transport efficiency and provide a significant boost to the economy of Wales”*.¹⁸⁴
279. Cardiff Airport states, *“the proposed improvements to the M4 motorway would be a significant benefit to Cardiff Airport. It is well documented that improving surface access to an airport can encourage growth and improves the opportunity for the region in which the airport provides services, to better compete in a global market”*.¹⁸⁵
280. CBI state, *“only the Black Route can provide what is required, i.e. a safe and resilient primary route around the bottleneck that is the Brynglas Tunnels”*.¹⁸⁶
281. ICE Wales offer full support for the Welsh Government’s proposals as published.¹⁸⁷
282. South Wales Chamber of Commerce state, *“it will make inter-regional and international trade easier for businesses throughout South Wales...ensuring that Wales has an effective transport infrastructure will raise the international profile of Wales as a whole as an accessible and well-connected place in which to work and live”*.¹⁸⁸
283. Port of Milford Haven say, *“Improvements to this route could potentially open up new markets for port development, stimulate further investment and create opportunities for additional trade from this area to the rest of Europe”*.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ SUP001
¹⁸⁵ SUP0194
¹⁸⁶ SUP0167
¹⁸⁷ SUP0005
¹⁸⁸ SUP0132
¹⁸⁹ SUP0031

284. The Welsh Government's proposals to ease congestion on this part of the M4, the main transport artery to South Wales, is broadly welcomed by Tata Steel.¹⁹⁰
285. The list of incidents reported in the Press¹⁹¹ goes a long way to explaining these reactions to the current situation and to the prospect of the Scheme.

INTERFERENCE WITH HUMAN RIGHTS

286. Relevant Human Rights are contained in Article 8 and Article 1 to the First Protocol. Article 8 provides as follows:

"Right to respect for private and family life

- 1 *Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.*
- 2 *There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others." (emphasis added)*

287. This right is engaged in relation to those in respect of whom the Scheme, Highways Orders and/or CPO impinge physically upon their homes.
288. Article 1 to the First Protocol provides as follows:

" (1) Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

(2) The preceding provisions shall not, however, in

¹⁹⁰ SUP0138

¹⁹¹ ID 136

any way impair the right of a state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.” (emphasis added)

289. This right is engaged in relation to all owners of property, whether domestic or business premises. Annex 2 to these submissions lists all statutory objectors whose human rights under these two provisions are engaged.
290. Both rights are qualified. In each case, WG submits that the very strong need which it has demonstrated for the new road in terms of the economic well-being of Wales (Art.8) and the general interest (Art.1 to First Protocol) is sufficient to justify the interference. The interventions are proposed under clear, known legal provisions within a statutory process which ensures a *“fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law”* in accordance with Article 6 and makes provision for compensation on known principles, as confirmed by the House of Lords in Alconbury, a case which considered, amongst others, compulsory purchase under highways schemes and orders. The Inquiry has provided a forum for statutory objectors to challenge the WG evidence and the Scheme has survived intense scrutiny.
291. WG’s evidence shows how steps have been taken to minimise land take and to work with farmers, businesses and other landowners to minimise interference with their interests. Details in respect of each individual objector are available in Annex 2 and matters are dealt with more generally in these submissions. In short, WG’s submission is that there is an overriding need for the Scheme and CPO with all attendant Orders. The

required interference with property rights and, in some instances, homes, are justified for the good of wider society.¹⁹²

292. Some objectors have seen the positions and resources of the WG and themselves as ill matched, raising, more or less obliquely, the question of equality of arms.¹⁹³ The clearest articulations of this point came in Mr Hall's written submission and Cllr Frances Taylor's appearance at the inquiry on behalf of Magor and Undy Community Council. However, in considering these points, it must be remembered that equality of arms under Art 6 applies, if at all, to the Public Inquiry and not to the consultation process.

293. Mr Hall is a resident of Redwick but not a statutory objector because none of his land or property is the subject of the Orders. He said:

"it seems unreasonable that so much money and professional Public Relations expertise has been put into the events supporting the plans when similar resources have not been made available to groups such as the GWT who see the proposed road as unnecessary and disastrously damaging to the environment. This is totally unfair, especially as such an imbalance is likely to be repeated at any Public Inquiry." This extract apparently raises two points about balance: balance at the consultation stage and in the Public Inquiry.

¹⁹² See. OBJs 227 and 231

¹⁹³ Mrs Ann Picton MBE (OBJ0203-007a Inquiry Proof "THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INQUIRY", "INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT para 02"; OBJ 0132 Mike Hall, first para.; Cllr Frances Taylor on behalf of Magor with Undy Community Council; Mr Byrne on behalf of GWT and Dr Lindstrum on behalf of CALM made similar comments in passing during their oral presentations

294. Dealing with consultation first, Mr Matthew Jones, in his written evidence and on more than one occasion in answer to objectors at the inquiry, responded to criticisms of the public engagement process in relation to the Plan and the Scheme. For example, County Councillor Frances Taylor (Magor and Undy Community Council) raised concerns regarding the quality and availability of information, including at the Public Exhibitions. WG's response to the evidence of County Councillor Frances Taylor¹⁹⁴ explains that engagement on the problems, objectives and possible solutions to the M4 around Newport has been ongoing since the early 1990s. Significant efforts were made to help people with an interest in the proposals to understand the available information and have any queries addressed appropriately. As was recorded in the 2015 Public Information Exhibitions Report¹⁹⁵, an evaluation survey of attendees showed 90% 'tended to agree' or 'strongly agreed' that the exhibitions helped them to understand the proposals. Furthermore, 92% selected 'YES' on a touchscreen computer which asked "Have you found all the information you wanted today? YES / NO". In addition, a designated Public Liaison Officer aims to help people contact the project team to help address any concerns or queries where possible. As explained to the Inquiry and Future Generations Commissioner in the WG response¹⁹⁶, engagement as part of the development of the draft Plan was cited by Climate Change Wales as an exemplar engagement exercise¹⁹⁷. As part of the draft Orders exhibitions, it was recognised by the project team that the public often have

¹⁹⁴ WG/REB/OBJ150

¹⁹⁵ <http://gov.wales/docs/det/publications/170117-m4-corridor-aroundnewport-en.zip>

¹⁹⁶ WG/RS/ISU0024

¹⁹⁷ PIQ-78: Climate Change Commission in Wales 2012 - Position Paper for Transport and Climate Change for Wales

difficulty in visualising projects particularly in relation to their own concerns - 'what will this proposed development look like from my home?' In response to this, an innovative 3D computer model with 'postcode finder' tool was developed. This used video game technology alongside engineering modelling in order to provide bespoke visualisation for thousands of people. This is one of the first times that the combination of gaming technology and engineering modelling has been employed in the UK. The noise specialists also produced a noise assessment tool searchable by postcode. This innovative approach enabled people to engage with the Scheme proposals and understand what the likely impacts on their properties and local communities would be if it went ahead.

295. It must also be remembered that the Plan was the subject of an unsuccessful judicial review by the professionally represented FoE Cymru based, amongst other things, upon the Blue Route proposal which was worked up by Professor Cole, who is a transport planner and transport economist.

296. Turning now to the Public Inquiry, there has been some consideration by the courts of Equality of Arms in public inquiries in the context of Art 6 of the Convention. R v The Secretary of State for the Environment Transport and the Regions ex p. Challenger CO/2048/2000 was an application for permission to appeal against the refusal of leave to bring a judicial review claim arising out of the public inquiry into Thameslink 2000. Mr Challenger was the tenant of a property where he lived and worked, which was proposed for acquisition, so he was a statutory objector to the CPO and his human rights under Art.8 and Art. 1 to the First Protocol were engaged. He

also sought to bring proceedings in the name of a residents' association of which he was a member. The association was promoting an alternative. Leading counsel on their behalf submitted at the Pre Inquiry Meeting that, unless they were given assistance in presenting their case, there would not be equality of arms between them and the promoters, Railtrack, since the issues were substantial, complex and highly technical and, accordingly, there would be a breach of Mr Challenger's Art 6 right to a fair hearing. The submission was that either Railtrack or the Secretary of State should fund representation or that counsel to the inquiry should be appointed. The inspector rejected the submission, saying, amongst other things, that he and the programme officer would *"go out of their way to assist those who are unfamiliar with the process, or who are not represented to the same degree as the principal parties."* He also referred to the possibility of seeking Legal Aid. Railtrack which was represented by leading and two junior counsel, refused to fund them, as did the Legal Services Commission. Permission was refused on the basis that the Human Rights Act 1988 was not yet in force, but the Judge considered the substantive point and made some useful observations. Firstly, he said that the question under Art 6 must be determined by reference to the particular facts and circumstances of the individual case. He regarded as significant the facts that Legal Aid had been sought and rejected, that other parties who were represented would be taking similar points at the inquiry and, in particular, promoting the alternative and he said that there was scope for the applicants to join forces with or liaise with other objectors. He alluded to the impressive material produced by them for the Court case with the aid of pro

bono assistance and said that he also relied upon the inspector to give such assistance as he could, consistent with his impartial role, in the event that pro bono professional help ceased. He therefore considered that their access to the tribunal would be “*practical and effective, not theoretical or illusory*”, tests drawn from the European jurisprudence in other types of case.

297. The next case is Pascoe v. First Secretary of State [2007] 1 WLR 885. It concerned a CPO made in respect of Ms Pascoe’s residential property. Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol to the Convention were therefore engaged. She claimed that she had been deprived of the right to a fair hearing under Art 6 because she had been denied Legal Aid for the inquiry. The claim succeeded on other, substantive grounds, but the Judge considered the Art 6 point as well. The promoters of the CPO were represented at the inquiry by leading and junior counsel and a large and well resourced firm of solicitors. As in Challenger, Legal Aid was sought and refused and a similar application for funding from the promoter was made at the Pre Inquiry Meeting. The inspector rejected that application and suggested that an approach be made to the Secretary of State. The Judge noted that the absence of any express provision in Art 6 requiring the provision of legal aid in civil cases meant that any implied obligation will be less extensive than the express right to such assistance in criminal cases. In these circumstances, the relevant State has a free choice as to how to ensure an effective right of access. He said: “*it is relevant that the tribunal conducting a hearing takes steps to ensure that the individual is not disadvantaged in presenting his or her case effectively and goes into*

*matters in care and detail to ensure that the case is understood. This will be particularly relevant as a factor in the context of an inquisitorial procedure such as applies in a planning inquiry, in which the task of the inspector is to get to the real facts and form his own judgment in the light of his own inquiry*¹⁹⁸... *“I accept that inquiry procedures are designed to be more user-friendly and less complex than those found in the courtroom. Individuals are enabled to present their own cases, and inspectors will normally adjust the inquiry timetable to facilitate matters for those seeking to put her case”*.¹⁹⁹

298. The Judge also had regard to the fact that Ms Pascoe had benefited from a considerable amount of pro bono legal assistance and other support from witnesses and experts. Summarising his conclusions, he said that he was satisfied that Ms Pascoe had, in fact, been given *“a reasonable opportunity to present her case which is the essence of the requirement of ‘equality of arms.’”* He based this view on the following facts:

- i. The claimant received the benefit of assistance from the inspector and a solicitor in the period before the inquiry. The claimant’s solicitor, a leading expert in compulsory purchase law, drafted a letter of objection in response to the agency’s statement of reasons. Counsel for the claimant drafted for her the application for pre-emptive costs that was submitted at the pre-inquiry meeting on 22 July 2005.
- ii. During the inquiry itself, the claimant had at various times the assistance of two barristers, acting pro bono, who attended the

¹⁹⁸ Para 102

¹⁹⁹ Para 108

inquiry for three days, cross-examined some of the agency's witnesses and submitted opening and closing submissions to the inquiry.

- iii. The claimant had a diploma in architecture and a degree in environmental science. She would therefore have had a much better grasp of the issues at the inquiry than would the ordinary lay objector.
- iv. Another statutory objector, Mr Gwynne, who assisted the claimant at the inquiry and cross-examined a number of the agency's witnesses, held professional qualifications in architecture. The claimant clearly benefitted from his expertise during the inquiry.
- v. Despite her limited resources, the claimant was able to obtain evidence and/or appearances from many witnesses, including several high-calibre public interest groups, academics and local politicians.
- vi. Eversheds, the solicitors acting for the agency, provided substantial administrative and technical support to the claimant before, during and even after the inquiry. This was done free of charge. It is clear that the claimant received very considerable assistance in this way (estimated at approximately 75 hours in all).
- vii. Although additional evidence was served by the agency on the penultimate day of the inquiry, the claimant did not seek an adjournment and, in the event, the claimant's witnesses

successfully responded to the evidence by e-mail to Eversheds on the last day of the inquiry. Further it is clear that the inspector for the claimant had the benefit of seeing the evidence served by the agency on 26 October 2005 before drafting the closing submissions on the claimant's behalf.

299. Drawing these matters together, it is noticeable:

- i. that both these claims concerned public inquiries similar to this one;
- ii. that both these claims failed;
- iii. that the clear approach of the Courts is to assess whether relevant people, whose Art 6 right is engaged, have had a reasonable opportunity to present their cases on a case by case basis;
- iv. that the inquisitorial and relatively flexible nature of a public inquiry, as opposed to Court proceedings, is highly relevant, including an assessment of the way in which inspectors have facilitated unrepresented persons to make their cases;
- v. that it is relevant to take account of any professional support / assistance received, both from legally qualified and other relevant professionals, as well as any relevant skills possessed by the applicants themselves.

300. Mr Hall is not a statutory objector. He chose not to make oral representations to the inquiry. Dr Lindstrum is not a statutory objector, but has made oral representations, both in her own right as a local resident and

- on behalf of the umbrella organisation CALM. Mrs Picton MBE is not a statutory objector by virtue of any interference with her property or home. She has appeared. Their human rights are not engaged. Art 6 therefore does not apply in their cases.
301. Cllr Frances Taylor is not a statutory objector in the sense of any of her property being the subject of the CPO. She appeared by virtue of her role as the ward member for Magor on MCC and as a member of the Magor and Undy Community Council speaking on behalf of local residents. Her human rights are not engaged. Some of her constituents are statutory objectors by virtue of their property interests being in the CPO, some of which concern their homes, but Cllr Taylor did not claim to be speaking on behalf of any individual resident/s in particular. No submissions about any individual's human rights generally or Art 6 compliance in particular were made. Nor was any request made to the inspectors for funding or other assistance.
302. GWT is a statutory objector by virtue of its ownership of Magor Marsh. Art 1 of the First Protocol is therefore engaged in GWT's case and, parasitic upon it, Art 6.
303. No application has been made by anyone to the inspectors for a direction in respect of either funding or appointment of counsel to the inquiry.
304. GWT have been ably assisted and represented by an impressive team of counsel who have volunteered their services. The fact that those barristers have been working pro bono (like Mr Challenger's barrister) has not diminished the quality of their contributions. Mr Byrne, who is an employed officer of GWT holds relevant qualifications, with degrees in Geography

and Biology and a Masters in rural Environmental Management. Mr Byrne is also a Chartered member of, and Assessor for, the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management and has wide relevant experience. On occasions, he engaged in advocacy on behalf of GWT, but chose not to give oral evidence although he submitted several detailed written statements in his own name. GWT have been able to present evidence from a number of academics and professionals in relevant fields of expertise, several of whom have appeared to present evidence, called and re-examined by counsel, who have, when so instructed, also cross examined WG's witnesses. GWT have liaised with other objectors, taking on an umbrella role and drawing upon the contributions of other organisations. RSPB's expert employed officers have been involved in many discussions with WG. CPRW and the Woodland Trust were both represented at the inquiry by employed officers with relevant qualifications, who gave evidence, called and re-examined by counsel. On occasions, GWT have been allowed further opportunities to cross examine WG witnesses in separate sessions by Mr Byrne. Dr Lindstrum, whilst not an expert in highway modelling, is a highly educated woman with an expertise in what she referred to as "*narrative.*" GWT have produced a large amount of written material in response to WG's evidence, often from expert witnesses, right up to the end of the inquiry.

305. Mrs Picton MBE deserves special mention and tribute. She is also a highly educated person – a retired school teacher, she has a degree and a PGCE qualification. She has come to occupy a central role in the inquiry, having attended almost every session. She has prepared herself by reading

relevant material in advance and come with questions in mind, often written down in her notebook. Her questions have been thoughtfully put to witnesses, and she has received assistance from the inspectors on occasions to refine them so as to get to the heart of the points which have interested her. As well as the inspectors, members of the WG team have gone out of their way to answer queries and provide her with documentary and other material to assist her in putting forward her case. She has graciously acknowledged this assistance on more than one occasion. When it came to her own evidence, however, she said very clearly, in writing²⁰⁰ and orally, that she wanted to give a different type of evidence from that given by experts in the various technical disciplines – her perspective on things. This she ably did and, having answered a few questions of clarification, was, quite properly, not cross examined on matters so close to her heart.²⁰¹

306. In conclusion, this is a public inquiry which has involved a large amount of technical evidence but one where people have also been able to present their cases in their own ways, assisted by the understanding of the inspectors. There has been flexibility and consideration in terms of timing appearances given by the programme officer and inspectors, to ensure that everyone who wanted to speak had the chance to do so in an atmosphere of order but not of undue formality. The Public Inquiry forum has therefore been accessible to all of those who might wish to participate.

Marshalls

²⁰⁰ Mrs Picton MBE is OBJ0203 and her closing statement is ID255

²⁰¹ After her presentation, Mrs Picton MBE thanked leading counsel for WG for her understanding and gave her a hug

307. Marshalls Mono own and operate a site on the eastern bank of the Usk which is required for the construction of the road and the Usk Crossing. It is accepted that they would not be able to operate from this site as a result of the Scheme. The operation would have to be re-located. The company is a significant employer and both it and WG would wish it to find an alternative site locally in Wales. To that end WG has offered Marshalls a site owned by it, known as Queensway Meadows.

308. On 19 June 2017 Marshalls appeared at the inquiry. Their position at that time was that the Queensway Meadows site was not suitable unless it was combined with an adjacent site to the North not owned by WG, known as the Freshwater site. At that time, the main thrust of Marshalls' case was that WG had not engaged with it properly pursuant to the approach recommended at paragraphs 22 and 23 of Circular 14/2004. That was, and is, denied and negotiations and discussions have continued between WG and Marshalls. Be that as it may, it was suggested by Marshalls during the course of that appearance that WG had the power, should it be so minded, to acquire the Freshwater site by compulsion pursuant to section 246(1) of the Highways Act 1980. That provides as follows:

“246 (1).....a highway authority may acquire land for the purpose of mitigating any adverse effect which the existence or use of a highway constructed or improved by them, or proposed to be constructed or improved by them, has or will have on the surroundings of the highway”

309. The Guidance provided in Circular 14/2004 as to this power is as follows:

“Section 246(1) provides that highway authorities may acquire land compulsorily for the purpose of mitigating any adverse effect which the existence or use of a highway constructed or improved by them (or proposed to be constructed or improved by them) has or will have on its surroundings. This power enables the acquisition of land needed to maintain or improve the environment of areas adjacent to the road”

310. Marshalls set out their legal submissions that WG had the power to purchase the Freshwater site by compulsion in ID 169.
311. Marshalls are correct that the gloss put on a statute in guidance is not determinative. It is, however, persuasive – see *R v Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council ex p J* [2000] 1 FLR 942, 951G where it was said that statutory guidance is:

“a helpful aid to the way the legislation is intended to be implemented, and it should not be departed from without good reason”

312. The purpose of acquisition under s 246(1) must be to ‘mitigate any adverse effect which the highway has or will have on the surroundings of the highway’. The land to be acquired in this instance is an industrial site. Accordingly, it has no intrinsic ecological, environmental or public amenity value. The highway has an adverse effect on the owner and occupier of the land and the balance of the site which is not to be acquired i.e. Marshalls but that will always be the case when highway land is in some use or occupation or is owned and has a market value. There is, in short, an important distinction to be drawn between the adverse effect of a highway

- on its surroundings and the adverse effect which the highway has on the landowner/occupier of the land acquired for the purposes of the highway.
313. On the construction favoured by Marshalls the scope of section 246 would be very wide, if not all-pervasive. It would give an acquiring authority the scope to consider dispossessing a landowner unaffected by a highway so as to accommodate or mitigate the loss of a landowner whose land was needed to build the highway. Such a power would put authorities in an unenviable position in having to choose between the landowner whose land is required for a highway and the almost infinite number of landowners whose land may be suitable for the dispossessed landowner.
314. There is a further point which is that the Freshwater site does nothing to mitigate the adverse effects of the Scheme on the balance of the existing Marshalls site: it is not an addition to that site. Rather, it is replacement for it and a mere coincidence that it happens to be nearby a different part of a highway.
315. The narrower construction set out by the Circular makes the power under s 246(1) more workable and compatible with human rights and the general proposition that powers of compulsion should be limited to that which is necessary in the public interest. Accordingly, if a highway has no adverse impact on its surroundings, because those surroundings are simply an industrial site with no redeeming ecological or public space amenity features, then the power simply does not arise.
316. In short, while it is conceded that the Circular is not determinative, the interpretation of section 246 contained within it is sound. The breadth of the

- power on the Marshalls construction is too great and cannot sensibly have been intended by Parliament.
317. In conclusion, WG maintains its position that the exercise of the power as suggested by Marshalls is outwith the terms of section 246(1). There are, however, other points to be made as well.
318. If, contrary to WG's primary case, the compulsory purchase of the Freshwater site could come within the scope of s 246(1), there remains the question of whether it would be appropriate to exercise the power. To this end the Circular would still be relevant. There is a public interest in discretionary powers being exercised consistently. The Circular suggests circumstances in which it would be sensible to exercise the statutory discretion.
319. Consideration of the exercise of the power to dispossess a third party landowner whenever another landowner loses his or her land as a result of a highway would lead to administrative chaos and injustice. Farmers, for example, who lose land might lobby WG to dispossess unaffected neighbouring farmers on the basis that they are better and more conscientious farmers than their neighbour and that thus it would be in the public interest to acquire their neighbour's land.
320. In short, if the power exists then WG were correct not to exercise the same. We will not repeat the contents of IDs 84, 161, 216 and 216A. The upshot is that WG has engaged properly and in good faith with Marshalls and have abided by both the letter and spirit of paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Circular. The Queensway Meadows site is suitable as a replacement and, with some potential minor peripheral tweaks of the Scheme land-take, there appears

to be emerging acknowledgment of that by Marshalls in Mr Glover's letter of 23/03/2018 (PID/216A). The suitability of an alternative site which can be provided without dispossessing a third party landowner by compulsion is yet another basis for concluding that it would not have been appropriate to consider the compulsory acquisition of the Freshwater site even if, contrary to WG's case, such a power existed and could, in an appropriate case, be exercised.

321. As part of its discussions with Marshalls Mono, WG will endeavour to find a means of avoiding or minimising any impact on production. There remains a possibility, of course, that there will be disruption to or cessation of production pending the establishment of a new site. That possibility has to be balanced against all the significant benefits of the Scheme and any losses sustained by Marshalls will be a matter for compensation which is not for this inquiry. The objection by Marshalls is not, we submit, any basis for an adverse recommendation.

PIQ 157

322. Some of the legal points noted in PIQ 157 are addressed elsewhere. In this section we will address the points raised on days 17, 26 and 44.
323. On day 17, 29 March 2017, Mr Alasdair Henderson of counsel called Professors Jones and Whitelegg who were also cross examined. The topics under discussion were carbon, traffic and economics. Mr Henderson was representing GWT. WG have no note or recollection of a legal submission being made by Mr Henderson on that date or, indeed, on any other occasion relating to scientific doubt or sliding scales of confidence in

respect of proposed mitigation measures. There is no discrete legal point of that nature raised either in GWT's closing submissions. We deal elsewhere with the nature of WG's obligations under the FG Act 2015, the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. *[Note: during the delivery of this part of the closing submissions it became apparent that the point referred to was raised by Mr Charles Streeten on behalf of GWT and not Mr Alasdair Henderson. The argument raised by Charles Streeten is addressed in the legal note at Annex 3.]*

324. As to the submission made on day 26 by Cycling UK that the Scheme would breach the Active Travel Act 2013 we rely on the evidence of Mrs Tindale at paragraphs 7.42 to 7.52 of WG 1.10.1. The 2013 Act places an obligation on WG, pursuant to section 1 (e) and section 9 (1), when exercising its functions under the Highways Act 1980 to take reasonable steps to enhance the provision made for walkers and cyclists, in so far as that is practicable.
325. As is apparent from Mrs Tindale's evidence all but one of the public rights of way which cross the path of the Scheme will be diverted. The path which is lost is only 134 metres long and is a dead end. All the other public rights of way which are affected will be diverted. In addition to diverting existing paths the Scheme will create six new public rights of way totalling 3.14 km and a shared-use path of approximately 1 km. Accordingly, we submit that reasonable steps have been taken to enhance provision for walkers and cyclists in so far as that is practicable and, moreover, that the Scheme results in greater and better provision for walkers and cyclists. In short, the

allegation that there has been a breach of the Active Travel Act 2013 is without merit.

326. On day 44 points were made as to the appropriate compensation payable to objectors 227 and objectors 231. Matters of compensation are not for the inquiry. The primary form of compensation is based on the market value of the land acquired. Further claims can be made for disturbance and, where the landowner retains land, for injurious affection and severance where the value of the retained land is diminished. These heads of claim may be relevant to the to objectors 227 and 231. It is not appropriate, however, to make any detailed observations with regard to these matters.

DELIVERY, CLEAR PLAN, RESOURCES AND NO LIKELY IMPEDIMENT TO IMPLEMENTATION

327. As noted above, the delivery of a relief road for the M4 round Newport is part of the Programme for Government, Taking Wales Forward 2016-2021²⁰². The broader based Prosperity for All, published in September 2017, identifies the delivery of a significant improvement to the M4 around Newport” amongst other national road schemes as part of its United and Connected theme and well being Objective 11: Deliver modern and connected infrastructure. Matthew Jones described the appointment of Costain/Vinci Joint Venture under an Early Contractor Involvement (“ECI”) contract. This is a delivery model which has been used successfully on other road schemes. A vast amount of detailed work has been undertaken

²⁰² Doc. 5.1.11

- already on this project, in recognition of its importance, sensitivities and complexities.
328. The M4 CaN Scheme has been long in the planning and preparation. This means that it has the advantage of being at an advanced level of design relative to its stage in the statutory process.²⁰³ Joint working in this way has generated a good level of knowledge about the detail and cost of implementation as demonstrated in the evidence of Messrs Sibert and Woodman.
329. An important outcome of this joint working is the Buildability Report. This document looks in considerable detail at every practical aspect of the Scheme. Mr Woodman led a comprehensive presentation of one of the most complex elements contained in the Report – the construction and connection of new reens. That was, in turn, informed and complemented by the intricate and innovative drainage/water quality design which was explained by Mr Graham, and the ecology team’s response to NRW’s advice about what has and has not worked well in previous reen creation projects. NRW were given a similar demonstration in November 2016. Significantly, on neither occasion did they take issue with the method set out in the Buildability Report. Indeed, nobody has challenged²⁰⁴ this or any other aspect of the Buildability Report at the Inquiry.
330. Turning to funding, there is provision for the Scheme through a combination of UK Government borrowing and Welsh Government Transport budgets.²⁰⁵ The M4 relief road is included in the National Transport Plan

²⁰³ Mr John Davies MBE explained the relationship of the project in terms of the revised WelTag stages – ID/205 and WG1.23.7

²⁰⁴ Though some, e.g., Mr Lowe, asked questions of clarification

²⁰⁵ Matt Jones proof WG 1.1.1 para 22.37

2010²⁰⁶ National Transport Finance Plan 2015 and its 2017 update²⁰⁷. Mr Matthew Jones described the cost increases as a result of the mitigation measures for the Docks, explaining how the costs are accounted for, in part by reductions in allowances for Project Risk and Optimism Bias, in part by means of a contribution from WG's Economic Development Fund. The Fund's contribution reflects the consequential benefits which would accrue to the Welsh economy from the proposed measures in the Docks.²⁰⁸

331. Steps have been taken to clear possible regulatory impediments to implementation. The need for LBC has been recognised and is addressed under the "*Planning Requirements*" section of these submissions.
332. The works of mitigation and relocation at the Docks would be implemented by ABP under their statutory powers and the GPDO.²⁰⁹ The land in question is allocated in the LDP for dock related employment development (B1, B2, B8) and the remit of the LPA is limited under the prior approval process. Such applications are screened for EIA and where appropriate, SIAA. WG has undertaken EIA and SIAA for the proposed arrangements on the basis of current knowledge of an in principle proposal. If assessments need to be carried out further in the light of detailed proposals, they can be. Assessment thus far has not indicated any likely impediments to delivery in due course.²¹⁰
333. One tenant, Origin, currently operates under Hazardous Substances Consent/s ("HSC") in respect of its fertiliser handling functions. Origin needs to move as a result of introducing the bridge over the Docks and the

²⁰⁶ CD 6.1.5, Intervention Ref 91

²⁰⁷ CD 5.1.7, Scheme ref R8

²⁰⁸ See Matthew Jones' Scheme Evidence Update Doc WG 1.1.8, Section 3.4

²⁰⁹ See ABP's statement (PID 196) submitted on 15.02.2018 (dated 20th February 2018)

²¹⁰ PID236

- plan is to relocate them further south.²¹¹ HSC in respect of the projected move has now been secured.²¹²
334. ABP hold an explosives licence to allow explosives to be handled in Newport docks. Following consultation with the HSE who would require the amount of explosives to be reduced as a result of the Scheme's construction, the MOD have stated in a letter dated 10 January 2017 that a reduced handling capacity at Newport Docks would not significantly affect the MOD's ability to import or export munitions.²¹³
335. ABP have withdrawn their objections/s.16 representations. Furthermore, objections on the part of the Newport Harbour Commissioners have been resolved. NRW's objections to the Scheme do not concern obstruction or impedance of any of their functions due to the proposed bridge. There is therefore now no possibility of Special Assembly Procedure being triggered under s.107(4) HA 1980 on the basis of objections by relevant bodies concerning the reasonable requirements of navigation. This absence of objection on navigational grounds means that the Inspectors can and should report, in discharge of their duty under s.107(1) HA 1980, that the reasonable requirements of navigation over the waters affected by the Scheme would be satisfactorily accommodated. Jonathan Vine summarised the position in terms of ship access to North Dock in his Scheme Evidence Update²¹⁴. The relevant section, we now know, is the one dealing with a 13.5m channel. His Table 5-17, which was not challenged, gave the breakdown as follows:

²¹¹ See port relocation plan and submissions above as to WG and ABP's contractual obligations in relation to Port tenants

²¹² PID /232 ; PID/ 227 HSC ; PID / 206 – plans for zones

²¹³ Set out in Matthew Jones' Main Proof – section 19.6 page 88 - 89

²¹⁴ Doc WG 1.22.5 p.31.

Breakdown by Deadweight (Vessel Visits), Junction Cut Width = 13.5m Air Draft Clearance = 1m, Dock Water level = 14.21m ACD					
Deadweight range in tonnes	No of visits in deadweight range	No. of visits impeded	No. of visits unimpeded	% Visits impeded	% Visits unimpeded
0 - 1000	2	0	2	0%	100%
1000 - 2000	71	2	69	3%	97%
2000 - 3000	154	19	135	12%	88%
3000 - 4000	218	127	91	58%	42%
4000 - 5000	91	88	3	97%	3%
5000 - 6000	22	22	0	100%	0%
6000 - 7000	8	8	0	100%	0%
7000 - 8000	1	1	0	100%	0%
8000 - 9000	1	1	0	100%	0%
Total	568	268	300	47%	53%

Table 5-17 Breakdown by DWT (JC Width = 13.5m)

336. He then presented a detailed capacity analysis of the Docks with the addition of the proposed new wharfage, concluding that with that, ABP would be able, with some operational modifications, to maintain the current number of vessel visits to the Docks.²¹⁵ This conclusion was also unchallenged. Having regard to the withdrawal of objections by ABP and Newport Harbour Commissioners, Mr Vine's evidence and that of Messrs Sibert and Finlay reviewed above,²¹⁶ there is therefore ample evidential basis for advising the Ministers that the reasonable requirements of navigation over the waters affected would be satisfactorily accommodated.
337. For both bridge protection measures and the creation of a new quay in South Dock, a marine licence will be required to authorise construction and dredging activities within the marine environment pursuant to the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. The process is administered by NRW. Dr

²¹⁵ Op cit Section 6 and para.7.1.

²¹⁶ At para. 5.4.5

- Ireland explained²¹⁷ that WG have engaged in pre-application discussions with the relevant team and the August 2017 ESS (No.5) reflects their requirements. Neither NRW nor anyone else has raised objection to the proposed Dock works in this respect and there is no reason to think that this issue presents an impediment to delivery.
338. European Protected Species (“EPS”) licences would or might be required in respect of the Scheme for a number of species: bats, dormice, great crested newts (“GCN”) and possibly otters. NRW is the licensing body.
339. The relevant statutory provisions concerning European protected Sites and species are now contained in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (“2017 Regulations”).
340. Regulation 9(1) provides as follows:
- “The appropriate authority, the nature conservation bodies and, in relation to the marine area, a competent authority must exercise their functions which are relevant to nature conservation, including marine conservation, so as to secure compliance with the requirements of the Directives.”*
341. By Regulations 3(1) and 7(1), the “*appropriate authority*” and the “*competent authority*” include the Welsh Ministers. The “*nature conservation bodies*” include NRW.
342. Assessment of plans and projects is dealt with in Part 6 of the 2017 Regulations. The provisions of this Part are expressly applied to the construction of new highways by Regulation 87(1)(a) and to planning permissions granted by the GPDO by Regulations 75 and 77.

²¹⁷ In his Scheme Evidence Update Doc.WG 1.7.5, paras. 3.3.78-9

343. The relevant European Sites are: River Usk SAC; Severn Estuary SAC; Severn Estuary SPA; Severn Estuary Ramsar Site; and Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites.
344. As noted above, NRW agree, in relation to the Scheme and the proposed works in the Docks, that there are likely to be no impacts which would adversely affect the integrity of any European Site. The SOCG goes on to state at paragraphs 2.1.30 and 2.1.31 that whilst NRW cannot pre-judge its opinion of the likely significant effects of the proposals on offer for the purposes of Regulation 76 of the 2017 Regulations, NRW is satisfied that the appropriate mechanism for consideration and determination of these matters relating to ABP exercising permitted development rights under the GPDO will be through the protective statutory processes by Part 6 of the 2017 Regulations described above. WG acknowledge and agree with that position.
345. GWT's objection in this respect is considered below but it should be noted here that a decision maker discharging its duties under Part 6 of the 2017 Regulations should give the views of a statutory consultee considerable weight: Ashdown Forest Economic Development LLP v. SSCLG, Wealden DC [2014] EWHC 406 Admin. The recent decision of Jay J in Wealden DC v SoSCLG, Lewes DC, South Downs National Park and Natural England [2017] EWHC 351 (Admin), which Inspector McCooey drew to the Inquiry's attention, considers in – combination effects at the screening stage of the process in the context of DMRB. WG considered in – combination at both the screening and Statement to inform Appropriate Assessment ("SIAA") stages in this case, so the recent Wealden case is not on all fours.

346. Conservation of European protected species is dealt with in Part 3 of the Regulations.

Regulation 42 - European Protected Species of Animals provides for those species of animal listed in Annex IV(a) to the Habitats Directive to be listed in Schedule 2 to the Regulations and references to a “*European protected species*” of animals are to any of those species.

Regulation 43(1) Protection of certain Wild Animals: Offences makes it a criminal offence deliberately to capture, injure, kill or disturb any wild animal of a EPS or deliberately to take or destroy such an animal’s eggs. It is also an offence to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal. Paragraph (2) provides that for these purposes, disturbance of animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely –

(a) to impair their ability -

(i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or

(ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or

(b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

Paragraph (9) provides that guidance as to the application of the offences in relation to particular species of animals or particular activities may be published by –

(a) the appropriate authority; or

(b) the appropriate nature conservation body, with the approval of the appropriate authority and such guidance may be taken into account by the criminal court.

347. These criminal provisions do not apply to any acts done pursuant to a licence issued under Regulation 55, which provides as follows:

55.— Licences for certain activities relating to animals or plants

(1) Subject to the provisions of this regulation, the relevant licensing body may grant a licence for the purposes specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The purposes are—

(a) scientific or educational purposes;

(b) ringing or marking, or examining any ring or mark on, wild animals;

(c) conserving wild animals or wild plants or introducing them to particular areas;

(d) protecting any zoological or botanical collection;

(e) preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

(f) preventing the spread of disease; or

(g) preventing serious damage to livestock, foodstuffs for livestock, crops, vegetables, fruit, growing timber or any other form of property or to fisheries.

(3) Regulations 43 (protection of certain wild animals: offences), 45

(prohibition of certain methods of capturing or killing wild animals) and 47

(protection of certain wild plants: offences) do not apply to anything done

under and in accordance with the terms of a licence granted under paragraph (1).

(4) Subject to the provisions of this regulation, the relevant licensing body may grant a licence to permit the taking or the possession or control of certain specimens of any of the species or subspecies listed in Annex II(b) (other than any bryophyte) or Annex IV to the Habitats Directive notwithstanding that the licence is for a purpose not specified in paragraph (2).

(5) Regulations 43 , 45 and 47 do not apply to anything done under and in accordance with the terms of a licence granted under paragraph (4).

(6) A licence under paragraph (4) may be granted only to such persons as are named in the licence.

(7) The relevant licensing body may grant a licence under paragraph (4) only if it is satisfied that the grant of the licence would be consistent with the restrictions in Article 16(1)(e) of the Habitats Directive (namely “under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent” and “in limited numbers”).

(8) A licence under paragraph (4) must specify—

(a) the species or subspecies of animal or plant to which the licence relates;

(b) the maximum number of specimens which may be taken or be in the possession or control of the person authorised by the licence, or which particular specimens may be taken or be in the possession or control of that person; and

(c) the conditions subject to which the action authorised by the licence may be taken and in particular—

(i) the methods, means or arrangements by which specimens may be taken or be in the possession or control of the person authorised by the licence;

(ii) when or over what period the action authorised by the licence may be taken; and

(iii) where the licence authorises any person to take specimens, the area from which they may be taken.

(9) The relevant licensing body must not grant a licence under this regulation unless it is satisfied—

(a) that there is no satisfactory alternative; and

(b) that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

(10) A licence under this regulation which authorises any person to kill wild animals must specify the area within which and the methods by which the wild animals may be killed and must not be granted for a period of more than two years.

(11) Where the appropriate authority exercises any functions under this regulation (see regulation 58(3)), the appropriate authority must from time to time consult the appropriate nature conservation body as to the exercise of those functions, and must not grant a licence of any description unless the appropriate nature conservation body has advised as to the circumstances in which, in its opinion, licences of that description should be granted.

(12) Where the Marine Management Organisation exercises any functions under this regulation (see regulation 58(2)(a)), it must from time to time consult Natural England as to the exercise of those functions, and must not grant a licence of any description unless Natural England has advised as to the circumstances in which, in its opinion, licences of that description should be granted.

(13) It is a defence in proceedings for an offence under section 8(b) of the Protection of Animals Act 1911 (which restricts the placing on land of poison and poisonous substances) to show that—

(a) the act alleged to constitute the offence was done under and in accordance with the terms of a licence granted under this regulation; and
(b) any conditions specified in the licence were complied with.

(14) In paragraph (2)(g) “livestock” includes any animal which is kept—

(a) for the provision of food, skins or fur;
(b) for the purpose of its use in the carrying on of any agricultural activity; or
(c) for the provision or improvement of shooting or fishing.

348. There is no material difference between the 2010 Regulations and the 2017 Regulations with regard to European Sites or EPS. The 2017 SOCGs between WG and NRW are framed in terms of the 2010 Regulations applicable at that time, but their substantive content is unaffected by the change in legislation.²¹⁸

349. In R (Morge) v Hampshire County Council 2011 UKSC 2 the Supreme Court considered the duty, under planning legislation, to “have regard” to the Habitats Directive. It had been held in earlier case law that the effect of

²¹⁸ Richard Wald agreed these propositions on behalf of NRW: Doc PID244 P.4 fn.1

- this provision was that the decision maker must satisfy itself that the statutory tests for granting a protected species licence under the predecessor to Part 3 of the Regulations were satisfied at the stage of the planning determination. The Supreme Court decided that this was too demanding a test.
350. The principle established in Morge should either be treated as applying to the decision to be made in relation to the HA 1980 Schemes and Orders, to the extent that the decision might be said to be “*relevant to nature conservation*”, and/or needs to be taken into account when considering whether or not there are any likely impediments to implementation under the CPO Circular.
351. NRW, as the licensing body, does not say that it is unlikely to grant a licence in respect of any of the relevant species²¹⁹. It has reached that position following extremely thorough scrutiny of the WG proposals. WG’s ecology team worked hard to respond to NRW’s concerns by a combination of supplying information and/or working up mitigation strategies in respect of the species concerned.
352. Most particularly, with regard to dormice, WG have worked extensively with NRW to produce a detailed Mitigation Strategy in draft. All of the relevant documents will be supplemented by further detailed information at the licensing stage, should the Scheme go ahead, reflecting, for example, ongoing survey work on dormice, otters and bats. But in the case of dormice in particular, NRW considered that a high level of detail was required because of the declining conservation status of the species in the UK. The

²¹⁹ See SOCGs ID 104 (bats) paras 2.1.11, 2.1.24 ; ID 105 (GCN para, 2.1.12; otter paras. 2.1.13 – 2.1.16); PID 236 re Docks and Otters; ID 154 (dormice) para.2.1.7; ID 233, NRW letter to Mr Martin Bates 16.3.18

draft document, therefore, sets out in considerable detail mature proposals for ensuring that the statutory tests will be capable of being met. It is an inherently flexible strategy which comprises early habitat enhancement work and several different approaches ranging from encouragement to colonise enhanced areas in the vicinity of their current habitat through to translocation to Coed Mawr. Mr Jon Davies, whose company Arcadis, have experience of a substantial dormouse mitigation exercise in connection with the Ryder Cup Project at Celtic Manor, sees the project here as a real opportunity to strengthen and extend the creature's colonisation in this part of South Wales.

353. GWT's Mr Byrne challenged Mr Jon Davies on his opinion but the group led no evidence to contradict it or to demonstrate that NRW's judgment was flawed. Suggestions in GWT's Closing that Mr Jon Davies' evidence should be given reduced weight because of Dr Keith Jones' indisposition are unwarranted. Mr Jon Davies always gave his evidence in such a way as to put his ecological expertise beyond serious contention. He was repeatedly cross examined by GWT, to much less effect than inaccurately claimed by them in their Closing. He plainly always did his best to – and did – assist the Inquiry.
354. NRW have not required such a detailed approach in relation to GCN nor is any objector suggesting that there is an outstanding issue.
355. With regard to Dormouse and GCN, therefore, there is no reason to suppose that licences under the Habitats Regulations will not be forthcoming. Richard Wald confirmed this in closing on behalf of NRW.

356. Turning to Otter, there is once again, agreement with NRW²²⁰, the licensing body, that there is adequate information before them and the Inquiry such that the Inspectors and Ministers should not conclude that any necessary licences would be unlikely to be forthcoming. This was confirmed by counsel in his closing.²²¹
357. GWT's case on Otter concentrated, as well as seeking to undermine that position on licensing, additionally on another point under the Habitats Regulations, the effect upon the River Usk SAC. That matter will be dealt with separately.
358. Lastly, we must consider Bats. There are outstanding objections in respect of effects on Bats on the part of NRW. GWT also object on that ground. The scope of their respective objections, however, differs.
359. GWT argue, on the basis of Prof Altringham's evidence, that licences would or should not be forthcoming. That case is predicated on a novel interpretation of the Habitats Regulations which WG submit is wrong for the detailed reasons set out in Annex 3 of these submissions.
360. GWT/Prof Altringham's interpretation of the Regulations is not shared by NRW. They do not suggest that relevant licences would not be forthcoming. NRW submitted a proof of evidence from Jean Matthews. Although they maintain concerns about the impacts of the Scheme on bats, this point is separate from the issue of licensing. Their evidence did not state that NRW's objection meant that they would be unlikely to grant a licence and

²²⁰ Covered in the signed Internationally Designated Sites SOCG; paras 2.1.39 and 2.1.31 being the most relevant.

²²¹ PID244 p.5 para.13

this position, as noted above, has been confirmed in a SOCG²²². Richard Wald closed NRW's case on this basis.²²³

361. In conclusion, the licensing body, having carefully scrutinised WG's proposals and sought reasoned justifications in all relevant respects, has concluded that there is no basis for suggesting that future consents under the Habitats Regulations would not be forthcoming in respect of the Scheme itself and the works in the Docks. GWT disagrees but it is not the statutory body with responsibility for licensing.

362. Similarly, NRW, having carefully considered the SIAA work undertaken in respect of the Scheme and the proposals in the Docks and required further information, now considers that the level of assessment, in the context of the implications for the European Sites, in view of their conservation objectives, is appropriate. Furthermore, NRW agrees with the conclusion of the SIAA in respect of each of the Sites, namely that no adverse effect on Site integrity is predicted because of the M4CaN either alone or in combination with other plans and projects and taking account of relevant mitigation as embedded into the Scheme or as set out as commitments within the Commitments Register²²⁴. We have derived the expression of this point from NRW's Closing Submissions, which were clearly crafted with care on this important matter. Therefore the inspectors can and should advise Ministers that there are no likely impediments to the Scheme being progressed on the basis of European protected species or Sites.

This exhaustive review of potential obstacles to implementation of the Scheme and the Docks works demonstrates that all potential impediments

²²² PID 104 paras.2.1.11 - 2.1.24

²²³ PID 244 P.5 para. 12

²²⁴ Richard Wald Closing Doc PID 244 pp.7-8, para.18

have been considered and, where necessary, steps have been taken to scope out future regulatory and other risk. If the Schemes and Orders are confirmed, there is no evidential basis for concluding that they could not be implemented.

WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS (WALES) ACT 2015 (“FGA 2015”)

363. We set out in Opening our submissions as to the interpretation and application of the FGA 2015. Those submissions stand because nothing has happened during the Inquiry to cause them to change. This document will, therefore, focus on responding to particular points which have been made by objectors.

364. For convenience, the key sections are reproduced below:

“2 Sustainable development

In this Act, “sustainable development” means the process of improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales by taking action, in accordance with the sustainable development principle (see section 5), aimed at achieving the well-being goals (see section 4).

3 Well-being duty on public bodies

(1) Each public body must carry out sustainable development.

(2) The action a public body takes in carrying out sustainable development must include—

(a) setting and publishing objectives (“well-being objectives”) that are designed to maximise its contribution to achieving each of the well-being goals, and

(b) taking all reasonable steps (in exercising its functions) to meet those objectives.

(3) A public body that exercises functions in relation to the whole of Wales may set objectives relating to Wales or any part of Wales.

(4) A public body that exercises functions in relation only to a part of Wales may set objectives relating to that part or any part of it.

4 The well-being goals

The well-being goals are listed and described in Table 1—

TABLE 1

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Description of the goal</i>
<i>A prosperous Wales.</i>	<i>An innovative, productive and low carbon society which recognises the limits of the global environment and therefore uses resources efficiently and proportionately (including acting on climate change); and which develops a skilled and well-educated population in an economy which generates wealth and provides employment opportunities, allowing people to take advantage of the wealth generated through securing decent work.</i>
<i>A resilient Wales.</i>	<i>A nation which maintains and enhances a biodiverse natural environment with healthy functioning ecosystems that support social, economic and ecological resilience and the capacity to adapt to change (for example climate change).</i>
<i>A healthier Wales.</i>	<i>A society in which people's physical and mental well-being is maximised and in which choices and behaviours that benefit future health are understood.</i>
<i>A more equal Wales.</i>	<i>A society that enables people to fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances (including their socio economic background and circumstances).</i>
<i>A Wales of cohesive communities.</i>	<i>Attractive, viable, safe and well-connected communities.</i>
<i>A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language.</i>	<i>A society that promotes and protects culture, heritage and the Welsh language, and which encourages people to participate in the arts, and sports and recreation.</i>

A globally responsible Wales.

A nation which, when doing anything to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, takes account of whether doing such a thing may make a positive contribution to global well-being.

5 The sustainable development principle

(1) *In this Act, any reference to a public body doing something “in accordance with the sustainable development principle” means that the body must act in a manner which seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*

(2) *In order to act in that manner, a public body must take account of the following things—*

(a) *the importance of balancing short term needs with the need to safeguard the ability to meet long term needs, especially where things done to meet short term needs may have detrimental long term effect;*

(b) *the need to take an integrated approach, by considering how—*

(i) *the body's well-being objectives may impact upon each of the well-being goals;*

(ii) *the body's well-being objectives impact upon each other or upon other public bodies' objectives, in particular where steps taken by the body may contribute to meeting one objective but may be detrimental to meeting another;*

(c) *the importance of involving other persons with an interest in achieving the well-being goals and of ensuring those persons reflect the diversity of the population of —*

(i) *Wales (where the body exercises functions in relation to the whole of Wales), or*

(ii) *the part of Wales in relation to which the body exercises functions;*

(d) *how acting in collaboration with any other person (or how different parts of the body acting together) could assist the body to meet its well-being*

objectives, or assist another body to meet its objectives;

(e) how deploying resources to prevent problems occurring or getting worse may contribute to meeting the body's well-being objectives, or another body's objectives.”

365. It is obvious, from the Act's definition of "sustainable development" that the required actions involve the weighing and balancing of different considerations. This proposition has been disputed by some objectors. The RSPB and GWT, in their letter of 26th May 2017 to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure and Mr Byrne, cross examining Mr Matthew Jones on behalf of GWT, both suggested that the only scope for balance in the Act is the importance to be placed, pursuant to s.5(2)(a), on the balancing of short term needs with the need to safeguard the ability to meet long term needs, especially where things done to meet short term needs may have detrimental long term effect. The RSPB / GWT letter also refers to the Sustainable Development Principle requiring integration, with the apparent implication that integration is in some way inconsistent with the balancing of well-being considerations. The Future Generations Commissioner ("FGC") made similar points in her letter to the inspectors of 13 September 2017.
366. With respect, this approach over simplifies the intricacies and subtleties of the statutory drafting and is inconsistent with PPW²²⁵, which has been updated specifically to reflect the new legislation; whilst policy is neither law nor the authoritative interpretation of the law, it is telling that the notion of

²²⁵ See, e.g., paras. 5.5.1 – 2, referred to by John Davies MBE in his Rebuttal to Mr Barnes for the Woodland Trust (WG/REB/OBJ271- Barnes) and para.7.2.2, referred to above.

balance, so familiar in the planning sphere, remains in national policy notwithstanding the new enactments. The RSPB approach also appears to presuppose that the transport and related needs to which the Scheme is directed are short term needs and that meeting such needs will or may have long term detrimental effects.

367. To deal, firstly, with the presuppositions, WG's evidence powerfully demonstrates that the needs which the Scheme addresses are anything but short term. They are longstanding problems which are projected to continue into the future and, in some respects worsen in the absence of the Scheme. GWT's witnesses and many other objectors had failed to inform themselves adequately of the evidence in support of the Scheme. Many favoured other approaches which they regarded as coming at less environmental cost, but had not drilled down into the detail. WG's witnesses have cogently explained in detail why the Scheme is necessary and alternatives, such as packages of non-road based measures or the Blue Route, alone or in combination with other measures, simply will not do the job.

368. The Scheme is a long term solution to long term needs. It is the only such solution to have emerged from years of careful analysis and collaborative endeavour, recently reviewed afresh and independently by Mr John Davies MBE in the context of the Act. Suggestions by the Future Generations Commissioner ("FGC") in her letter of 13 September 2017 that the WG M4CaN inquiry team had not properly considered and applied the new legislation were and are wholly unwarranted. One can only assume that the FGC did not have Mr John Davies MBE's painstakingly careful assessment

- of the Scheme in the context of the FGA 2015 drawn to her attention before sending her letter.
369. Interestingly, Mr Barnes of the Woodland Trust asked rhetorically how long compensation measures can be expected to last, in the light of the fact that some of the 1960s/70s planting along the existing M4 is to be lost to the Scheme.²²⁶ The current M4 exemplifies what happens when infrastructure is not future- proofed; the long term results are less sustainable than where needs are faced up to and long term solutions applied. The M4CaN Scheme is designed to meet the pressing needs of the present whilst properly addressing the long term as part of an integrated transport strategy. Not one of the Alternatives put forward at the Inquiry, on the other hand, has shown itself to be up to the task.
370. Turning to long term detrimental effects, it is necessary, once again, to make an accurate assessment. WG has done so and Mr John Davies MBE drew on this work to reach conclusions on the FGA 2015 questions, both in his original Proof of Evidence, and in his concluding Scheme Evidence Updates²²⁷, which reflect the developments which have occurred as the Inquiry has unfolded. No other witness attempted this exercise. Whilst it cannot substitute for the judgment of the inspectors or the ultimate decision maker, and is not intended to do so, it is a thorough, evidence-based assessment. The process enjoined by the Act on the public bodies requires this kind of careful exercise. The improvement sought by s.2 is real, not speculative, improvement. The Sustainability Goals in s.4 are

²²⁶ Proof for Woodland Trust (OBJ0271) para.4.31

²²⁷ WG 1.23.5 and 7

concepts which require judgments to be made, but, to be meaningful, they must be based on evidence, rather than assertion.

371. The contention that the only form of balancing required or, allegedly, permitted under the Act, is the balancing of short term needs and long term detrimental effects is untenable. This is a generic duty laid upon public bodies, all of whom operate within an existing statutory framework, and many of whom are democratically accountable. The list of matters which must be taken into account in order to act in accordance with the sustainable development principle is not exhaustive (s.5(2)), nor could it sensibly be. The s.4 goals, like the s.2 definition, involve some elements which are, potentially, in tension and which require the application of informed judgment to resolve. In reaching such resolution – in other words, in striking the balance – the decision making body looks for an integrated solution, seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met – which may be its statutory or democratic duty – without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, taking account of the required matters and adopting the ways of working required in s.5(2). This is complex territory, especially when taking a decision about major infrastructure which will give rise to a vast collection of effects across the economic, social, environmental and cultural spheres. Whilst the Act requires new processes to be undertaken and gives more detailed expression to the pre-existing statutory concept of “*sustainable development*”, it does not prescribe answers or outcomes. It does not say that environmental concerns must always trump economic and/or social ones, or vice versa. The Act calls, instead, for smart decision making and

action, which achieves improvement in all four areas. The evidence amply demonstrates that this Scheme would achieve such improvement. The nature of this improvement, its precise outworkings in the four statutory fields of endeavour, may not take the form which objectors would choose, but that is not to say that the Act prevents the Minister from reaching such a conclusion.

372. Detailed responses have been made in written and oral evidence to the FGA 2015 points raised against the Scheme²²⁸. This includes a full rebuttal of the further submissions made by the Future Generations Commissioner (“FGC”)²²⁹.

373. The role of FGC is a statutory one, set up and defined by Part 3 of the Act. S.18 provides that the FGC’s general duty is:

“(a) to promote the sustainable development principle, in particular to—

(i) act as a guardian of the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and

(ii) encourage public bodies to take greater account of the long-term impact of the things that they do, and

(b) for that purpose to monitor and assess the extent to which well-being objectives set by public bodies are being met.”

374. It is interesting to note that the particular part of the sustainable development principle with which the FGC is to concern herself is the long term. This particular statutory emphasis must be borne in mind. WG/WMs, of course, are subject to the duty to carry out sustainable development,

²²⁸ See John Davies MBE’s original Proof WG 1.23.1 paras. 35-44

²²⁹ FGC – WG/REB/ISU0024 and ISU0024-2

which includes ensuring that the needs of the present are met. The FGC, in her representation, suggests that WG have not comprehensively considered alternative options for addressing the problems of the M4, favours a package of measures, and refers to the objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These points are developed in a variety of ways.

375. WG's Rebuttal²³⁰ deals comprehensively with these points. We do not repeat the detailed points of rebuttal here. In respect of most of the points, the opportunity has been taken to assist both the FGC and the Inspectors by pointing out where, in the extensive evidence base, all these points have been considered.

376. One suggestion made by the FGC and others is that Mr John Davies MBE's appraisal is merely a retrofit, the implication apparently being that his assessment is, by definition, inconsistent with the Act. The Act contains no transitional provisions. There is no suggestion that, exceptionally, its effect is retrospective. The relevant parts came into effect on 1 April 2016. Given the stage which the project had reached by then, it would have been absurd and, indeed, unsustainable to have stopped it in its tracks and gone back to inception. The Act imposes no such requirement. Therefore criticism of Mr John Davies MBE's work is unjustified. It is a far more thorough and well-informed assessment than the FGC's representation. As Mr Matthew Jones explained,²³¹ the FGC had one meeting with WG shortly before the deadline for submission of her representations when she and her team were fairly new in post. Therefore the opportunity was taken in the

²³⁰ WG/REB/ISU0024-2- Howe;

²³¹ During his cross examination by James Byrne

Rebuttals to reassure the FGC of the extensive and collaborative work undertaken over the years to assess alternatives, to consider social and health impacts and to achieve the best fit between meeting present needs without compromising future generations.

377. A further point of principle addressed in Mr John Davies MBE's Proof and Rebuttal is the manner in which individual projects should be assessed under the Act. The point is a simple one. Not every project is required to contribute in equal measure to every well-being goal. S.3(2)(a) refers to the setting of objectives by the public body. This process is important and is the only activity specified in the Act to be a compulsory sustainable development action. S.3(2)(a) refers to the setting of objectives by a public body, which are "*designed to maximise its contribution to achieving each of the well-being goals*" (ie. the body's contribution; emphasis added). The point is that the actions of the relevant body, taken as a whole, should contribute across all the goals and objectives; in the case of WG, the canvas is obviously broad. This interpretation is confirmed by consideration of s.3(2)(b). Whilst this subsection imposes a duty on the relevant public body to meet the published objectives that are designed to maximise the body's contribution to each of the well-being goals, it does not make this duty an absolute one. Instead, the obligation is to take all reasonable steps in exercising its functions to meet the objectives which it has set. This provision therefore leaves considerable scope for judgment to the public body as it goes about its work, rather than being prescriptive. Moreover, s.3(4) provides that a public body which exercises functions in relation to the whole of Wales may set objectives relating to Wales as a

whole or any part of Wales and a similar degree of latitude is granted to more local bodies within Wales, which is not consistent with a reading which requires equal contribution across all objectives from all projects of Government.

378. Interestingly, the FGC, in her recent evidence to the Equality, Local Government and Communities Committee on 1 March 2018, appears to recognise the role of balanced judgment in assessing effects under the four elements of well being under s.2 of the Act and the FGC's initial submission and letter of 13 September 2017 must now be read subject to her evidence in Senedd. Replying to a question which apparently referred to Mr John Davies MBE's evidence²³² she said:

“Well, what the Act says is that public bodies have a duty to undertake sustainable development, and ‘sustainable development’ is defined as the process of improving the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales. I’ve also had legal advice, as you can imagine, and believe that my interpretation of that provision is robust. There have been some interesting ways of looking at that. I think the important word is ‘improving’. So, that doesn’t mean that, if you’re going to undertake a particular project or spend a particular amount of money, you couldn’t have a situation where the economy massively benefits and, say, the environment only benefits in a minimal way. In my view, that sort of decision would be allowed; it wouldn’t be contrary to the Act. If, however, you have a decision whereby the economy benefits massively and the environment is massively negatively

²³² Incorrectly referred to by John Griffiths AM as WG's ‘legal representative’

impacted, so therefore it's not improved, I think that would be contrary to the future generations Act. "

379. These submissions demonstrate that, even adopting the FGC's approach (which is not admitted to be the right one since it reads words into the legislation and impermissibly cuts down the discretion of the decision maker) a decision to confirm the Orders would not be inconsistent with the FGA 2015. This is because it is not tenable, on a fair and comprehensive assessment of the environmental evidence, to conclude that the environment would not be improved, especially when one considers the long term effects of the ecological mitigation measures on the Levels and at Coed Mawr, air quality and noise improvements for significant residential areas of Newport and the regeneration of worn out parts of Newport Docks. The weight to attach to these improvements as opposed to admitted environmental disbenefits is, of course, a matter of judgment, as is the weight to attach to economic and other social benefits, but judgment and weight are not matters of law.
380. The Welsh Government set 14 well-being objectives and published them in November 2016, simultaneously with its Programme for Government, Taking Wales Forward 2016-2021. The Cabinet Secretary flagged up the fact that there were close links between them. The objectives were revised and reduced in number to twelve, issued in the Well Being Statement of 19 September 2017. Mr John Davies MBE reassessed the Scheme against the new objectives in his Update,²³³ concluding that it delivers benefits in a

²³³ WG 1.23.5

cross-cutting way across many of the new objectives as it had done in respect of the previous ones.

381. To summarise, suggestions to the effect that the Scheme is contrary to the FGA are ill founded. The Inspectors are free to recommend confirmation and the WMs are free to confirm the Schemes and Orders if they are satisfied that to do so would be in accordance with the sustainable development principle. That judgement is for them, properly assessing the evidence in the context of the statutory requirements and their own well-being objectives.

OTHER STATUTORY ENVIRONMENTAL DUTIES

382. A theme of many objections has been the claim that the Scheme is in conflict with a number of important duties laid upon public bodies by UK and Welsh legislation. There has also been some criticism of the ES and Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (“SIAA”), which will be considered after the general duties deriving from domestic UK and Welsh law.
383. The relevant domestic law duties will be analysed individually in the context of the evidence. Before embarking on that exercise, however, it is important to note a fundamental point of difference between WG and objectors with regard to the scope and operation of the statutory provisions.
384. As briefly outlined in our Opening and repeated during the inquiry, it is the case that none of the relevant provisions is unqualified. This approach has

provoked disagreement, even protest.²³⁴ Mr Byrne for GWT suggested to Mr Matthew Jones that the inquiry should concern itself with the intentions of those, apparently including himself, who had had some involvement in bringing the FGA 2015 and the EWA 2016 to the statute book. The question was not answered, in the event, because it proceeded on a false legal basis. The RSPB / GWT letter to the Minister²³⁵, similarly, refers to the “*spirit*” of the legislation and to observations apparently made in the Assembly as the Bills were introduced. Legislation must be interpreted by objectively construing the words used; this is the route to discerning and giving effect to the intention of the legislative body. Extraneous (and strictly circumscribed) material is only to be considered in exceptional circumstances where the words of the legislation itself are ambiguous or lead to manifest absurdity.²³⁶ That is not to underplay the importance of the provisions in question here, which are perfectly clear, rather it is to do them full justice. They cover all the actions of public bodies. In a modern society, the ambit is, therefore, huge and multifarious. In many instances, authorities will also be under many, more specific, statutory duties. The new provisions require certain approaches to decision making, but they cannot possibly prescribe outcomes in a complex, mature democracy; properly construed, this is not their effect.

385. Apparently contrary to widespread belief amongst those who have mobilised and advanced opposition to the Scheme, it does not breach

²³⁴ ID / 088 RSPB letter to Ken Skates, Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure 26th May 2017, including certain observations of RSPB and GWT representatives on the evidence of NRW.

²³⁵ ID / 088

²³⁶ *Pepper v. Hart* [1993] AC 593; moreover, comments by the House of Lords in subsequent cases have suggested that the rule should be applied very restrictively: *R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions ex p. Spath Holme Ltd* [2001] 2 AC 349, *Wilson and others v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry* [2003] UKHL 40, *R (Westminster City Council) v National Asylum Support Service* [2004], JR

recent Welsh Environmental legislation. Nor is it in conflict with s.28G Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (“WCA 1981”) or any other relevant statutory provision. It is important to recall that Friends of the Earth Cymru’s (“FOEC”) legal challenge to the Plan underlying the Scheme failed. FOEC argued that, in adopting the Plan, the Minister failed to take reasonable steps, consistent with the exercise of WG’s functions, to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora and fauna of the SSSIs over which the proposed route runs, as required by s.28G. Hickinbottom J rejected that contention on the basis of his interpretation of s.28G and the facts which demonstrated how WG had discharged the duty up to Plan adoption stage. He rightly refused to enter into the merits of the decision to adopt the Plan as a matter of policy, but it must follow from his decision that there can be no question of WG’s having acted contrary to s.28G up to the stage when it adopted the Plan in 2014. Moreover, the recent Welsh legislation was not in force then and is not retrospective. This is important, as stated above, because it means that there can be no valid opposition on legal grounds on the basis of the *idea* or *concept* of this road scheme. A proper decision can only be reached by weighing up all the pros and cons and reaching a balanced view.

Part 2 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

386. S.28G WCA 1981 must be considered in context. It sits within a suite of provisions which were consolidated and expanded by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. These provisions form a coherent statutory scheme for the notification and protection of SSSIs. S.28G undoubtedly

imposes a duty on WG and all other s.28G authorities, but it is not an absolute duty and, under the statutory scheme, NRW is not the ultimate arbiter of the acceptability of relevant works which a s.28G authority proposes to undertake.

387. S.28E WCA 1981 requires the owner of SSSI land to obtain the consent or agreement of NRW to do works. There is a right of appeal against refusal to WG. It is a criminal offence to do such works without consent, subject to the operations having been authorised by a grant of planning permission or permitted by a s.28G authority which has consulted NRW under s.28I. Different rules apply to s.28G authorities carrying out operations. They are required to notify NRW in advance of proposed works and, if NRW do not assent, they must notify NRW of their intention of starting operations and state *“how (if at all) it has taken account of any written advice”* received from NRW. It must then do the works in such a way as to cause as little damage to relevant features as is reasonably practicable in all the circumstances and restore the site to its former condition, so as far as is reasonably practicable²³⁷.
388. As Ms Poole agreed,²³⁸ therefore, the law distinguishes between private owners/developers on the one hand and public authorities on the other, since the s.28G authority can, ultimately, go ahead without the approval of NRW or another body in consultation with NRW. Perhaps oddly, s.28H (5)(b) even countenances the possibility that NRW’s written advice under s.28H(1) might not be taken into account. Of course in this case, WG has

²³⁷ S.28H(6) WCA 1981

²³⁸ Cross examination (ME QC)

taken NRW's advice fully into account²³⁹. As NRW's schedule²⁴⁰ and the SoCgs on Flood Risk, Water Quality, Internationally Designated Sites, Nationally Designated Sites, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Visual Effects, Dormice, Bats and Other Protected Species demonstrate, NRW have given the Scheme the closest scrutiny in general, including the SSSI effects in particular, in the course of protracted dialogue with WG and its advisors on ecology, drainage and water quality. WG have taken their advice into account, paying it the most careful attention and refining their proposals as a result. Richard Wald acknowledged the depth of this dialogue during his Closing Submissions and WG would like to take this opportunity to pay particular tribute to Ms Poole's work on this project and continue to wish her well in her recovery. Following her accident, dialogue has continued, as her colleagues have picked up matters where she had to leave them. It is this detailed work which has enabled the position of substantial agreement recorded in Mr Wald's Closing to be reached. There has been no dereliction of duty on the part of either NRW or WG in this regard, rather, a proper engagement between experts considering matters objectively.

389. S.28G itself provides as follows:

“Statutory undertakers, etc.: general duty.

- (1) *An authority to which this section applies (referred to in this section and in sections 28H and 28I as “a section 28G authority”) shall have the duty set out in subsection (2) in exercising its functions*

²³⁹ Criticism of WG by RSPB in their letter of 27th May is, therefore, doubly misplaced. They were apparently surprised to find out what the law actually is and then implied that WG had, in fact, ignored / proposed to ignore the advice of NRW, which contention is plainly untenable, on the basis of NRW's own evidence, as well as WG's ecology, water quality, flooding and environmental evidence.

²⁴⁰ ID/063

so far as their exercise is likely to affect the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which a site of special scientific interest is of special interest.

- (2) *The duty is to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of the authority's functions, to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which the site is of special scientific interest.*
- (3) *The following are section 28G authorities—*
 - (a) *a Minister of the Crown (within the meaning of the Ministers of the Crown Act 1975) or a Government department;*
 - (b) *the National Assembly for Wales;*
 - (c) *a local authority;*
 - (d) *a person holding an office—*
 - (i) *under the Crown,*
 - (ii) *created or continued in existence by a public general Act of Parliament, or*
 - (iii) *the remuneration in respect of which is paid out of money provided by Parliament;*
 - (e) *a statutory undertaker . . . ; and*
 - (f) *any other public body of any description.*
- (4) *“Statutory undertaker” means a person who is or is deemed to be a statutory undertaker for the purposes of any provision of Part 11 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”*

390. Whilst the section imposes the subsection (2) duty, this duty is qualified.

What is required of a relevant authority (including WG/WM) is to take:

- reasonable steps
- consistent with the proper exercise of the authority's functions

to further the specified SSSI objectives. In closing, Richard Wald summarised NRW's remaining s.28G case as being "*in a nutshell, NRW is not satisfied that reasonable steps have been taken.*" In WG's submission, NRW have signally failed to justify this stance, either by their own evidence or through cross examination of WG's witnesses.

391. As Ms Poole recognised in cross examination, Part 2 of the Act, in its general scheme, and s.28G in particular, gives recognition to the other public interests involved when considering the implications for SSSIs of public projects. It is also apparent from the qualified nature of s.28G, as she went on to agree, that full mitigation of impacts is not required in such instances. In Closing, counsel for NRW accepted that the nature of the statutory requirement under s.28G is "not absolute" and put their remaining points on the basis that they should "weigh against the acceptability of the M4CaN Scheme."²⁴¹ Whilst WG strongly submits that these impacts do not outweigh the need for the Scheme, for reasons set out above (flooding) and below (loss of reens and ditches, bats and landscape/cultural heritage), we welcome NRW's recognition that the approach is one of weighing up pros and cons. It should also be noted that their closing submissions do not argue that the Scheme should be rejected; instead,

²⁴¹ DOC PID244 p.9, paras 25, p.16 para 34 and p.28 para 69

they request that their outstanding objections be “given significant weight.....in the no doubt further careful consideration of the ..Orders.” Their adoption of this approach to the question is significant in the light of the submissions of GWT and others on the relevant environmental legislation. By the end of the process, NRW properly recognise that assessment and decision making must proceed on a careful appraisal of the evidence which is then weighed up in order to reach the right conclusion in the light of all competing considerations. Whether or not WG have discharged the duty, on this – correct – analysis, is a question of judgment. That judgment must, however, be based on evidence and not mere assertion or feeling.

392. The concessions on approach by Ms Poole and Richard Wald are significant because initially NRW’s objections²⁴² were predicated on seeking or requiring full mitigation of impacts on the SSSIs rather than recognising that the law permits less than that where the steps taken are reasonable ones, consistent with the proper exercise of the authority’s functions. Thus, the law permits SSSI interests to yield to other considerations so long as the steps taken to further conservation and enhancement of the relevant features are reasonable. Therefore Ms Poole rightly accepted that NRW’s evidence had not attempted a full consideration of the s.28G questions, since they had not called evidence on highways engineering, traffic modelling, economics or the host of other matters involved in the discharge by WG of its functions as a Highways Authority and the national Government. The questions on this point were

²⁴² As well as those of others, principally GWT

entirely fair and her admissions were entirely appropriate. Again, complaints by RSPB about this passage of the evidence simply served, with respect, to illustrate an incomplete appreciation of the law on the part of some who were observing the inquiry at this point. Indeed, as was made clear at the outset of WG's cross examination of Ms Poole, part of the purpose of the questions was to ensure that other organisations and their representatives might have a full understanding of NRW's role. To the extent that the exchanges, which were wholly amicable, have prompted surprise, they have served this part of their purpose. Neither RSPB nor Mr Byrne chose to give evidence themselves and it was appropriate, in the circumstances, to explore these points with NRW's lead officer.

393. The RSPB letter²⁴³ accepts that the new legal duties arising from the Welsh legislation do *“not act as an absolute prohibition on harm”* so there really should be no controversy about the obvious proposition that ecological interests do not necessarily trump other considerations. The reality, of course, is that these objectors disagree with the way in which WG has balanced these considerations, but that is wholly different from a contention that WG has got the law wrong. It will be for WM, guided by the Inspectors' report, to weigh the competing considerations in the light of all the material, including the extensive evidence of steps which WG proposes to take to maintain, enhance and mitigate impacts upon biodiversity in general and SSSIs and protected species in particular. The Welsh legislation will be analysed in detail below, along with the position regarding protected species.

²⁴³ ID / 088

394. Returning specifically to s.28G, however, there is nothing new or alarming in WG's interpretation of the law. Hickinbottom J construed s.28G in the FOEC case where it was submitted by the Claimant that:

"WG failed properly to understand the nature of its duty under s.28G, which gave the protection and preservation of SSSIs enhanced weight in the decision-making process, such that there is a presumption against any plan that would lead to harm to such sites."

395. The judge described this as a "bold submission" and he rejected the analogy which the Claimant sought to draw with s.66 PLBCAA 1990 (the planning equivalent to the s.16 LBC duty considered above). He said that s.28G was "in entirely different terms". It does not impose a general duty on the decision-maker to have some particular regard to the desirability of protecting and preserving SSSIs; it imposes an entirely different type of obligation, namely a duty to 'take reasonable steps ... to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora, fauna or geological or physiological features by reason of which the site is of special scientific interest'." He therefore went on to hold that the duty "does not seek to protect SSSIs by weighing the desirability of their protection as against other factors, but by requiring relevant authorities to take reasonable steps 'to further the conservation and enhancement of the ... features by reason of which the site is of special scientific interest'."

396. Turning to the facts to date, the Judge noted the following:

i) "In the early 1990s, the Countryside Council for Wales expressed concerns about potential environmental impact of the proposed M4 relief motorway, routed

as it was south of Newport and across the Gwent Levels SSSIs. As a result, a further review was carried out, which noted the detrimental environmental effect that any northern route motorway would have, and confirming the southern route was preferred (see paragraph 29 above).

- ii) For the purpose of the first TR111 notice in 1995, the route was identified to “minimise the potential impacts” on the Gwent Levels SSSIs.....*
- iii) The route was altered – moving it north – as a result of a review in 2004-6, to reduce the impact on and severance of the Gwent Levels SSSIs. The review specifically and expressly took into account the strengthening of the protection for SSSIs by the 2000 Act and particularly the Welsh Government’s duty under section 28G of the 1981 Act brought into being by the 2000 Act. In announcing the consequent revisions to the preferred route in the 1997 TR111 Notice, the Minister emphasised that the changes “offer a clear benefit to the environment by taking the route northwards and where possible onto land previously of industrial use thereby reducing its impact on the Gwent Levels including the [SSSIs]”*
- iv) The March 2013 WeITAG Appraisal specifically took into account, for each option considered, the comments received from the consultation on the November 2012 Environmental Report*
- v) The June 2013 WeITAG Appraisal did not deal with environmental matters in any detail, pending the SEA Report. However, it said that all three highway options “result in moderate to large impacts on the environment...”. It also indicated that the main ecological interest of the SSSIs was the reën system.....*
- vi) The 2013 SEA Report expressly took account of the 2000 Act as a relevant statute, and, in detail, assessed the*

- significant effects of the draft Plan and the chosen reasonable alternatives, determining the significance of effect as “minor negative”*
- vii) *The SEA Post-Adoption Statement set out the potential environmental effects and associated mitigation, in detail, in a similar manner to the SEA report*

135. *Mr Moffett submitted that the only steps that the Minister could have taken to conserve or enhance the relevant features would have been:*

- i) *Not to proceed with any option that involved a highway across the Gwent Levels SSSIs. However, as I have explained, none of the options that did not involve such a highway came anything like achieving the objectives, namely the TPOs or (in short) the relief of the M4 motorway around Newport. The do-minimum scenario was also discounted on, amongst other things, the environmental unacceptability of the status quo.*
- ii) *To mitigate the harm necessarily caused by such a highway. Looking at the history, briefly related above, it is simply not maintainable that the Minister was not sensitive to that harm, and to the importance of mitigating and minimising it. Indeed, as Mr Moffett submitted, looked at fairly, the whole process that resulted in the decision challenged was focused on the potential harm to the Gwent Levels SSSIs of a new highway crossing them, and the mitigation of that harm. The Minister clearly paid the SSSIs and the desirability of preserving and protecting them the regard required of her. She did not arguably err in this regard.”*

397. This lengthy quotation from the judgment helpfully summarises the steps taken up to adoption of the Plan in discharge of the s.28G duty. It is notable that the Judge dismissed FOEC’s argument as unarguable.²⁴⁴
398. The passage in TAN 5: Nature Conservation, relied on by Richard Wald for NRW²⁴⁵ in cross examination of John Davies MBE and in closing, to the effect that the Government expects s.28G authorities “*to apply strict tests when carrying out functions within or affecting SSSIs, to ensure that they avoid, or at least minimise, adverse effects*”, in no way conflicts with the law as enunciated by Hickinbottom J in the judicial review or as put by WG in the inquiry. (Emphasis added) The TAN recognises that, even putting itself under a “*strict*” test, a s.28G authority may, as a matter of judgment, decide that adverse effects on SSSIs cannot be avoided, hence the reference to minimisation. That part of the guidance recognises that the ultimate judgment about the reasonableness of steps is to be reached in such a way as to be consistent with the proper exercise of the authority’s functions. Mr Davies MBE did not shrink from agreeing in cross examination that, as a matter of practice (as opposed to law) WG should be an exemplar but added that, in his view, the Scheme is that. This judgment is justified by the minimisation of SSSI landtake when the decision was taken in 2006 to move the line northwards and by the detailed work during Scheme development of the ecological, water quality, contamination and engineering/construction teams, in consultation with NRW, to design in and

²⁴⁴ The case comprised a so-called “rolled up hearing”, where the Court considers both the threshold (permission stage) question of arguability which arises in a judicial review and the substantive claim. In relation to this ground, the Judge found that it was not even arguable, i.e.. it would not have passed the threshold (permission) test.

²⁴⁵ And RSPB in the letter of 27th May 2017

- develop “*reasonable steps*” for the protection of SSSI features, as well as other natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.
399. It is also clear, from a proper consideration of s.28G, that mere land-take is not the issue. NRW’s Closing was inconsistent in this respect. Having accepted the non absolute nature of the s.28G duty, Richard Wald inconsistently continued to submit that the SSSI land take was “*manifestly excessive*”, evidencing a “*breach of s.28G*”.
400. This submission was doubly unjustified. It was wrong in law, because inconsistent with the proper interpretation set out by Hickinbottom J and accepted elsewhere in the Closing. Moreover, it simply did not reflect the evidence. Despite the position taken in her proof,²⁴⁶ Ms Poole agreed in cross examination that scale of loss alone “*cannot answer the question*” of acceptability under s.28G or generally. This is for several reasons. Firstly, in s.28G terms, as Hickinbottom J held, the question is as to the reasonableness of steps to further the conservation and enhancement of the features. The law leaves this judgment to the relevant s.28G authority: at promotion stage, WG; at decision stage, WMs. Unless the decision maker reaches a judgment which is irrational in the legal sense, it is for him / her to evaluate the reasonableness of steps in the light of the statutory objective that they should be consistent with the proper exercise of the authority’s functions. Consequently, the judgment about loss cannot be a mere numbers game, because it will depend on the quality and significance of what is lost. Richard Wald made this point about significance of consequences in re-examination of Ms Poole and in closing, but did not

²⁴⁶ Proof para 4.2.8, e.g..

develop it by reference to the evidence. In fact, the evidence of NRW's SSSI feature sheets, disclosed to WG in autumn 2016, clearly demonstrates that the majority of the land in the SSSIs, far from exhibiting notification features, is very ordinary and contributes negatively to the condition of the important features as a result of modern farming practices and/or industrial pollution.²⁴⁷ As a result, the SSSIs are in unfavourable condition. Dr Ireland and Mr Jon Davies pointed out more than once that eutrophication of reens and ditches and agricultural "improvement" of grazing marsh due to unregulated modern farming practice has caused many of these features to exhibit less biodiversity than might be expected of a SSSI of this type. Mr Boyce's surveys between the years 2009 and 2012 surveys for CCW (NRW's predecessor) concluded that the figures for invertebrates in various SSSIs were low compared to grazing marsh ditches sampled in other parts of southern Britain, such as the Somerset Levels²⁴⁸ and there is no evidence of improvement in the meantime. The allegedly "*manifestly excessive*" SSSI land take is, in fact, less than 2% of the Levels designations.

401. Similarly, whether or not the scale of land take is "*unprecedented*" does not assist in making a judgment about the reasonableness of steps. Furthermore, as Ms Poole agreed,²⁴⁹ the judgment must be made in relation to the Scheme itself, rather than earlier developments. This latter point is important, given the emphasis placed on precedent by many objectors. Mr John Davies MBE has also explained, more than once, that the nature of balanced decision making required here means that the

²⁴⁷ ID/049 Appx A to SSSI Mitigation Strategy.

²⁴⁸ Doc. 2.3.2 ES p.10-121, para 10.4.501

²⁴⁹ Cross examination (MEQC)

- Scheme would not create a precedent for further development if approved because of its unique nature.²⁵⁰ This is the answer to fears about the solar farm NSIP proposal raised by RSPB, GWT and others.
402. Turning to consider the evidence about the steps taken by WG, Dr Ireland explained that the multi-disciplinary team worked to minimise impacts on the SSSI as the design was taken forward from the concept stage approved in the 2014 Plan. As noted above, the lawfulness of WG’s approach to selection of the route and adoption of the Plan has been established by the court.
403. Dr Ireland said that, starting from the establishment of the strategic position (i.e. arriving at the Plan), the team moved to considering the scope for reduction. The decision of principle having been made to place the line as far north as possible, there followed many subsidiary decisions where the SSSI was taken into account. For example, in response to advice from NRW, two of the six water treatment areas (“WTAs”) were located to the north of the road so as to avoid SSSI land take. It was not possible to place more of them outside the SSSIs because of the low fall of the carriageway, occasioned by keeping the road as low as possible in the landscape. Another example of SSSI – led thinking is the detailed consideration given to reed/ditch continuity and replacement now set out in the Buildability Report²⁵¹. Such is the importance of this issue that WG requested a special multi-disciplinary inquiry session to explain the proposals as had earlier been undertaken with NRW. On neither occasion did NRW query the engineering or ecological approach.

²⁵⁰ Wentlooge CC Rebuttal WG/REB/6904 section 3.6 and in the recent rebuttal of Hepworth/CPRW in ID213 section 2.4.

²⁵¹ 2.4.14.12 Appendix SR3.1 of the December 2016 ESS

404. In closing, despite the allegation of “*manifestly excessive*” SSSI landtake, the only example relied upon was the Glan Llyn junction. NRW’s concern was based on the belief that it would take 12ha of SSSI land, Ms Poole’s point on this being expressed in terms of NRW’s not being satisfied that WG had demonstrated strict testing of SSSI loss. However, it was established during the Inquiry that the SSSI landtake for the junction (as distinct from the carriageway) was, in fact, c. 4.3ha²⁵² and Ms Poole agreed in cross examination that her concern was therefore reduced.
405. As Dr Ireland and Mr Jon Davies stated when cross examined on the mitigation hierarchy, the fact is that WG’s Plan was scrutinised by the Court for compliance with the s.28G duty and found to be lawful. Subsequent to that, a host of individual decisions had to be taken as the Scheme developed. Specifically with regard to Glan Llyn, where the junction was added in response to a clear need for it articulated by NCC, it was necessary to look at ways to reduce landtake, which is what WG did. NRW neither led evidence nor challenged WG’s witnesses to suggest that NCC and WG were wrong about the strategic need for a junction at this location. Whether or not the Options and Appraisal Report described it in exactly the terms that counsel sought in his questions was not the point. Obviously, scope for the precise siting of the junction was limited in terms of the line of the route – as far north as possible to minimise effects on the Levels. Within these constraints, however, landtake had been minimised. Mr Sibert explained the design development of this element.²⁵³ Challenged about the team’s process of arriving at their Glan Llyn decision, Dr Ireland explained

²⁵² When deducting the carriageway from the total required for carriageway and junction at this point: see PIQ 98 and Peter Ireland’s explanation in chief, which was not challenged

²⁵³ Proof WG 1.5.1 paras. 4.34 – 4.40

that there were other constraints in play when siting the junction – needing to limit the level of contaminated land for potential removal and the desire to minimise impacts to the electricity grid.

406. Dr Ireland confirmed:

*"the SSSI was always at the fore of our minds – that is, the environmental and design team – JV's and WG's thinking. It was looked at in relation to the location's other factors which were coming to the fore – factors that could cause difficulty in terms of uncertainty of programme, etc. The decision was this was the optimum."*²⁵⁴

WG has amply demonstrated a rigorous process with regard to use of SSSI land for the Glan Llyn junction.

407. As Mrs Jacob agreed,²⁵⁵ promoting a road scheme is a complicated business. S.28G – and the environmental duties contained in it and Part 1 of the EWA 2016 – are flexible enough to enable public bodies, be they promoters or decision makers, to reach judgments in the public interest about complex matters. Prolonged testing of WG's approach by NRW, inside and outside the inquiry, has helped to shape this Scheme and the steps to further conservation and enhancement of SSSI features.

408. So far, this review of the evidence has focused on route selection and embedded mitigation by design. It is also very important to consider the additional mitigation measures proposed in respect of SSSI landtake and operational impacts.

²⁵⁴ Re-examination (ME QC)

²⁵⁵ Cross-examination (ME QC)

409. Before turning to the detail of the SSSI mitigation strategy, it is right to recall that, by the end of the inquiry, there was a substantial measure of agreement with NRW about effects on SSSI and natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems generally. The SSSI SOCG of May 2017 between WG and NRW records the following matters:

- (i) Landtake on the SSSIs is accurately described and assessed in the ES;
- (ii) the replacement of infilled and culverted reens and ditches is to take place at an agreed ratio of approximately 1:1;
- (iii) the SSSI mitigation strategy (now agreed in its draft form²⁵⁶, taking account of NRW's comments, as anticipated in the SoCg²⁵⁷) provides for mitigation at three sites. Two of these (Maerdy Farm and Tatton Farm) are within SSSIs. The third (Caldicot Moor) is on the Gwent Levels but outside any SSSI, though adjacent to the Magor and Undy SSSI. In each case, arable land would be converted to permanent grassland, existing grassland would be enhanced for biodiversity and former ditches which have been infilled would be reinstated. It is also agreed that the areas of land are appropriate in the light of the predicted impacts of the Scheme on the Gwent Levels SSSIs and essential mitigation. The latter point is important in terms of demonstrating need to justify compulsory acquisition of some of the land (at Caldicot Moor). As Dr Ireland

²⁵⁶ Deliberately not in its final form, it needs to be checked against all the more recent draft mitigation strategies (dormouse, bats, protected species) to ensure that all the mitigation strategies are integrated as per Commitment 212.

²⁵⁷

explained, the other areas were chosen because, as well as having the necessary potential to fulfil mitigation needs, they are already in WG ownership; WG thus observed its obligations to use a CPO as a last resort and chose land which could start to be prepared early, maximising its mitigatory effect;

- (iv) Having regard to the SSSI mitigation and enhancement proposals would commence in advance of construction and that improvements in the ecological interest of the grasslands would be expected to be manifest within a few years, the significance of the land take impact would be reduced from Moderate or Large in the short term to Slight or Moderate in the medium to long term;
- (v) As a result of the small extent of construction land within the SSSIs, the agreed SSSI mitigation strategy and the ability for land severed by the Motorway to continue to be managed as grazing marsh alongside the road, construction and operation effects would be of slight or moderate significance in the medium term and of slight significance in the long term;
- (vi) Having regard to severance effects in some areas and the ability for continued management as grazing marsh, operational effects would be of slight significance.

410. Ms Poole confirmed²⁵⁸ in her oral evidence that she was satisfied that there would not be indirect effects on the Rumney and Peterstone SSSI, the Magor and Undy SSSI, the Newport Wetlands SSSI or the Magor Marsh

²⁵⁸ Jess Poole evidence in chief. See also RW's Closing ID

SSSI. She was able to reach this conclusion because of NRW's acceptance that WG's road drainage proposals would be appropriate in terms of water quality and quantity. She agreed in cross examination that this removed one of NRW's four issues with regard to SSSI impact.

411. One might be forgiven for feeling some surprise at these matters of agreement given the exaggerated claims made in some quarters about the effect of the Scheme on the Levels. It is understandable that members of the public will not be au fait with all the scientific detail, but their contributions to the inquiry must be considered in the context of these carefully considered expressions of agreement with basic and important conclusions of the ES on SSSI effects. The inspectors should give them very great weight when considering the ecological evidence of other parties and when carrying out the balancing exercise between SSSI impacts and the benefits of the Scheme. One particularly important example arises from Agreement Points (v) and (vi). Prof Sir John Lawton and GWT generally raised objections in strong terms on the basis of severance. We deal below with the weight to be given to written evidence of this type and it is significant, in our submission, that NRW, having carefully considered the Buildability Report, Mr Richard Graham's evidence on water quality, the EMPs and all the other evidence showing how connectivity of reens and ditches and retention of grazing marsh in active use would be achieved, as well as the biodiversity benefits of the SSSI mitigation areas, reached the conclusion that impacts on severance would be slight in the medium / long term.

412. It is impossible to overstate the importance of WG's proposals for road drainage, safe handling / re-use of contaminated materials and maintenance of water quality and quantity across the Levels. Many objectors, not having got up to speed with the detail (some of which is highly technical), assumed that these matters would not have been properly addressed and would not be properly managed²⁵⁹. The fact that NRW / the Internal Drainage District ("IDD") are satisfied with the robustness of the designs and proposals, including monitoring and funding Commitments, is of great evidential significance in terms of considering both NRW's residual objections and other objections based, in whole or in part, upon SSSI impacts.

Water quality

413. Much of the ecological interest and value of the Gwent Levels derives from the system of reens and ditches. The value and sensitivity of the aquatic environment has informed the design of the drainage for the Scheme. Richard Graham gave evidence on these matters on three occasions. On 9 May 2017 he answered questions from Mr Pickup, who has a detailed knowledge of the Gwent Levels and the water environment, and on 25 May 2017 Mr Graham and Mr Jon Davies were cross examined by GWT's Mr Byrne. Mr Graham's evidence was impressive. Mr Pickup's concerns were largely addressed by Mr Graham's oral evidence and the content of his

²⁵⁹ OBJ0270 Gwent Wildlife Trust including Neil Ward, Lindi Rich, James Byrne, David Boyce, Geoff Liles; OBJ0077 A. R. Pickup; OBJ0266 Louise Davies, OBJ0154 Laurence Lowe, OBJ0203 Ann Picton MBE

- rebuttal. Mr Vaughan, who dealt with flooding, explained why Mr Pickup's favoured means of draining run off via the main rivers was not practicable.
414. The drainage system consists of a treatment train with four stages – grass lined channels, a pollution lagoon, an attenuation lagoon or sediment pond and finally a reed bed. While none of these stages is and of itself unique or innovative the combination of all four stages in one drainage system is unprecedented. The scale of attenuation is also remarkable. Mr Graham explained that many grass lined channels or swales are in the region of 10 to 20 metres. The lengths in this case are very much greater and the gradients very flat which means that pollutants will spend much longer in the grass lined channels thereby greatly enhancing the chances of the pollutants being removed or degraded whilst in the channels.
415. WG and NRW have reached complete agreement in respect of drainage and water quality – ID 53. In terms of the baseline:
- “2.2.4 Baseline monitoring indicates that with respect to determinands likely to be released by road runoff (i.e. dissolved and suspended metals, hydrocarbons and salt), concentrations in the Gwent Levels are low to very low and well within safe levels.*
- 2.2.5 There were undesirable concentrations of nutrients and other signs of nutrient pressures, but these are not likely to be affected by road runoff”*
416. There will be a heightened risk to water quality during the construction period but that can be managed – SoCG 2.3.
417. The drainage system which has been designed is an exemplar:

“2.5.2 The large, multi-method design of the proposed Scheme drainage Water Treatment Areas (WTAs) represent a much higher standard of treatment than comparable road schemes in Wales and would treat run off from the motorway to higher standards than is usually required for trunk roads. This is necessary given that all of the Scheme water discharged by WTAs flows into the SSSIs and the sensitivity of the Gwent Levels SSSIs to water quality impacts”

418. The methodology employed for designing the treatment of run-off and assessing its likely efficacy – HAWRAT – is the best available, SoCG 2.5.9. But due to uncertainty relating to HAWRAT’s limitations “a number of precautionary assumptions have been made in relation to flow and treatment train performance” - SoCG 2.5.10.
419. Appropriate commitments have been made on the Register of Environmental Commitments relating to monitoring, taking remedial action and maintaining the different legs of the treatment train – SoCG 2.5.14, 2.5.15, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3.
420. With regard to protection of the Gwent Levels from potential spills on the new section of motorway, the proposed drainage system provides a high initial storage volume within the nearly flat and impervious grass lined channels in addition to a penstock controllable pollution control lagoon at every WTA. This provides opportunities to retard and capture potential major spills on the carriageway and prevent release of such spills to reens - SoCG 2.5.12.
421. To ensure longer term functionality of the drainage system and to further protect the Gwent Levels from potential declining performance as a consequence of silt build up, a WTA maintenance schedule has been

proposed in keeping with DMRB standards. This maintenance programme, coupled with a comprehensive monitoring regime at every proposed WTA discharge for a minimum of five years, will provide a robust body of evidence on the compliance status of the drainage system with NRW water quality criteria for the SSSIs. In this way, any adverse deviations from expected performance can be identified, investigated and corrected for in a timely manner - SoCG 2.5.14-15.

422. It is also agreed that the settlement lagoons and the reedbed systems have potential biodiversity benefits and commitments are included to promote these benefits and to guard against colonization by invasive species – SoCG 2.5.16. Both Mr Graham and Mr Jon Davies observed that the Tata lagoons had become a haven for wildlife and that the level of pollutant in those water bodies was significantly greater than the pollution which will be present in the settlements lagoons and reedbeds serving the Scheme.

423. The water within the reens and ditches are not in good condition. This, however, is due to elevated levels of nutrients. Road run-off will not contain nutrients and the levels of pollutants likely to be released by road runoff in the Gwent levels are low or very low and well within the safe levels. Allied to the very high level of treatment provided we submit that water quality will be preserved in this sensitive and valuable environment.

424. NRW's remaining issues were:

- extent of loss, which has been addressed above and in respect of which the steps taken to mitigate, both through the three mitigation areas and reen/ditch replacement must be taken into account;

- connectivity/design of the proposed reen and ditch network and inequality of mitigation across SSSIs; and
- security of long term funding for management of reens, ditches and the mitigation areas.

425. The long term funding issue has now been resolved to NRW's satisfaction by means of Commitments 195, 196 and 197, which provide for funding of extra management functions incurred as a result of the Scheme and for complying with the Environmental Commitments. Resolution of this point is highly significant because it means that the inspectors can approach their assessment of the effects of the Scheme upon the SSSIs and biodiversity generally on the basis that mitigation measures will be properly funded in perpetuity. Where NRW would be involved in that work, they will be reimbursed for any extra costs occasioned by the M4CaN. This important fact should be borne in mind when evaluating NRW's (and others') remaining SSSI points about the effectiveness of mitigation.

426. The Nationally Designated Sites SOCG sets out the position with regard to reen and ditch design as at 17 May 2017, but Ms Poole updated and clarified matters in her oral evidence. She stated that, in her opinion, WG had done everything possible and that "*the proposals are the best they could possibly be*". Given the s.28G duty to take "*reasonable steps*," this statement is highly significant. Ms Poole said this because, in response to NRW's PIQ's and the Appendix to her proof, WG had confirmed that reens and ditches could be designed in an ecologically sensitive way, with

sinuous routes, variable widths, berms and grazing areas on banks.²⁶⁰ All of these features would support biodiversity by allowing for variation and different micro-habitats to be available. Ms Poole expressed NRW's satisfaction with the proposed construction method, which would maintain connectivity and involve the transfer of organic material from old to new reens. She was also pleased with WG's commitment to monitoring and where necessary, remedial action.²⁶¹ NRW's only remaining concerns at the stage when she gave evidence related to the time that it might take to support SSSI features, inequality of provision across different SSSIs and the mechanics of WG's funding commitment.

427. As we have seen, the funding question is now resolved.

428. The timescale point was related, in part, to the timing for construction works. Ms Poole said that her concern was that if works were done during the summer, algal bloom was likely to form, which would compete with species of interest in terms of SSSI features/biodiversity. Dr Ireland explained that the movement of material from old to new reens would "*give a headstart to establish vegetation*". Whilst that would not totally prevent algal bloom, it would inhibit its development. In the event of real problems, there are natural remedial measures available. The three year construction and five year aftercare periods for monitoring would be useful in this respect. Whilst WG could not make a commitment to avoid summer working, because of the need to maintain the construction programme, the situation could be monitored and, where necessary, addressed.

²⁶⁰ See PIQ /94 amplified by Dr Ireland in chief

²⁶¹ See Commitments 62 and 130, which are acceptable to NRW.

429. Dr Ireland was able to confirm that works could/would start on the mitigation strategy at Tatton Farm early.
430. In conclusion, NRW substantially recognised that the mitigation measures proposed were appropriate and feasible. Their remaining point on timing was fully answered by Dr Ireland whose detailed evidence should be preferred to the generalised complaint. Mr Jon Davies stated, on several occasions during the inquiry,²⁶² his belief that, given time, the proposed SSSI mitigation areas, including their restored reens and ditches, would make a substantial contribution to biodiversity and that Caldicot Moor would develop in such a way as to justify SSSI status in due course; he likened WG's vision for the three mitigation areas to the Magor Marsh reserve, where one can see the benefits of the Levels landscape where it is managed for nature conservation, rather than commercial agriculture.
431. Unlike NRW, GWT and other objectors²⁶³ have, apparently, disregarded or downplayed WG's well conceived mitigation proposals. But they have been unable to demonstrate that Mr Jon Davies' assessment is false. He has repeatedly explained, in chief and under cross examination, that the mitigation tasks and methods in issue are not unduly complex or risky. He pointed to Magor Marsh as local proof, as well as published studies from other parts of the country with similar habitats and ecosystems²⁶⁴. GWT called no live witnesses to substantiate their repeated general critiques of

²⁶² Eg. in response to GWT's Invertebrates and Water vole objections and when presenting evidence on Ecosystems Services

²⁶³ See eg. summary of GWT's position in Mr Byrne's Supplemental Written Statement presented in ID/217 (pp.7-9). Also Mr Byrne's and Prof Sir John Lawton's "Statements of Evidence" dated February 2017

²⁶⁴ See response by Jon Davies op. cit. pp.8-9 and Responses to James Byrne WG/REB/OBJo270.16 pp.12-20 and Appx A- Norfolk, Somerset, Oxon, Powys and to Prof Sir John Lawton WG/REB/OBJo270.12 – GWT/Lawton

the WG team's work – and critiques is what they were, not independent surveys or assessments. The inquiry cannot know, therefore, how much Prof Sir John Lawton, Prof Maltby or, indeed, Mr Byrne had actually read in relation to WG's proposals, let alone form an understanding of the detailed basis – if any – for their generalised criticisms. Mr Jon Davies, on the other hand, was prepared to be cross examined, showing himself to be an experienced, responsible, knowledgeable and visionary ecologist whose evidence should be afforded great weight. He was ably supported by Dr Ireland with his vast experience of the environmental design, assessment and management of road schemes. Part of the point of a public inquiry is to enable evidence to be rigorously tested. In WG's case, this was done, repeatedly. No fundamental flaws in the approach to mitigation were discovered and full weight should be given to the proposals, both as mitigation and as a legacy of enhancements in a number of areas.

432. Turning to NRW's quantitative issue, Ms Poole acknowledged that NRW's concern about inequality of reprovision was raised late in the day. She clearly did not regard it as a strong point. WG originally proposed to replace reens and ditches at a ratio of 2.76 for reens and 1.26 for ditches. NRW/IDD were concerned that this overprovision would, potentially, make it difficult to maintain sufficient depth of water across the Levels and responded that the ratio should simply be 1:1. This advice was given early in the process of Key Stage 3 design, before the Scheme and associated Orders and ES were made or published. No quantitative issue was raised in NRW's comprehensive letter of May 2016. In September 2016, Ms Poole realised that reprovision would be greater in the Wentlooge Levels

than in the Caldicot Levels and therefore unequal as between individual SSSIs. This was discussed with WG at that time and the team responded with a proposal to restore Ellen's Reen in the Nash and Goldcliffe SSSI, to the south of Tata Steel, which Ms Poole acknowledged went some way to addressing the point. Taking this addition into account, the resultant figures are:

The total replacement reen length is 2826m (from RMS) + 610m (from Ellen Reen diversion) = 3436m

The total field ditch loss is 9373m (from RMS) + 610m (converted to reen for Ellen Reen diversion) = 9983m loss

The total replacement field ditch does not change from RMS = 10594m

433. Against this background, Ms Poole voiced NRW's concern somewhat tentatively in her oral evidence and readily acknowledged, then and in writing, that the subdivision of the Levels into a number of different SSSIs was, in part, for administrative convenience at the notification stage. Nevertheless, there are subtle differences between them and the concern is to maintain biodiversity across each. Dr Ireland further responded to the residual concern with the suggestion that existing ditches could be cleaned out and widened to facilitate reen characteristics and managed to enhance their biodiversity. The point here is that, whilst reens are managed by NRW wearing their IDD hat, ditches are not under their management, being, instead, the responsibility of their owners. This, indeed is part of the reason for the SSSIs being in unfavourable condition, as noted above. Dr Ireland's proposal would address the concern about providing adequate mitigation for the impacts to biodiversity in the Caldicot SSSIs whilst not leading to

- difficulties with regard to drainage management. Possibly because of Ms Poole's indisposition, Dr Ireland's idea, to which she was receptive at the inquiry, was not taken any further by NRW. No further light was shed on the concern in NRW's Closing. In the absence of any coherent ecological explanation, this cannot be treated as an objection of real significance.
434. To conclude on NRW's case in relation to SSSI impacts/s.28G WCA 1981, their remaining concerns are limited. These concerns must be assessed in the context of law and guidance and weighed against the need for and benefits of the Scheme, as they recognised in evidence and in closing.
435. NRW's objection on scale of loss proceeded on an inaccurate premise with regard to Glan Llyn junction, which was the only example which was advanced. WG has given a full explanation of its efforts to minimise landtake, having regard to the proper exercise of its functions as Highways Authority and Government concerned to promote the nation's economy. Coupled with Ms Poole's satisfaction that the re-en design and monitoring proposals are the best they could be, in NRW's agreement, it is clear that the statutory duties have been discharged by WG and that the Inspectors and WMs should approach their own assessments on this basis. The law does not require an absence of impact or total certainty or immediacy of full mitigation. Reasonable steps have been taken and are proposed for the future to further the conservation and enhancement of SSSI features and to promote the resilience of ecosystems, in each case, consistent with the proper exercise of WG's functions.
436. Many other objectors have claimed that WG is in breach of s.28G, sections 6 and 7 EWA 2016 and s.4 NERC 2006. Here again, the effect of the law

has been overstated, for reasons set out in detail above. Species-specific objections are considered in the next section.

Environment (Wales) Act 2016, Specific Species and Habitats

437. The purpose of Part 1 of the Act is “to promote sustainable management of natural resources”, the latter being defined to include “animals, plants and other organisms; air, water and soil, minerals; geological features and processes; physiographical features; and climatic features and processes”.²⁶⁵

438. S.3 provides:

“Sustainable management of natural resources

(1) In this Part, “sustainable management of natural resources” means—

(a) using natural resources in a way and at a rate that promotes achievement of the objective in subsection (2),

(b) taking other action that promotes achievement of that objective, and

(c) not taking action that hinders achievement of that objective.

(2) The objective is to maintain and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and the benefits they provide and, in so doing—

(a) meet the needs of present generations of people without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, and

(b) contribute to the achievement of the well-being goals in section 4 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (anaw 2).”

²⁶⁵ SS.1 and 2 Environment (Wales) Act 2016

439. S.4 sets out the “principles of sustainable management of natural resources” as follows:

“In this Part, the “principles of sustainable management of natural resources” are—

- (a) manage adaptively, by planning, monitoring, reviewing and, where appropriate, changing action;*
- (b) consider the appropriate spatial scale for action;*
- (c) promote and engage in collaboration and co-operation;*
- (d) make appropriate arrangements for public participation in decision-making;*
- (e) take account of all relevant evidence and gather evidence in respect of uncertainties;*
- (f) take account of the benefits and intrinsic value of natural resources and ecosystems;*
- (g) take account of the short, medium and long term consequences of actions;*
- (h) take action to prevent significant damage to ecosystems;*
- (i) take account of the resilience of ecosystems, in particular the following aspects—*
 - (i) diversity between and within ecosystems;*
 - (ii) the connections between and within ecosystems;*
 - (iii) the scale of ecosystems;*
 - (iv) the condition of ecosystems (including their structure and functioning);*
 - (v) the adaptability of ecosystems.”*

440. Section 6 imposes duties on WG, the WMs and the Inspectors²⁶⁶ in respect of biodiversity and eco-systems. It provides as follows (so far as relevant):

“(1) A public authority must seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity in the exercise of functions in relation to Wales, and in so doing promote the resilience of ecosystems, so far as consistent with the proper exercise of those functions.

(2) In complying with subsection (1), a public authority must take account of the resilience of ecosystems, in particular the following aspects—

(a) diversity between and within ecosystems;

(b) the connections between and within ecosystems;

(c) the scale of ecosystems;

(d) the condition of ecosystems (including their structure and functioning);

(e) the adaptability of ecosystems.

...

(4) In complying with subsection (1)—

(a) the Welsh Ministers, the First Minister for Wales, the Counsel General to the Welsh Government, a Minister of the Crown and a government department must have regard to the United Nations Environmental Programme Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992, and

(b) any other public authority must have regard to any guidance given to it by the Welsh Ministers.

(5) In complying with subsection (1), a public authority other than a Minister of the

²⁶⁶ As persons holding office under the Crown upon relevant terms: s.6(9)(f)

Crown or government department must have regard to—

- (a) the list published under section 7;*
- (b) the state of natural resources report published under section 8;*
- (c) any area statement published under section 11 for an area that includes all or part of an area in relation to which the authority exercises functions.*

...

(9) In this section—

“Minister of the Crown” (“Gweinidog y Goron”) has the same meaning as in the Ministers of the Crown Act 1975 (c. 26);

“public authority” (“awdurdod cyhoeddus”) means—

- (a) the Welsh Ministers;*
- (b) the First Minister for Wales;*
- (c) the Counsel General to the Welsh Government;*
- (d) a Minister of the Crown;*
- (e) a public body (including a government department, a local authority, a local planning authority and a strategic planning panel);*
- (f) a person holding an office—*
 - (i) under the Crown,*
 - (ii) created or continued in existence by a public general Act of the National Assembly for Wales or of Parliament, or*
 - (iii) the remuneration in respect of which is paid out of money provided by the National Assembly for Wales or Parliament;*
- (g) a statutory undertaker.”*

441. The references in s.6 to the report under section 8 is to the State of the Natural Resources Report (“SoNR). This Report was addressed in WG response to the Final Response of RSPB.

442. The first thing to note about s.6(1) is that it does not create an absolute duty; the authority is to seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity in the

exercise of its functions and promote the resilience of ecosystems “*so far as consistent with the proper exercise of those functions*”. Subsection (2) is framed in terms of taking certain matters into account, rather than setting out any statutory weighting. Of course, these duties must be discharged in the context of the S.1 purpose, but none of these provisions requires either a total absence of harm on the one hand or enhancement on the other. Indeed, the scope of natural resources and the principles of sustainable management are so broad that it is impossible to conceive of any major infrastructure project which could achieve positives across all of them.

443. The statutory sustainable management of natural resources concept is expressly linked to meeting the needs of present and future generations of people and contributing to the achievement of the FGA’s well-being goals.

444. Account is to be taken of the condition of ecosystems and, logically, this will form a starting point. Although the line of the new road passes through SSSIs and designated historic landscape, it also traverses urban areas and produces indirect impacts upon other areas, specifically the corridor of the existing M4. As set out above, the SSSIs are in unfavourable condition. The suggestions by RSPB²⁶⁷ and GWT²⁶⁸ that one should assume favourable condition as the base-line for assessment are not founded in law or guidance and are plainly illogical and unscientific. Proper assessment, design and mitigation must respond to the situation on the ground and the inspectors/Ministers cannot proceed on the basis of an assumed reality which does not exist. Whilst the effects of the new road would be negative in the short term, mitigation in line with principles of

²⁶⁷ ID220

²⁶⁸ See e.g. James Byrne on Ecosystems Services Assessment ID217 paras 54 and 55

- sustainable management of natural resources would reduce many effects to slight or, at the most, moderate significance in the long term. These are effects which are agreed with NRW and were assessed in the ES on a precautionary basis.
445. Mr Jon Davies said²⁶⁹ that, in his opinion the s.4 principles of sustainable management permit consideration of short, medium and long term consequences of actions. There is no doubt that WG is seeking to maintain and enhance biodiversity as it exercises its functions.
446. Turning to consider “*natural resources*” in the broad statutory sense, the net effects of the Scheme on air quality are positive. With mitigation, water quality and quantity in the SSSIs would be maintained. In some cases, they would be enhanced because currently unmanaged ditches would be brought under management and the SSSI mitigation areas would offer opportunities to restore lost reens and ditches and manage grazing marsh to improve biodiversity, replacing the current, unhelpful agricultural regimes on that land. Elsewhere, contaminated soils would be treated and utilised wherever possible in road construction, thus sustainably removing contamination and avoiding use of other imported and natural materials.
447. Climate features and processes have been taken fully into account, as explained above. After 2025, M4 CaN would make no difference in respect of tidal flooding potential. In the short period between implementation and 2025 at the latest, there would be different effects. On balance, they would be marginally better with than without M4 CaN. In these respects, the statutory purpose would be served.

²⁶⁹ Cross examined by Mr Byrne

448. Animals, plants and other organisms in general fall within the definition of “*natural resources*” and thus within the statutory purpose. Clearly they also form the subject matter of the s.6 biodiversity/ecosystems duty.

449. S.7 EWA 2016 provides as follows:

7 Biodiversity lists and duty to take steps to maintain and enhance biodiversity

(1) The Welsh Ministers must prepare and publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat which in their opinion are of principal importance for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in relation to Wales.

(2) Before publishing a list under this section the Welsh Ministers must consult the Natural Resources Body for Wales (“NRW”) as to the living organisms or types of habitat to be included in the list.

(3) Without prejudice to section 6, the Welsh Ministers must—

(a) take all reasonable steps to maintain and enhance the living organisms and types of habitat included in any list published under this section, and

(b) encourage others to take such steps.

(4) The Welsh Ministers must, in consultation with NRW—

(a) keep under review any list published by them under this section,

(b) make such revisions of any such list as appear to them appropriate, and

(c) publish any list so revised as soon as is reasonably practicable after revising it.

(5) In exercising their functions under this section, the Welsh Ministers must apply the principles of sustainable management of natural resources.

450. Clearly, there are connections between sections 6 and 7. The legislation recognises this by imposing the duty in s.7(3), “without prejudice to s.6”.
451. By s.6(5), the Inspectors, additionally, are to have regard to the s.7 list and the SoNR.
452. Both sections, however, are qualified. The s.6(1) is a duty to “seek” to maintain and enhance biodiversity, “so far as consistent with the proper exercise of ... [its].. functions.” The s.7 duty is to take “all reasonable steps”. These statutory qualifications are important. They mean that causing a negative effect to biodiversity or to a s.7 species or habitat is not, in itself, a breach of statute. What the law requires is consideration of the protected elements and a conscientious effort, taking all reasonable steps, to seek to maintain and enhance them while exercising the functions of, in this case, the national Government and Highways Authority.
453. For reasons set out above, it is clear that these duties have been discharged with regard to the Levels SSSI ecosystems.
454. A particular feature of the evidence before the inquiry has been the comprehensive, systematic assessment of the effects of the Scheme upon ecosystems. The ESA was undertaken in response to a number of objections made by GWT and CPRW. Whilst it is not a requirement of statute or Weltag to carry out such an exercise, the ESA was undertaken and reported to the Inquiry to assist the Inspectors in evaluating the Scheme’s effects upon ecosystems and the services they provide. This

piece of work can assist in assessing claims by objectors that the Scheme conflicts with the FGA 2015 and EWA 2016 and/or that WG has not complied with its duties under that legislation. In particular, as set out above, s.3(2) EWA 2016 defines the central statutory concept of “*sustainable management of natural resources*” in terms of promotion to achievement of the objective “*to maintain and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and the benefits they provide ...*”, in line with the sustainable development principle. S.4 EWA 2016, in setting out the “*principles of sustainable management of natural resources*” includes: “*take account of the benefits and intrinsic value of natural resources and ecosystems*”; “*take account of the resilience of ecosystems ...*” (emphasis added); and many other principles involving the use or collation of evidence and taking account of short medium and long term consequences of actions.

455. The ESA stands alongside the long established assessment tools and processes comprised in EIA, SIAA and Weltag, as well as the professional evidence of expert witnesses. By considering net impacts and values over a 100 year period, the ESA contributes to the assessment of long term consequences in a robust way.

456. It is important to bear in mind, when considering the ESA and the criticisms levelled at it by GWT, that such an assessment is not a requirement of statute, policy or practice. It is quite a new appraisal technique and there is no set methodology. The ESA for M4CaN comprises both a quantitative, monetised assessment, where feasible, and a qualitative assessment. All agreed that it is not possible to place a monetary value on all the elements

- in question. That is why the ESA must be considered in parallel with the other environmental and economic assessments referred to above.
457. The ESA identifies and describes the services provided by the four ecosystem habitat types that would be affected by the scheme – the Gwent Levels SSSIs, farmland and woodland outside the SSSI and Brownfield land within Newport Docks and Tata Steelworks. Then it assesses the change in provision with the scheme.
458. The ESA shows that the total area of land within the SSSIs affected by the Scheme would be 212.31 ha; this includes 76.4 ha at Tatton and Maerdy Farms, two of the three SSSI Mitigation Areas, plus a further 30.21 ha for mitigation planting. The actual permanent loss would be the 85.66 ha within the footprint of the new section of motorway. The total area provided in mitigation, including land reinstated, enhanced and provided as SSSI mitigation, would amount to 169.6 ha. There would hence be a net increase of 41.87 ha of land performing SSSI functions.
459. In the Farmland habitat outside the SSSIs, 257.16 ha would be affected, which includes 55.24 ha at Caldicot Moor, the third SSSI Mitigation Area. Whilst all the land temporarily affected would be restored to its previous use, 139.6 ha of arable and other farmland would be lost due to the land take for the Scheme (82.74 ha) and mitigation planting (56.86 ha); those areas of arable and improved grassland due to be ‘de-intensified’ (such as Caldicot Moor) would remain as farmland. The Report points out that should the Scheme proceed there would be a net loss in ecosystem services associated with food production. However, there would be benefits

to biodiversity from the species-rich grassland and woodland provided in the landscaped areas and the Caldicot Moor SSSI Mitigation Area; 26.1 ha of additional species-rich grassland would be created. Other benefits would include food for insects on the species-rich grassland; improved water quality through reduction in pesticides and fertiliser; and benefits to human health and well-being through increased access to woodland areas.

460. In the Woodland habitat outside the SSSIs, 56.99 ha would be affected. The main adverse impacts would be the loss of a relatively small area of 1.04 ha of ancient woodland at Berryhill Farm and the time lag to recreate woodland habitat. There would also be an impact on soil and some decrease in carbon sequestration. However, this would be offset in the longer term by the replacement of woodland at a rate of 2:1; the actual loss would be 49.35 ha with 119.73 ha provided, including shelter belts, scrub and replanted woodland. Replacement woodland would provide greater opportunities for outdoor recreation and education. Clearly ancient woodland cannot be replaced but the amount lost would be small and the amount of replacement woodland and the management proposals at Coed Mawr would in the longer term benefit biodiversity.

461. With regard to the fourth habitat type, Brownfield land, 168.52 ha would be affected. The main adverse impact would be loss of biodiversity since these areas are of nature conservation value due to the presence of invertebrates, reptiles and birds; there would be a net loss of 63.17 ha. There would also be a minor loss of heritage value due to the demolition of industrial buildings at Newport Docks. These impacts would be balanced to

an extent by the provision of species-rich grassland, which would exceed the loss of flower-rich habitat, and by the slight improvement in human health following the remediation of contaminated land, especially at Tata Steel.²⁷⁰

462. Monetising existing and projected services where possible, the ESA estimates the value of ecosystems services lost at just over £6.02m (discounted and capitalised over a 100 year period) and, on the same basis, estimates total benefits to be provided by mitigation areas at £7.73m. The same monetary values were applied for losses and benefits, therefore the net change is independent of the monetary values used. These figures were also put forward with a proper degree of caution, unlike Mr Byrne's £67m figure for the entire Gwent Levels which was unexplained. Whilst the resultant net figure of £1.71m over 100 years would make no difference if applied to the BCR, this exercise in quantitative and qualitative appraisal usefully demonstrates that the M4CaN project, taken in the round, is not the environmental disaster which GWT and certain other objectors have claimed, rather, it will, over time, make positive contributions to ecosystems services. The findings of the ESA should also be taken into account also when considering the FGC's representations and her latest evidence to Senedd on the application of the FGA 2015.

463. GWT's Prof Maltby and Mr Byrne made a number of detailed criticisms of methodology, but did not conduct their own assessment or come up with alternative, transparently justified monetary figures. Prof Maltby was not called to give evidence and Mr Byrne, though present at the relevant

²⁷⁰ WG 1.23.7 paragraphs 3.60 – 3.62

inquiry session, elected not to give evidence. Counsel's cross-examination point comparing Prof Maltby's expertise with that of Mr Jon Davies was therefore somewhat hollow. Mr Davies did make himself available for cross-examination and was not flawed on any point. His evidence, for all these reasons, should be given more weight than GWT's. As he made clear, he had worked on the ESA alongside members of his company who are qualified and experienced in environmental economics and, specifically, the evaluation of ecosystem services.

464. GWT's late retorts²⁷¹ to Mr Jon Davies' oral evidence should also be treated with caution for all the reasons stated above. Moreover, read carefully, it is clear that they are contingent or caveated: specifically, Prof Maltby states, (not having heard Mr Jon Davies give evidence) that he "*stands by*" his opinion that the use of benefits transfer "may" be "quite" unsafe. Neither he nor Prof Morris responds to Mr Jon Davies' evidence of being unable to find any project ESA which does anything else. The highest Prof Morris is prepared to put the point is that:

"a judgment needs to be made whether the potential impacts of road development through the Gwent Levels are such that a site specific assessment is deemed appropriate."

465. The M4CaN ESA team has made that judgment. Mr Jon Davies was cross-examined on it and amply justified the approach. Prof Morris does not hazard his own opinion, unsurprisingly, since he clearly has nothing like Mr Davies' understanding of the Scheme, only just having been asked to

²⁷¹ GWT comments on WG's Rebuttal of Prof Maltby and James Byrne Evidence, 23.03.18.

comment, without hearing any of the evidence on this or other matters. All the rest of his comments, including those concerning archaeology, are similarly inconclusive.

466. The particular points which appear, from the GWT “*Comments*” document, to be in contention relate to:

- (i) the value of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh – but the “*Comments*” fail to engage with Mr Jon Davies’ evidence to the effect that the ESA took a precautionary approach in two ways: firstly, by valuing all the relevant land as coastal wetlands, which attract a higher monetised value than inland wetlands, notwithstanding that the Gwent Levels are more inland in character; secondly, by attributing the full value to all the SSI areas to be lost, despite the well documented problems caused by modern farming of the grass, meaning that biodiversity value is principally located in the reens and ditches, themselves subject to eutrophication due to the agricultural “*improvements*” to the fields.
- (ii) Ramsar Convention – it is accepted that the Convention applies generally in relation to wetlands including the Gwent Levels; the fundamental issue between the parties on this point is GWT’s refusal to recognise the deliverability or value of WG’s proposed mitigation, a point which has been considered above and which Mr Jon Davies, once more, convincingly dealt with in cross-examination at the ESA session.

Bats

467. As noted above, these are the only species in respect of which NRW have an unresolved objection. It is based on the impacts associated with severance – fragmentation of habitats and increased mortality through collisions, leading to a reduction in bat abundance and species diversity in the vicinity of the Scheme (as summarised in Counsel’s Closing). NRW submitted written evidence, but did not call a witness on this issue. Hence, as Mr Wald added, the case set out in writing “has not narrowed during the course of the inquiry”. This is unfortunate because, as he recognised, WG have provided further information during the inquiry, particularly a Bat Mitigation Strategy (“BMS”), which has, itself, been improved²⁷². We do not rehearse its contents here, but it is a detailed document and should be referred to when considering this review of NRW’s and GWT’s contentions.
468. Notwithstanding the terms of NRW’s original objection,²⁷³ it is now agreed that the ES did conclude that the landtake would have significant effects in the short and medium term, construction would have significant effects in the short and medium term and that there would be long term effects as a result of the operation of the Scheme.²⁷⁴
469. The SOCG further records agreement:

- i. that baseline data is sufficient for the purpose of EIA;

²⁷² Latest version is ID/56a

²⁷³ “unable to agree with the conclusions of the March 2016 ES that adverse effects on the ... bats ... can be avoided.”

²⁷⁴ ID/104, Bats SOCG, p.2, para 1.1.15

- ii. that further bat surveys would be required for a licence application under Part 6 of the 2017 Regulations;
- iii. that the draft BMS²⁷⁵ takes account to NRW's comments and would, informed by further surveys prior to the licence application, support that application;
- iv. there is no objection to the Listed Building application on the basis of bats because adequate mitigation could be provided;
- v. the only licensing requirement for the Scheme and for the listed building would be in respect of bat roosts;
- vi. based on the information provided in the draft BMS, NRW does not hold the view that the grant of a licence in respect of bat roosts would be unlikely;
- vii. all reasonable steps to mitigate effects have been taken;
- viii. because of the need to keep the road low in the landscape and minimise SSSI landtake, not all adverse effects can be prevented and residual severance effects will remain, assessed as being of

²⁷⁵ ID/56

moderate adverse significance in the long term, during operation.

470. Pausing there, it is clear that the inspectors can advise Ministers that there is agreement about survey effort, assessment of impacts and that all reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate impacts. All that remains in issue with NRW is their judgment that the significance of residual impacts properly founds an objection to the Scheme. Because no bat witness was called, it was impossible to explore this issue of judgment and weighting.
471. In the light of ss.6 and 7 EWA 2016, the admission that all reasonable mitigation measures have been taken is highly significant. If the inspectors accept WG's case on need and the absence of reasonable alternatives, then impacts upon bats are inevitable. It was clear from Ms Poole's answers to general cross-examination questions about balancing different considerations that NRW had not attempted to do this. They have not challenged the need for the road and, in respect of bats, as with all other European protected species, would deal with a licence application on the basis of the inspectors' and Welsh Ministers' findings on overriding public interest ("IROPI") should the Scheme be confirmed.
472. GWT's Closing Submissions go to great lengths to demonstrate, with regard to bats (as with other species and habitats) that WG witnesses did not claim 100% certainty with regard to mitigation proposals. The claimed cross-examination victories on these points were not the achievements they were painted to be, because none of the GWT ecologists, including Mr Green, has claimed such a potential success rate. (As a generality, GWT's summary of the evidence should be treated cautiously; for example, in

some instances, the proposition put by counsel or Mr Byrne to a witness is given, rather than the actual answer.) For reasons set out above and in Annex 3, that does not mean, however, that mitigation should be disregarded. Moreover, as well as GWT's interpretation of the law relating to European species licensing is wrong for the reasons detailed in Annex 3, the attempt in Closing to extend that principle to species which are protected in domestic legislation alone is one misconception further and was not the basis of Mr Streeten's legal submissions made at the Bats session. His point is based on European caselaw on the Directive underlying the 2017 Regulations. He did not attempt to extend the point to the other species / topics with which he dealt (water vole, invertebrates and general SSSI cross examination). The Closing elides his European point by apparently drawing it into general submissions about mitigation.

473. Returning to bats, Prof Altringham undertook a critique of WG's proposed mitigation measures and initially sought to argue that such measures should be disregarded on the basis of the Waddenzee²⁷⁶ case unless there could be 100% confidence at the licensing stage that mitigation measures would be effective to ensure no adverse impacts on bats at all, and, in particular, that level of confidence in their ability to use the proposed culverts.

474. The conventional approach, adopted and confirmed by NRW as their position in the Bats SOCG, is that they would only require a licence in respect of disturbance of bat roosts/breeding sites,²⁷⁷ and not in relation to impacts from land take and operational effects; this is important because of

²⁷⁶ C-127/02

²⁷⁷ As Mr Green explained, this would comprise 8 buildings and 6 trees which have been revealed by the surveys to contain roosts.

the admitted effects from the latter two causes, not all of which can be mitigated, as the ES and Mr Green's evidence accepted. On the other hand, as we shall see, Mr Green has full confidence in the tried and tested methods of mitigation for roost disturbance. (That is not to say that he lacks confidence in the culverts, but he accepted that there is some uncertainty about their effectiveness and therefore adopted a precautionary assumption about them and associated mitigation measures, such as landscaping).

475. Under cross-examination, Prof Altringham downgraded his required standard of confidence from absolute certainty to "*the balance of probabilities, based on and informed by evidence*". He described his contention that the Waddenzee principle, which applies to Appropriate Assessments under Part 3 of the 2017 Regulations, should be extended to cover Protected Species licensing under Part 6 as "*simply his personal opinion*". So GWT's point was not, in fact, supported by its witness.
476. Nevertheless, the Legal Note at Annex 3 to these submissions explores this contention in detail and explains why it is wrong. In short, the Waddenzee principle applies to different functions under the Directive / Regulations, not species licensing. Mr Green stated that, in over 100 licence applications, he has never encountered either NRW or Natural England applying the Waddenzee principle; rather, as set out in the Commission and Natural England's guidance, the approach is to seek a proportionate evidence base, having regard to the particular species and circumstances. The SOCG supports WG's position, because NRW there state that licensing would be limited to roosts and they do not claim that

such an application would be determined on the Waddenzee standard of proof.

477. The scope of the licence matters because it was, apparently, agreed by the Professor that mitigating for roost loss by means of bat boxes and barns is a tried and tested approach. Mr Green's opinion, which was not challenged, was that there would be no adverse effect on favourable conservation status on the basis of roost disturbance because of the proposed re-provision. We say "*apparently*" because Prof Altringham, unlike Mr Green, had no practical experience of applying for licences or implementing mitigation for road schemes. Mr Green was able to point to successful examples of bat mitigation by means of bat barns and culverts on road schemes elsewhere, most locally on the Heads of the Valleys 2 Scheme but also the Porthmadog Bypass.²⁷⁸

478. There was much discussion of Prof Altringham's earlier studies showing a decline in bat activity 1-1.6km either side of the M6 in Cumbria. When considering how much weight to give these, it is important to bear in mind the locational and environmental distinctions. The principal areas of recorded bat activity along the M4CaN route are much closer to human populations and urban activity, including roads, than the M6 in Cumbria. In any event, the discussion perhaps generated more heat than light, because the ES and Mr Green had taken a precautionary approach in their assessment of land take and operational impacts. Despite "*all reasonable steps*"²⁷⁹ having been taken in terms of proposed culverts and associated features, he had not relied on them when assessing impacts. The ES took

²⁷⁸ PID51

²⁷⁹ As agreed with NRW in the SOCG

a precautionary approach, based, amongst other things, on Prof Altringham's work which had not been ignored, as he claimed.²⁸⁰ Although his assessment took this approach, Mr Green was able to draw on his and others' experience to show the ability of such measures to operate well. The Professor was disinclined to rely on anything other than academic research studies, but Mr Green's experiences are also relevant and should be given weight, especially given his extensive practical experience. Moreover, Prof Altringham agreed that, if the Scheme were to go ahead, he would rather that the measures were included and even said that they could add to the body of research in due course.

479. In conclusion, there is no legal impediment to confirmation of the Scheme on the basis of bat impacts. Residual effects should be judged on the basis of all the evidence and weighed in the balance. The licensing regime recognises that, even in the case of relevant disturbances to European protected species, IROPI can justify some interference on the basis of the needs of human society. Here, the need is pressing and WG proposes to take all reasonable steps to mitigate effects upon bats.

Dormouse

480. As noted above, in connection with the licensing of European Protected Species, NRW withdrew their objection to the Scheme on the basis of impacts upon dormouse following extensive work on a draft Mitigation

²⁸⁰ CD 2.3.2 ES p.336, para. 10.9.282; p.337 para 10.9.288

Strategy. The details are to be found in the Dormouse SOCG²⁸¹ and the draft Strategy itself.

481. GWT called no evidence on dormouse, but, following NRW's withdrawal, Mr Byrne sought, and was granted, permission to cross-examine Mr Jon Davies. He concentrated on trying to demonstrate, in spite of NRW's exhaustive process of scrutiny, that the Strategy would not work. Mr Davies made it clear – as, indeed, is evident from the history of this matter set out in the agreed documents – that NRW had required a high level of confidence, having regard to the high level of legal protection which the dormouse enjoys and its conservation status. Not only had WG and NRW addressed themselves to the maintenance test in Reg.55 of the 2017 Regulations, but they had also worked with the aim of enhancement, pursuant to Part 1 of EWA 2016. Although dormouse is a European Protected species, GWT's Closing argues for an excessively rigid approach to mitigation, for reasons set out in Annex 3. Having said that, WG's draft Mitigation Strategy, viewed objectively, gives a very high level of confidence that favourable conservation status would be maintained.

482. In response to Mr Byrne's general point about the effect of roads on wildlife,²⁸² Mr Davies was not "*dismissive*", as GWT's Closing dramatically suggests, rather, he pointed to the manifest evidence that the relevant population is already living within 5kms of the existing M4; he had survey evidence, as opposed to a generalised academic paper, to back up what he said – i.e. better evidence. Bridge Crossings were not considered necessary by him or NRW because of the populations either side of the

²⁸¹ ID154.

²⁸² Moreno-Mateos – GWT Closing p.25 which does not fairly summarise Mr Davies' answers on this point.

road would be greater after all the habitat enhancement work proposed. This new habitat would be created with dormice in mind, unlike the 1970s roadside landscaping which they have, in any event, colonised. Mr Davies pointed to his experience of translocation success on the A2/M2 Scheme – more specific evidence as opposed to generalised academic publications.

483. Mr Davies also confirmed his confidence and optimism with regard to the Coed Mawr proposals. He rated the chance of success at 95%²⁸³ and gave his reasons based on a thorough research of Coed Mawr and his experience elsewhere. He was clear that the effect would be *“to turn Coed Mawr into 90ha of thriving dormouse habitat for expansion of the population.”*

Invertebrates

484. GWT instructed Mr Boyce to produce an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme.²⁸⁴ That is not actually what he did; rather, he produced a critique of the ES and September 2016 ESS and supporting surveys. He was unsure whether he had looked at the appendices to the ES/ESS and had not read the 2015 Desk Study or the Scoping Report, which Mr Jon Davies had agreed with NRW. He had undertaken no surveys or analysis of his own. Critically, given that he was commenting on water, as well as land-based invertebrates, he said that he had made no assumptions on water quality. Apparently he had “raised concerns” with GWT about this, but was quite unclear about the basis of his critique; however, he accepted in cross-

²⁸³ GWT’s Closing (p.29, headline point) completely misstates the evidence actually given. No bridge is proposed and tunnels are not relied on for mitigation because WG and NRW agree that they are not required. Mr Davies had high confidence levels in the Mitigation Strategy.

²⁸⁴ Cross examination (ME QC)

examination that, if the inspectors agreed with WG and NRW about water quality, that would “take care of lots of his concerns about aquatic invertebrates”. This collection of points must reduce the weight to give to this witness’s evidence, in addition to the facts that NRW:

- i. scoped WG’s work;
- ii. take no point on survey effort;
- iii. take no point with regard to the conclusions of the ES and do not object on the basis of invertebrates;
- iv. are satisfied that the Scheme design has made proper provision to secure water quality in the reens and ditches.

485. It was agreed that adequacy of survey effort and methodology are matters of professional judgment. Mr Jon Davies (who has particular expertise in invertebrates²⁸⁵) considered the level of effort and consequent attention to invertebrates in the ES to be good. And, as we know, NRW have no concerns in these respects. The details are summarised in WG’s Rebuttals and the base documents are in the ES and ESS.

486. Mr Boyce also disagreed with NRW’s judgment that 1:1 replacement of reens and ditches is the appropriate ratio. (In fact, the SSSI mitigation areas do offer the opportunity for a little more).

487. The ES assumes that all reens and ditches are capable of supporting the full assemblage of SSSI features. Mr Boyce accepted that this was a generous assumption, in view of the evidence of unfavourable condition. His own surveys of the Levels were referred to in the ES and factored into

²⁸⁵ He explained his role in working on the latest CIEEM guidance

judgments, surveys which, he said at the time, were somewhat disappointing for SSSIs. Therefore there was absolutely no basis for criticising the EIA or suggesting that it was based on inadequate information.

488. Whilst Mr Boyce's main attack was on survey effort, he also made some points about mitigation. His main concern was the alleged lack of information. Whilst recognising that mitigation had been put forward, especially by means of flower rich meadows in the SSSI mitigation areas, which would be of value to shrill carder bee, he criticised lack of detail and lack of mitigation for severance. Buglife and RSPB make similar points. Clearly there would be some severance but Mr Boyce agreed²⁸⁶:

- i. that some bees would successfully cross the road;
- ii. that there would be less need to cross with mitigation in place at the three SSSI mitigation sites and on the southern embankments of the new road; and
- iii. that land to the south would be unaffected, while much of the SSSI land to the north was either already developed or would be occupied by SSSI mitigation land.

489. WG has made a commitment²⁸⁷ to produce a Bumblebee Mitigation and Protection Plan in consultation with the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and RSPB. WG's response to RSPB's final submission explains the proposal to work up detail for this Plan which was submitted in draft by those bodies.

²⁸⁶ In cross examination (ME QC) and (c) in answer to Inspector Wadrup.
²⁸⁷ Commitment 213

Monitoring, which was a specific point raised by Mr Boyce, will be scoped and agreed ahead of the survey season. WG has confirmed its willingness to do further surveys.

490. Contrary to the submissions of Buglife²⁸⁸ and GWT in their Closing, it is not the case that EWA 2016 or FGA 2015 requires full mitigation for every impact upon biodiversity or listed species.

Birds

491. Wintering and breeding birds are the subject of a SOCG between WG and NRW.²⁸⁹ Baseline data are agreed to be sufficient for EIA purposes and the ES assessment is agreed.

492. Since drafting that SOCG, matters have moved on by reason of the publication and consideration by NRW of ESS5 (August 2017) and Addendum to the SIAA. They responded by letters dated 26 September 2017,²⁹⁰ 6 December²⁹¹ and 19th March 2017.²⁹² The latter letters concern otters, but it is quite clear that NRW have no objection to the Scheme or the proposed Docks Works on EIA, SIAA or species licensing grounds.

493. RSPB has made a number of written representations. WG's responses are also listed:

RSPB Written Submissions 7.02.2017 –	Rebuttal	WG/REB/OBJ0030-RSPB (September 2017)
---	----------	---

RSPB/GWT " <i>Legal</i> " Letter to Ken Skates 26.05.2017 ²⁹³ -	Legal	Submissions	above	on
---	-------	-------------	-------	----

²⁸⁸ ID/126
²⁸⁹ ID/105 Protected Species SOCG p.6
²⁹⁰ ID/130
²⁹¹ ID/164
²⁹² ID/236
²⁹³ ID/088

interpretation of FGA 2015 and EWA 2016. WG's interpretation and application of the legislation has also been the subject of evidence from Mr Jon Davies MBE in his original and final proofs,²⁹⁴ which he has delivered publicly and upon which he has been cross-examined, including on behalf of GWT, with whom RSPB wrote their letter to the Minister.

Letter from Director RSPB Cymru to Ken Skates 31.08.2017²⁹⁵ -

Draft Bird Protection and Mitigation Plan ("BPMP")²⁹⁶ and Commitment 193 presented to the inquiry on 27th March 2018 in the presence of RSPB representatives, who had the chance to put questions.

– ID/243 - Modifications to proposed orders to provide a new breeding and rearing area for a pair of canes.

Final Submission for RSPB, 20.03.2018 -

WG Response. RSPB submission OBJ 0030-ID/250

²⁹⁴ WG 1.23.1 and 1.23.7

²⁹⁵ ID/111

²⁹⁶ PID/187A

494. Behind this suite of written exchanges, there lies a great deal of engagement between Drs Zisman and Ireland and representatives of RSPB and NRW to develop the draft BPMP. WG acknowledges that this activity has been without prejudice to RSPB's objection to the Scheme and is grateful for their very proper approach. In WG's submission, whilst the Scheme and the Docks Works would have effects upon birds, these are justified by the need for the Scheme and relevant environmental legislative duties have been met by working up a detailed suite of mitigation measures.

495. We shall not rehearse details here, partly because all the material is before the inquiry and Dr Zisman has clarified where necessary. The inquiry has also adopted an appropriately restrained approach to public discussion of cranes. The key points are:

- i. two potential breeding areas are proposed; one ("X") is in NRW ownership and control and can be prepared in advance of works commencing in the vicinity of the current next; the other ("Y") is close to the existing nest area; both areas can be prepared with nesting platforms and "*early days*" foraging areas for newly hatched chicks;
- ii. NRW raise no objection on bird, or specifically, crane grounds;
- iii. Area Y will also be able to provide useful habitat for shrill carder bee and dormouse;
- iv. There is scope for NRW, using its powers under s.16 EWA 2016, to enter into management agreements to manage nearby fields in a condition which would provide habitat for slightly older chicks;

- v. The point which has been raised about the solar farm NSIP proposal is dealt with in WG's final response to RSPB; information has been shared on a confidential basis with the ecologists for that project and effects upon crane will be taken into account in their cumulative assessment; this will, of course, be subject to independent public examination under the Planning Act 2008.

496. Mr Hepworth, on behalf of CPRW, responded to the draft BPMP.²⁹⁷ He pointed out that there is no guarantee that the cranes would relocate as proposed. He also stated that common crane is covered by the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species ("CMS") and an associated Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds ("AEWA").
497. A full response was made to these points in ID / 245. Mr Hepworth simply re-iterated his points in his final response.
498. It is important to recognise that neither the terms of the Convention nor the Agreement impose absolute obligations. WG reject the suggestion that it would be unlawful to confirm the Scheme on its current line. As Mr John Davies MBE explains, the principle of proportionality, which the Convention espouses, entails looking at matters in the round. In this case, there are good reasons, including environmental ones, for using developed, brownfield land in preference to greenfield land, albeit within the SSSI. Moreover, WG has gone to great lengths, in collaboration with NRW and RSPB, to provide alternative areas of habitat. These are secured through

²⁹⁷ PID 245. Addendum to Further Evidence submitted by CPRW to the M4 Public Inquiry, 1.03.2018.

the relevant Side Road and CPO Modifications²⁹⁸ and Commitments 138, 193, 204, 205, 114. The response is proportionate to the Convention/Agreement obligations and the duties in EWA 2016.

499. Gwent Ornithological Society (“GOS”) objected in writing on general grounds. They raised a supplementary point on 27.02.2018,²⁹⁹ concerning the effects of rooftop nesting on lesser blacked back gulls and herring gulls. WG responded in writing³⁰⁰ explaining how the surveys referred to by GOS were consistent with and corroborated those of WG. In compliance with duties under Part 1 EWA 2016, nesting needs would be taken into account when designing Docks buildings for prior approval. Both NCC (as a local authority) and APP (as a statutory undertaker) are under these duties.

Otters

500. The starting points are the Protected Species and the internationally Designated Sites SOCGs.³⁰¹ NRW agree with WG that the baseline survey data is sufficient for EIA and SIAA purposes. The latter document specifically records the precautionary approach adopted to the question of whether otters associated with the R. Usk SAC could utilise a limited part of Gwent Levels that would be affected by the Scheme. Having regard to the small number of such otters, NRW agree that adverse effects on the integrity of the River Usk SAC with respect to European otter features are not predicted to occur as a result of the construction or operation of the Scheme.³⁰²³⁰³ This SOCG was signed on 23.03.2018. They also indicate

²⁹⁸ To which all relevant parties consent: ID/243

²⁹⁹ WG-REB – OBJ0297

³⁰⁰ ID211 and ID211 Rev A

³⁰¹ ID/105

³⁰² ID/251

that there is no evidence to suggest that a Habitats Regulation licence would be necessary. They have never required preparation of a mitigation plan.

501. NRW have also carefully considered ESS5 (August 2017) and accompanying SIAA. These relate to proposed works in the Docks. Initially³⁰⁴ NRW indicated a likely holding objection in relation to Otter. Following discussions about the process, they confirmed by letter dated 18.03.2018 that they were not raising a holding objection. In this letter they explained that, since no requirement for a licence had been identified, NRW's primary role would relate to European Sites and they were satisfied, therefore, that appropriate mechanisms would be in place to ensure the integrity of the SAC.

502. It is important to note the dates of the International Sites SOCG and Docks correspondence given the nature of GWT's objection in relation to otter. Because of NRW's stance, GWT had to mount an attack on their conclusions with regard to adequacy of baseline information and scientific certainty regarding the lack of effect of the Scheme upon the integrity of the SAC. NRW will have been aware of their evidence, which was provided in writing and orally by Mr Liles. Notwithstanding his views, NRW confirmed their position in the recently signed International Sites SOCG and, after very careful consideration, also in relation to the Docks. GWT, via the written submissions of Lindi Rich,³⁰⁵ reiterated Mr Liles' points about survey effort and lack of information to inform a mitigation strategy / lack of a strategy.

³⁰³ para 2.1.25

³⁰⁴ PID 164

³⁰⁵ PID 236

503. Adequacy / methods of survey are, as Mr Liles agreed, matters of professional judgment. Despite much criticism of the WG team, the fact is that NRW have reviewed the work and are satisfied with it. GWT had not commissioned him to undertake any surveys and he was unable to point to evidence of any active sites – whether breeding or resting sites. Mr Jon Davies considered that this absence was due to the relative unsuitability of the Levels for such purposes, as opposed to the wealth of habitat further north in the River Usk SAC. Subsequent survey of the Docks produced no such evidence either, hence NRW’s opinion that Habitats Regulation licensing would be unnecessary.
504. WG’s assessments have, however, assumed, on a precautionary basis, that the whole of the route would be in use by otters travelling through the area. The EMPs include otter fencing along the route and culverts beneath it. Mr Davies – and NRW – consider this adequate mitigation for now and, at detailed design stage, a mitigation strategy will be prepared. Mr Liles regarded precise positioning of culverts as critical, but said in cross-examination that he was not suggesting that the road should not go ahead. This was an important answer and one which was, of course, conveniently forgotten in GWT’s Closing, which does seek this result, on the basis of Otter interests along with many others.
505. Mr Liles’ SIAA point was supported by a document prepared by research students at Cardiff University. This report was submitted just before the hearing date, although dated earlier. In the circumstances, WG provided a considered response in writing.³⁰⁶ That response comprehensively rebuts

³⁰⁶ ID/106

the adequacy and relevance of the Cardiff Study. In particular, it should be noted that Mr Liles stated in cross-examination that the authors had not been given any information concerning mitigation for the Scheme. This was obviously a fundamental omission since his case rested on an assertion that mitigation was inadequate.

Water Vole (“WV”)

- 505A. WV is dealt with in the Protected Species SOCG between WG and NRW.³⁰⁷ Baseline data and assessment of effects are agreed. Commitment 140 deals with a proposed WV Mitigation Strategy, to be informed by further surveys. NRW are satisfied that their requirements can be met in the Strategy. Subject to the Strategy being fully implemented, NRW are satisfied that there should be no adverse effects on the species.
- 505B. GWT led no evidence on WV. Nevertheless, as with Dormouse, they were permitted to cross-examine Mr Jonathan Davies on his proof.³⁰⁸ Mr Streeten’s questions sought to establish that WG’s survey effort had been insufficient to found its assessment of effects or Mitigation Strategy.
- 505C. Mr Davies justified WG’s position very clearly. The population was surveyed 500m either side of the route and assessed as being of County value. The ecology team had a good and sufficient idea of where the animals were likely to be and would take proper account of them in re-en mitigation and ditch creation in the SSSI mitigation areas. Contrary to the

³⁰⁷ ID/105

³⁰⁸ WG 1.19.1 Sections 3.1, 4.1, 5.2

suggestion in GWT's Closing, Mr Davies did not say that he was relying on lengthy culverts as mitigation. Genetic exchange would, in his view, occur and fragmentation was not an issue. GWT had no evidence to rebut his opinions or, indeed, those of NRW. Here again, the Closing seeks to impose a higher standard of mitigation than the law requires.

CONCLUSION

506. No doubt to the relief of many, we have come to the end. Despite the length of this speech we have not tried to cover every point. We rely upon the detailed and careful evidence of the WG project team in its entirety. We have, however, tried to cover all of the fundamental issues and controversies so as to assist the inspectors, as best we can, in the task which confronts them.

507. We were informed during the course of this Inquiry that human beings dislike cognitive effort and like to rely upon rules of thumb to guide their actions. Avoidance of cognitive effort is not a luxury open to those in government, nor to those charged with presiding over public local inquiries. Some who have attended this inquiry have fallen into the trap of relying on rules of thumb rather than examining the detail of what is proposed. That new roads lead to more carbon emissions is, by and large, a reliable rule of thumb. But it doesn't hold true in this case. That new roads lead to new traffic which re-introduces congestion and causes noise, air quality and carbon impacts can also be true in certain circumstances. It is for that reason that government guidance mandates that significant roads should

be modelled so as to take account of induced traffic and so that noise, air quality and carbon impacts can be ascertained. That has been done in this case, showing that the Scheme will not be self-defeating, will not have unacceptable environmental impacts and will become carbon neutral.

508. There is a consensus that the status quo is not sustainable, a recognition that the recurrent congestion and incidents which blight the M4 around Newport is also a blight on the economy of Wales and the aspirations of her people. All conceivable alternatives were assessed during the M4 CEM process. The conclusion reached was that there was no solution without creating additional road capacity. That capacity has to be adequate for the long term and has to provide good value for money. The Blue Route, which is the only comprehensive alternative to the Scheme, fails miserably on both counts. It may retain support amongst those who have not ascertained the true factual position or objectively considered the evidence. But it has comprehensively failed to survive the attention and scrutiny which it has properly received within the Inquiry. WG is committed to public transport and active travel. But those alone cannot meet the demand for long distance travel along this corridor. The commitment to public transport and active travel is not simply legislative; Metro is being implemented and the choice between Metro and the Scheme posited by some objectors is a false choice. Wales needs both.

509. WG does not pretend, of course, that building a new road across a valuable and sensitive landscape does not have its disadvantages; there would be admitted negative environmental impacts. But this is not the whole environmental story and it should not obscure what has been achieved by

collaborative and sustainable ways of working. Given the constraints and sensitivities of the locality, environmentalists have been involved in design from the outset and with some innovative thinking have shown that it is possible to create environmental benefits and gains. WG have worked collaboratively with other bodies. The Design Commission for Wales have reviewed and praised the design of the road. Collaborative working has identified a way of salvaging the listed building. Ecological mitigation has been devised in discussion with NRW, the People's Trust for Endangered Species and RSPB. The team have talked to individuals whose land would be affected by the Scheme to identify ways of reducing impacts, solving problems. The real advantages of the mitigation measures incorporated into the scheme should not be dismissed by reference to rules of thumb.

510. Cyfeiliornus yw'r portread o'r Cynllun hwn fel un anghynladwy. Mae gan y Cynllun lawer i'w gynnig i Gymru o ran yr economi, diwylliant, yr amgylchedd a materion cymdeithasol. Ffordd yw hon sy'n abl i gysylltu prif ddinasoedd, rhwydwaith gyfoes i ddatrys problemau'r presennol ac i liniaru ar flynyddoedd mawr o rwystredigaeth yn sgil tagfeydd y twneli Bryn Glas.
511. Yn amlwg mae angen ffordd newydd ar Gymru i oresgyn y problemau dybryd sy'n llethu'r rhwydwaith o gwmpas Casnewydd. Y Cynllun hwn yw'r opsiwn gorau. Gofynnwn i chi i'w gymeradwyo i Weinidogion Cymru. Rydym hefyd yn gwahodd Mr McCooey i argymhell i Weinidogion Cymru y dylid rhoi caniatad adeilad rhwystredig ar gyfer ficerdy Magwyr.
512. It is simply not true to characterise the Scheme as unsustainable. It has so much to offer the nation in its economic, social, cultural and environmental life – a resilient road fit to connect capital cities, smart twenty first century

infrastructure to solve the environmental problems, frustrations and dangers caused by years of “patch and mend”, at last, an artery freed from the tourniquet of the Bryn Glas tunnels.

513. It is clear that Wales needs a new road to address the problems on the M4 around Newport and this Scheme is the best option. We invite the inspectors to commend it to the Welsh Ministers. We also invite Mr McCooey to recommend the Welsh Ministers to grant LBC in respect of Magor Vicarage.

MORAG ELLIS QC
EMYR JONES

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0001</u>		David Layton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Traffic • Alternatives 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Peter Ireland WG 1.7 Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.31-22.32)
<u>OBJ0002</u>		Dr Anthony Owen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 13.5 & 22.27) Stephen Bussell WG 1.3. Nicholas Rowson WG 1.8 (Paragraph 3.14.5) Michael Bull WG 1.12 Philip Evans WG 1.14
<u>OBJ0003</u>	Statutory	Jeff Neale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality • Land use 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.59-8.62) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2-10.5 & 10.8-10.11)
<u>OBJ0004</u>		Monmouth County Councillor / Linda Guppy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Design • Landscape • Noise and Vibration 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 Stephen Bussell WG 1.3 Barry Woodman WG 1.6 Nicholas Rawson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.5-5.5.10) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Mick Rawlings, 1.9.1
<u>OBJ0005</u>		Emma Caresimo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Air quality • Alternatives • Economics 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Paragraph 22.27) Michael Bull WG 1.12 Keith Jones WG 1.18 Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8)
<u>OBJ0006</u>		Steven Wernham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Heritage • Traffic • Economics 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Paragraph 22.37-22.38) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Mick Rawlings WG 1.9 (Paragraphs 7.42 - 7.50)
<u>OBJ0007</u>		Amy Rackham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0008</u>		A P Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Alternatives • Carbon • Traffic • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Stephen Bussell WG 1.3 Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Tim Chapman WG 1.13 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.31-22.32 and 22.27) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0009</u>		Matthew Sutton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community & Recreations • Traffic • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1 Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Ben Sibert WG 1.5 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)
<u>OBJ0010</u>		Allan McBain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 9.6.1-9.6.8)
<u>OBJ0011</u>		Anna Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community & Recreation 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (paragraph 10.12) Rebuttal WG/REB/OBJ0099 - PJ Cromwell
<u>OBJ0012</u>		University of South Wales Madeleine Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Environment • Carbon • Cultural Heritage 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Peter Ireland WG 1.7 John Davies WG 1.23.1 (paragrapgh 49-55) Mick Rawlings WG 1.9.1 (Chapter 7)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0013		Verity and Julian Branscombe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature conservation • Environment and Carbon • Alternatives • Sustainable Development • Cultural Heritage 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.78-5.89) John Davies WG 1.23.1 (paragraph 49-55) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18 & 22.33-22.36) Mick Rawlings WG 1.9.1 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0014		Tom Bond	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Development • Alternatives 		John Davies WG 1.23 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
OBJ0015		Hazel White	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality • Noise & Vibration • Economics 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.13-10.20) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 5-5.5) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5)
OBJ0016		Jeremy Gass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature conservation • Carbon • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7 Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3.2-3.6) Stephen Bussell WG 1.3.1 (paragraph 4.61) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 and paragraph 22.27) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0017		Peter Harris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics 		Stephen Bussell WG 1.3 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26, 22.27)
OBJ0018		Patricia Sheehan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Environment • Carbon • Sustainable Development • Alternatives • Economics 		Keith Jones WG1.18 Stephen Bussell WG 1.3 Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 Peter Ireland WG 1.7 John Davies WG 1.23.1 (paragraph 49-55) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Tim Chapman WG 1.13.1 (Paragraphs 5.1-5.1.3) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0019	Statutory	W&M McDonald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0020</u>		David James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Environment, Ecology and nature conservation • Flood Consequences assessment, Water quality • Economics • Traffic • Environment • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1</p> <p>Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Chapter 5)</p> <p>Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.5-5.14)</p> <p>Nicholas Rawson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3 & 5.5-5.5.10)</p>
<u>OBJ0021</u>		Mark Heathfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community and Recreation 		<p>Julia Tindale WG1.10.1</p> <p>Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (Document 2.3.2)</p>
<u>OBJ0022</u>		Howard & Elizabeth Wainwright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and Vibration • Environment • Design • Air Quality • Environment • Noise & Vibration • Construction • Traffic • Air quality 		<p>Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 7.1)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.8)</p> <p>Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2, 10.6-10.7 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19)</p> <p>Nicholas Rawson WG 1.8.1 (Paragraphs 5.7-5.7.8)</p>
<u>OBJ0023</u>		o-Dzin Tridral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0023</u>		o-Dzin Tridral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0024</u>		Dave and Marilyn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation • Carbon • Ecology - wildlife • Ecology - Water Voles • Cultural Heritage • Consultation • Sustainable Development 		<p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 22.33-22.36 & Chapter 13)</p> <p>Stephen Bussel WG 1.3</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0025</u>	Statutory	Network Rail Stephen Sprei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0026</u>	Statutory	Road Chef Simon Turl, Chief Executive, RoadChef	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Economics Design Environment 		WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Simon Turl WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mke Axon - by Dr P Ireland WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mike Axon - by Bryan Whittaker WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BWo Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 Bwo Erratum Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 JD Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Planning WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 MJ Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Decision Making and Policy WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Supplementary Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BS Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Engineering PIQ/123 ID/078 ID/091 ID/094 (Statement of Common Ground)
<u>OBJ0027</u>		Gerrard Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Environment, Ecology and nature Design Port Economics, Shipping Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 and 19) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.6 Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ0028</u>		Dr Graham Small	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and Vibration Air Quality Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0029</u>		Wildlife Trust Wales Wildlife Trust Wales Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Sustainable development Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0247 ID/217 ID/218 ID/219 ID/220

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0030</u>		RSPB Cymru The RSPB Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable Development 		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB ID/250
<u>OBJ0031</u>	Statutory	Associated British Ports Matthew Kennerley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Economics • Shipping • Design • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	PIQ/042 PIQ/045 PIQ/050 PIQ/056 PIQ/074 PIQ/080 PIQ/116 ID/070 ID/188 ID/189 ID/196 ID/228 ID/239
<u>OBJ0032</u>		Andrea Jackman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (paragraph 22.27)
<u>OBJ0033</u>		The Woodland Trust The Woodland Trust Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Nature and conservation 		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ0034</u>		PJ Brannigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and Vibration • Air Quality • Alternatives • Environment 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Rebuttal WG-REB-OBJ0150 - Magor and Undy Community Council
<u>OBJ0035</u>		Dick Finch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Water quality • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0036</u>		Wildlife Trust Wales campaign letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology • Sustainable development • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0037</u>		Susan Danziger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 Chapter 5 and (Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Nicholas Rawson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0038</u>		removed Wildlife Trust Wales campain letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0039</u>		Pam Webb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0040</u>		Huw Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0041</u>		Caroline Wynn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0042</u>		J Harding Morris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Carbon 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7 Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5,6) John Davies WG 1.23 (paragrapgh 49-55)
<u>OBJ0043</u>		Brian & Susan Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Air Quality • Ecology and nature conservation 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30) Keith Jones WG1.18
<u>OBJ0044</u>		Helene Jessop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Air Quality • Ecology & Nature Conservation • Sustainable Development 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.18 & 22.28-22.30) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0045		Nicola Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Economics • Environment • Alternatives • Environment • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Noise and Vibration • Air Quality 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0046		Margaret Pobjoy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1
OBJ0047	Statutory	LDH Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	
OBJ0048	Statutory	Lyndon Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community and Recreation 	Withdrawn	
OBJ0049	Statutory	Parc Golf Club TG Hicks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community and Recreation 		WG/REB/OBJ0049 - Parc Golf Club
OBJ0050		IS Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable Development 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
OBJ0051		Lindsay Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
OBJ0052		Residents of Common y Coed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Sustainable development • Cultural Heritage • Traffic • Economics 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.13-10.24) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13, Paragraph 22.27) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Mick Rawlings, 1.9.1

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0053</u>		EJ Boardmore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and Vibration Landscape Design 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Nicholas Rowson WG1.8.1 (paragraph 5.5.-5.5.10) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (paragraph 4.21 and 4.41-4.45)
<u>OBJ0054</u>		Elizabeth Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
<u>OBJ0055</u>		David Austin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology & Nature Conservation Environment 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7 Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7))
<u>OBJ0056</u>		Nick Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0057</u>		Lin Ashcroft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Ecology and Nature Conservation 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11) Keith Jones WG 1.18 Jon Davies WG 1.19 Richard Green 1.20 Simon Zisman 1.21
<u>OBJ0058</u>		Donal McCarthy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology & Nature Conservation Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)
<u>OBJ0059</u>		Daniel Webb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology & Nature Conservation General 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16, 4.11 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.31-22.32 & 22.42-22.44)
<u>OBJ0060</u>		Pat Jones Jenkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and Nature Conservation Sustainable development Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0061</u>		Chris Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and Nature Conservation Noise and Vibration, Environment Water Quality Alternatives Traffic 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0062		Alison Stroud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
OBJ0063		Mary Watkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)
OBJ0064		Mary Pearce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and Vibration, Environment • Traffic • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Water Quality • Alternatives 		Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0065		Angharad Beurle-Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 & Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0066		Rich Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18)
OBJ0067		Wendy Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 Simon Zisman 1.21 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0068	Statutory	IAC Systems Peter Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Alternatives • Design 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 and Chapter 23) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.13-5.16)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0069</u>		Wildlife Trust Wales Ruth Loebel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Traffic • Sustainable Development 		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0070</u>		Max Hastings-Herbert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable Development 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18)
<u>OBJ0071</u>	Statutory	The Newport Harbour Commissioners J Lloyd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP ID/235
<u>OBJ0072</u>		Arthur G Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		Refer to OBJ0238 Newland Rennie
<u>OBJ0073</u>		Caerphilly CBC Terry Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives <p>Now supporter 24/01/17</p>	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0074		Alison Willott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Carbon • Traffic • Land Use, Community and Recreations • Sustainable Development • Environment 		<p>Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraphs 11.23-11.25)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9) and paragraphs 8.5-8.14</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11, 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Tim Chapman WG 1.13.1 (Paragraphs 5.1-5.1.3)</p> <p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)</p> <p>Julia Tindale WG1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.117)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>Document 2.5.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
OBJ0075		John Staton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology & Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		<p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
OBJ0076		Thomas J Wheeler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Ecology & Nature Conservation 		<p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18</p>
OBJ0077		A R Pickup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Quality 		WG/REB/OBJ0077 - Mr A Pickup ID/052
OBJ0078		Mrs J Pickup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and Vibration • Air Quality • Economics • Environment 		WG/REB/OBJ0078 - Llandeenny Residents ID/075
OBJ0079		Gareth Walters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use, Community and Recreation • Traffic • Design 		<p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Julie Tindale WG 1.10.1</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0080</u>		Adrian Deere-Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Land use 		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 4.124-4.127)
<u>OBJ0081</u>		Cardiff and Vale Public Health Team Chris Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Economics • Alternatives 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.12-10.20 & 8.10-8.11) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26)
<u>OBJ0082</u>		Ceri Crossland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)
<u>OBJ0083</u>		Rose Reveral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Flood consequences assessment • Cultural heritage • Alternatives • Flooding 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5) Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.78-5.89) Mick Rawlings 1.9.1 (Paragraph 6.39 & 7.42 - 7.51) Document 4.7.2 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0084</u>		Christopher Hatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)
<u>OBJ0085</u>		Ruth Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0086		Allan Cowhig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0087		Wales Green Party candidate of Newport East Peter Varley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Water quality • Environment 		Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Peter Ireland 1.7.1 Mr Bryan Whittaker 1.2.6 (Paragraphs 10.3.7 - 10.3.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 22.28-22.30 & Chapter 9) PIQ/078 PIQ/165
OBJ0088		RSPB Cymru Katie-jo Luxton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation 		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0089		Robert Hughes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3)
OBJ0090	Statutory	Vodafone Rob Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.42-10.43 & 9.9)
OBJ0091		Peter Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Air Quality • Cultural heritage • Ecology and Nature Conservation 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.32)
OBJ0092		Dr Catherine Linstrum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Traffic • Environment • Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ0092 - Dr Catherine Linstrum PIQ/087 ID/059

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0093		Dr Steve Palmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon and Sustainable Development • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Cultural heritage • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
OBJ0094		Caroline Syred	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Economics • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0095	Statutory	Port Security Authority Ian Meredith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipping 		WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP PIQ/012 PIQ/032 PIQ/039
OBJ0096		Ann Kenny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Traffic • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19 & 10.13-10.20) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 5-5.5) Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and 13 and Paragraphs 22.27-22.30) PIQ/072 PIQ/073 PIQ/085
OBJ0097	Statutory	Tarmac & Cambrian Stone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0098</u>	Statutory	Carlsberg Supply Company UK Limited David Bodily Head of Property, Facilities & Security Carlsberg Supply Company UK Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0099</u>		Paul J Cromwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Economics 		WG/REB/OBJ0099 - PJ Cromwell WG/REB/OBJ0099 - Erratum to Rebuttal PIQ/058 PIQ/060 ID/038 (Statement of Common Ground)
<u>OBJ0100</u>		Jill Rossiter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ0101</u>		Barbara Willis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0102</u>		Margaret Durkin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Traffic • Sustainable Development • Air Quality • Noise and Vibration • Alternatives • Water quality 		<p>Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraphs 11.23-11.25) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0103</u>	Statutory	Bovis Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	WG/REB/OBJ0103 - Bovis Homes ID/050
<u>OBJ0104</u>		Gareth Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0105</u>		Mal Jenkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Landscape • Traffic • Alternatives 		<p>Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0106		Gwent Wildlife Trust Lindi K Rich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Air Quality • Noise and Vibration • Cultural Heritage 		WG/REB/OBJ0270.13 - Lindi Rich WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0107		Dru Brooke Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Consultation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 11.11-11.16) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 Chapter 3 and 23 Document 4.7.2
OBJ0108		Carole Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Economics 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland 1.7.1 Chapter 8 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)
OBJ0109		Chris Kirby-Lambert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Ecology and nature conservation • Carbon • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0110		Keith Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0111</u>		Thomas Simcock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Noise and Vibration • Traffic • Environment • Cultural heritage • Water quality • Sustainable Development • Alternatives • Landscape 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9)</p> <p>Nicholas Rowson WG 1.8.1 (Paragraphs 5.7-5.7.8)</p>
<u>OBJ0112</u>		Mike Worthington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipping • Design • Air Quality • Noise and Vibration • Landscape • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		<p>Jonathan Vine WG 1.22.1 (Paragraphs 8.1.1-8.1.8)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p>
<u>OBJ0113se</u>		Chrissi Perry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Traffic. • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11)</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)</p>
<u>OBJ0114</u>		Gareth Ham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Landscape 		<p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.3-5.3.5)</p>
<u>OBJ0115</u>		Maggie Hampton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Environment 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p>
<u>OBJ0116</u>		Sandra Alexander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Environment • Alternatives 		<p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0117</u>		Jenny Cripps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Economics • Alternatives 		<p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0118		Liz Worthington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 and Paragraph 3.18-20) Keith Jones WG1.18 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0119		Lynne Topman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Air quality • Noise and Vibration • Landscape • Water quality • Alternatives 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Phillip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0120		DHB Accountants Limited Daw Bray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 	withdrawn	
OBJ0121		Sue Collingbourne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives. 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9)
OBJ0122		Lyndon Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8)
OBJ0123		Sandra Dowrick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Air quality • Noise and Vibration • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.3-5.3.5) Phillip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Michael Bull, WG 1.12.1
OBJ0124		Ruth Dow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Alternatives 	withdrawn	
OBJ0125		Friends of the Earth Cymru Gareth Clubb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Water Quality • Air Quality • Noise and Vibration • Carbon • Economics • Sustainable Development 		WG/REB/OBJ0125 - Friends of the Earth - Gerald Kells ID/073 WG/REB/OBJ0247 ID/200 WG/REB/OBJ0125-3
OBJ0126		Thomas Timbul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & Vibration • Ecology and nature conservation • Shipping, Port economics • Air Quality • Alternatives 		Phillip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0127</u>		Hugo Perks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)
<u>OBJ0128</u>		Barbara Spence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Environment 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18
<u>OBJ0129</u>		Judy Hanny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives Sustainable Development 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 22.28-22.30 & Chapter 9)
<u>OBJ0130</u>		Alison James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 Dr Peter Ireland 1.7.1
<u>OBJ0131</u>		Peter Warren	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Environment Air quality Noise and vibration Traffic 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Michael Bull 1.12
<u>OBJ0132</u>		Mike Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human rights Environment Alternatives Noise and vibration Ecology and nature conservation Culture and heritage 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30) Keith Jones WG1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11) Mick Rawlings 1.8.1 (Chapters 6, 7 & 8) Phillip Evans 1.14.1 Peter Ireland 1.7.1

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0133		Gavin Bray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1
OBJ0134		Natalie Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Cultural heritage • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Economics • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.33-22.36) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8) Documents 4.1 - 4.7
OBJ0135		R B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Alternatives 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)
OBJ0136		Mike Erskine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Sustainable Development 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0137	Statutory	Cargo Services (UK) Ltd John Davey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Development 	Withdrawn	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.26-5.29) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.62-10.64) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.15-10.16)
OBJ0138		Andrea Hennessey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1
OBJ0139		Carla Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Design • Air quality • Landscape 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Paragraph 9.1) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.3-5.3.5) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)
OBJ0140		Sue Emlyn Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Economics 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 & 13) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0141		Barbara Dwyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Sustainable Development • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0142</u>		Vivien Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Design • Sustainable Development • Ecology and nature conservation • Carbon • Consultation 		<p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11)</p> <p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0143</u>		Meyrick Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1
<u>OBJ0144</u>		Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales Newport and Valleys Branch Vic Warren	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural heritage • Environment • Carbon • Ecology and nature conservation • Traffic • Economics 		<p>WG/REB/OBJ0144-2 - Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Victor Warren)</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0144-1 - Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Peter Ogden)</p> <p>ID/213</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0144-4 CPRW</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0144-3</p> <p>ID/245</p> <p>ID/249</p>
<u>OBJ0145</u>	Statutory	Mr John Watts-Baker & Mr Peter Watts-Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		<p>Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraphs 4.46-4.58)</p> <p>Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.4-8.9)</p> <p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.30-5.32)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.17)</p> <p>Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5)</p>
<u>OBJ0146</u>		Isla Holland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson WG 1.8.1 (Paragraphs 5.7-5.7.8)
<u>OBJ0147</u>		TU Agencies Noel Challenger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipping, Port economics • Economics • Port economics • Alternatives 		<p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 and 23)</p> <p>Stephen Bussel WG 1.3.1 (Paragraph 6.14)</p> <p>Andrew Meaney WG 1.4.1</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0147</p>
<u>OBJ0148</u>	Statutory	Railway Paths Ltd Howard Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Land Use, Community & Recreation • Traffic • Alternatives 		<p>Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.116)</p> <p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.33-5.36)</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0149</u>		Dianne & David Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Flood consequences assessment • Flooding • Alternatives • Traffic • Economics 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 4.46-4.58) Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0150</u>		County Councillor Frances Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Noise • Air quality • Sustainable development • Economics • Alternatives • Consultation • Traffic • Flood consequences assessment • Ecology and nature conservation • Land Use, Community & Recreations • Design • Environment 		WG/REB/OBJ0150 - Magor and Undy Community Council WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0151</u>		Robert Hayes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Noise and vibration, • Air quality • Economics • Environment • Land Use, Community & Recreation • Traffic • Alternatives • Consultation 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0152	Statutory	S E Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Cultural heritage • Construction • Traffic • Air quality • Economics 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.13-10.24) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13) Mick Rawlings, 1.9.1
OBJ0153		Mark Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Air quality • Noise & vibration • Traffic • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0154		Laurence Lowe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Economics • Sustainable Development • Ecology and nature conservation • Consultation 		WG/REB/OBJ0154 - Laurence Lowe PIQ/044 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0155		April Wiggins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
OBJ0156		Charlotte Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)
OBJ0157		Ian Cummings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 	withdrawn	
OBJ0158		David & Stella Collard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable development • Ecology - Otters • Land Use, Community and recreation 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0159		Dr Ingo Schuder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0160		Nicola Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & Vibration • Air Quality • Environment 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)
OBJ0161		Kieron Huston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Cultural heritage • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0162		Dr William Picton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Economics • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18
OBJ0163		Amanda Sergeant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Economics • Economics • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapters 9, 13 & paragraphs 22.19-22.26)
OBJ0164		Gareth Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Economics • Alternatives • Landscape 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.27) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0165		John Butler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Noise and Vibration • Sustainable development • Traffic 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18)
OBJ0166		David Brassey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Peter Ireland WG1.7 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0167		Iolo Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ0270.17 - Iolo Williams WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0168		Saran Allott Davey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable Development • Alternatives • Economics 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26, Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20) John Davies WG1.23 Stephen Bussell WG1.3 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0169		Gill Saunders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 Document 4.7.2
OBJ0170		Nick Saunders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
OBJ0171		Peter Gardner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
OBJ0172		Christina Gardner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3)
OBJ0173		James Loftus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Traffic • Alternatives • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)
OBJ0174		Anne Warrell & Wayne Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Landscape • Noise & Vibration • Air quality • Alternatives • Economics 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.3-5.3.5) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0175		John Loftus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality, Noise & Vibration • Alternatives • Landscape • Traffic 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)
OBJ0176		Dafydd Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape • Ecology and nature conservation 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0177</u>		Helen Lyndon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Landscape • Environment • Shipping, Port economics • Alternatives 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Documents 4.1 - 4.7
<u>OBJ0178</u>		Ed Drewitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0179</u>		Mike Morris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Traffic • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0180</u>		Marina Branscombe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
<u>OBJ0181</u>		Michelle Cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Ecology and nature conservation • Shipping • Sustainable development • Economics 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & Paragraphs 3.18-20, 22.19-22.26 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0182</u>		Maria Phipps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0183		Caroline Robertson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Noise and Vibration • Air Quality • Water Quality • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraph 11.26-11.30) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0184		Dave Farthing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Sustainable development 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0185		Richard Waller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Cultural heritage • Sustainable development • Carbon • Economics • Alternatives • Flood consequences assessment 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20, and 13 & 22.19-22.26 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36) Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.39- 5.45) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0186		Rhodes Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Ecology and nature conservation • Water Quality • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0187		Carol Gunter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0188		Christine Seabridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Economics • Ecology and nature conservation 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0189		Tracey Lawrence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Shipping, Port economics • Cultural Heritage • Traffic • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)
OBJ0190		Andrea Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
OBJ0191		Alexander Rhodes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Ecology & Nature Conservation • Water quality • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0192		Marje	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Economics • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)
OBJ0193		Mei Gordon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1
OBJ0194		Ruth Lovell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0195		Kate Pearce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Flood consequences assessment • Flooding • Cultural Heritage • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.5-5.14) Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0196</u>		Derek Coldwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Ecology and nature conservation 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8)
<u>OBJ0197</u>		Robin Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Traffic • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)
<u>OBJ0198</u>		Steven Rogers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural heritage • Ecology and nature conservation • Landscape • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1(Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18)
<u>OBJ0199</u>		Hannah Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Landscape 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4)
<u>OBJ0200</u>		Roger James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 and paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0201</u>		Ian McIver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 23)
<u>OBJ0202</u>		Jane Doyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Noise and vibration 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)
<u>OBJ0203</u>		Ann Picton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Consultation • Alternatives • Traffic • Economics • Shipping, Port economics • Sustainable Development • Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ0203 - Ann Picton PIQ/035 PIQ/069 PIQ/070 PIQ/076 ID/073 ID/103 PIQ/166 ID/255
<u>OBJ0204</u>		Dipti Patel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Landscape • Sustainable development • Traffic • Alternatives 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.39-22.40) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0205</u>	Statutory	National Grid Nicholas Dexter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0206</u>	Statutory	Rogiet Community Council Maureen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Ecology - water voles. • Cultural heritage • Flood consequence assessment • Environment • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Land use • Shipping, Port economics • Traffic • Land use, community and recreation • Alternatives • Economics • Consultation 		WG/REB/OBJ0206 - Rogiet Community Council
<u>OBJ0207</u>	Statutory	Nicholas Victor Rebecca Jane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Noise and Vibration • Design • Construction 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.37-5.41) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82)
<u>OBJ0208</u>		Robert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0209</u>	Statutory	Clive William	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		WG/REB/OBJ0209 - Mr Rabbitt, Daffodil Lodge ID/086
<u>OBJ0210</u>		Mike & Liz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Design • Environment • Landscape • Land use 		WG/REB/OBJ0210 - Mr & Mrs Smith ID/208 WG/REB/OBJ0210-2

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0211	Statutory	T.C. F. Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Land use 		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.45-5.49)
OBJ0212	Statutory	R.P Mrs D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Land use 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.10-8.11) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.50-5.52) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.18)
OBJ0213	Statutory	JS & RE Anstey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use • Construction • Noise and vibration 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.12-8.17) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.53-5.59) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.22)
OBJ0214	Statutory	SG Anstey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.18-8.23) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.60-5.69)
OBJ0215	Statutory	D Colley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use 		ID191

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0216</u>	Statutory	Mr Derek Trevor David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use • Noise and vibration • Air quality 		Modification 30
<u>OBJ0217</u>	Statutory	Huw Richard Brenda Kathleen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.36-8.41) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.83-5.88) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82)
<u>OBJ0218</u>	Statutory	W.T German	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Environment • Noise and vibration 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0219</u>	Statutory	Executors of DG Harris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Design 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.43) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.90-5.95) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.28)
<u>OBJ0220</u>	Statutory	M.D.W Hazell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Design 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.44) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.96-5.100) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.29)
<u>OBJ0221</u>	Statutory	Peter Griffiths Deborah Jane Howells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0222</u>		B.G James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Land use 		Peter Ireland WG1.7.1 (Chapter 9) Document 2.3.2 (Chapters 3 and 18)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBI0223</u>	Statutory	David Howard James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.45-8.47) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.102-106) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.30)
<u>OBI0224</u>	Statutory	Trustees of FH James Joyce Doubleday Frank Jones Diane Price Heather Richards Kathleen Harris Rosemary Ballard Janet Corbett Judith Parry Trustees of FH James Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.107-5.112) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.31-10.33)
<u>OBI0225</u>	Statutory	R.M Jenkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Environment Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.48-49) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.113-5.117) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.34 & 11.24-11.30)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBI0226</u>	Statutory	C.W Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBI0227</u>	Statutory	Roger Jones Gillian Kate Matthew Rhiannon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Economics • Water quality 		WG/REB/OBJ0277 - New Park Farm
<u>OBI0228</u>	Statutory	William David Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Design • Land use 		PID191 Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.59-8.62) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.129-5.135) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.8-10.11)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0229</u>	Statutory	John & Joan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 5-5.5) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.118-8.119) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.136-5.140) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.40-11.46)
<u>OBJ0230</u>	Statutory	Laura Neville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.63-8.65) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.141-5.146) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.38 & 11.47-11.53)
<u>OBJ0231</u>	Statutory	Nicholas Simon Park Alicia Sarah Sophie Rebecca Verity Lydia Adam Brandon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Economics 		PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0231 - Mr N S Park

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0232</u>	Statutory	Christine Margaret Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment 		PID191 WG/REB/OBJ233 - Phillips PIQ/117 Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.69-8.76) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.151-5.154) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.54-11.61)
<u>OBJ0233</u>	Statutory	Stephen Charles Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use • Environment • Flood consequence assessment 		PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0233 - Mr S C Phillips PIQ/112 PIQ/117
<u>OBJ0234</u>		J W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Construction 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0235</u>	Statutory	Llewellyn Morgan Pritchard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use 		PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0235 - Mr L Pritchard - The Beeches
<u>OBJ0236</u>	Statutory	William Reece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.81) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.172-5.176) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.43 & 11.66-11.67)
<u>OBJ0237</u>	Statutory	Jane Renton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Land use • Environment 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.69-8.76) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.163-5.166)
<u>OBJ0238</u>	Statutory	Arthur George	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Economics • Land use 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.82-8.84) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.177-5.181) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19 & 10.82)
<u>OBJ0239</u>	Statutory	Messrs. J.J. & A.D. Turner & Sons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.182-5.184)

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0240</u>	Statutory	Alan James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.185-5.190) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.44)
<u>OBJ0241</u>	Statutory	Lyndon James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Land use • Air quality • Noise and vibration 		PID191 Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Paragraph 11.1) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.85-90) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.191-5.197) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.68-11.69)
<u>OBJ0242</u>		William	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Environment • Consultation • Traffic • Economics • Port Economics • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0243</u>		Newport Friends of the Earth Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Traffic • Economics • Alternatives • Air quality • Sustainable development 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13, 22.18, 22.19-26 & 13 & paragraphs 22.28-22.30) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 4.124-4.127) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Rebuttal - WG/REB/OBJ0125 - Friends of the Earth
<u>OBJ0244</u>		Rebecca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Ecology and nature conservation • Landscape • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Nicholas Rowson WG1.8.1 Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9 & paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.39-22.40) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0245</u>		RSPB Cymru Simon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Flooding • Ecology and nature conservation • Ecology - ornithology • Alternatives • Sustainable development 		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0246</u>		Lynda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0247</u>		Cycling UK Hugh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & vibration • Air quality • Sustainable development • Traffic • Alternatives • Economics • Health Impact Assessment • Land use, community & recreation 		WG/REB/OBJ0247-BS - Engineering Evidence WG/REB/OBJ0247-SB - Economics Evidence WG/REB/OBJ0247-MJ - Chief Evidence WG/REB/OBJ0247-JD - Planning Evidence WG/REB/OBJ0247-BW - Traffic Evidence WG/REB/OBJ0247 - BW - Traffic Evidence part 2 WG/REB/OBJ0247-PI - Environmental Evidence PIQ/092 ID/066 ID/073 ID/092 WG/REB/OBJ0247 ID/210 WG/REB/OBJ0247-4 PIQ/162

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0248</u>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Traffic • Air quality • Carbon • Noise & vibration • Alternatives • Sustainable development 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36)</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0249</u>		Mrs Kitcatt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation • Landscape 		<p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4)</p>
<u>OBJ0250</u>		Ruth Watkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Flooding 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.15-5.38)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8)</p>
<u>OBJ0251</u>		Julia Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Economics 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 22.27)</p>
<u>OBJ0252</u>		Torfaen Friends of the Earth Carole Jacob	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Land use • Alternatives 		<p>WG/REB/OBJ0252 - Carole Jacob ID/073</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0253</u>		Tom Rugg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Documents 4.1-4.7</p>
<u>OBJ0254</u>		Nick & Rebecca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0255		Richard Pearcy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Sustainable development • Ecology - water vole 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16, 4.2.60-64 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.39-22.40 and Chapter 23) John Davies WG 1.23 Jon Davies WG 1.19
OBJ0256	Statutory	Keith & Jane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	
OBJ0257	Statutory	Paul & Karen Clatworthy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Construction 	Withdrawn	
OBJ0258		Steve Rawlings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Carbon • Traffic • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Alternatives 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26 and Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0259		Mae Holland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Alternatives • Traffic 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26 & 22.28-22.30) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9)
OBJ0260		Wildlife Trust Wales James Byrne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation 		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust PIQ/08
OBJ0261		David Wall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)
OBJ0262		D & C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26 and Paragraph 3.18-20) Peter Ireland WG1.7 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0263</u>		Karen Maddock-Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26 and Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0264</u>		Andrew Gainsbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Traffic • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 and Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0265</u>		Dr Joanna Stafford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable development • Economics • Alternatives 		<p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26 & 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11)</p>
<u>OBJ0266</u>		Louise Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Traffic. • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation 		<p>WG/REB/BJ0266 - Louise Davies</p> <p>WG/REB/BJ0266 - Supplementary - Louise Davies</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0267</u>		Buglife - the Invertebrate Conservation Trust Alice Farr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Paragraphs 7.6.57-7.6.70)</p> <p>Rebuttal WG-REB-OBJ0270.13 - Lindi Rich</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0268	Statutory	Natural Resources Wales John Hogg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Flooding 		WG/REB/OBJ0268.2 - Elizabeth Halliwell WG/REB/OBJ0268.4 - Jean Matthews WG/REB/OBJ0268.5 - Jessica Poole WG/REB/OBJ0268.6 - Purnell PIQ/06 PIQ/093 PIQ/094 PIQ/095 PIQ/098 ID/048 (Statement of Common Ground) ID/049 ID/053 (Statement of Common Ground) ID/055 ID/056 ID/058 ID/060 ID/061 (Statement of Common Ground) ID/087 ID/185 ID/192 ID/233 ID/236 ID/244 ID/254
OBJ0269		Alison Thomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Air quality • Alternatives 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3) Documents 4.1 - 4.7
OBJ0270	Statutory	Gwent Wildlife Trust Ian Rappel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Ecology and nature conservation • Environment • Traffic • Economics • Sustainable development 		WG-REB-OBJ0270.1 - Prof Marsden WG-REB-OBJ0270.2 - Prof Calvin Jones WG-REB-OBJ0270.2 – Prof Calvin Jones Addendum WG-REB-OBJ0270.3 – Prof John Whitelegg WG-REB-OBJ0270.4 - Prof Kevin Anderson WG-REB-OBJ0270.4 - Errata to Rebuttal to Prof Kevin Anderson WG-REB-OBJ0270.5 - Prof Lorraine Whitmarsh WG-REB-OBJ0270.6 – Prof John Altringham WG-REB-OBJ0270.6 - Prof John Altringham Addendum WG-REB-OBJ0270.7 – David Boyce WG-REB-OBJ0270.8 - Richard Bakere WG-REB-OBJ0270.11 - Geoff Liles WG-REB-OBJ0270.11 - Geoff Liles Erratum WG-REB-OBJ0270.12 - Prof John Lawton WG-REB-OBJ0270.13 - Lindi Rich WG-REB-OBJ0270.14 - Neil Ward WG-REB-OBJ0270.15 – Mike Webb WG-REB-OBJ0270.17 - Iolo Williams PIQ/055 ID/051 ID/068 ID/073 WG/REB/OBJ0270-18 WG/REB/OBJ0270-19 WG/REB/OBJ0270-20 WG/REB/OBJ0270-21 GWT
OBJ0271		The Woodland Trust Jack	Ecology and nature conservation		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0272</u>		Gavin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0273</u>	Statutory	Claire Rose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		Ben Sibert WG1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.217-8 Julia Tindale WG1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.59-62)
<u>OBJ0274</u>		Barbara Hancock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0275</u>		Campaign for Better Transport Bridget Fox	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Carbon • Sustainable development • Traffic • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11, 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.36 & 22.41) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0276</u>		Anthony & Catherine Venn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Contamination • Economics • Alternatives 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Andy Clifton WG 1.11.1 (Paragraphs 6.16-6.18)
<u>OBJ0277</u>		Charlotte Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology - water voles. 		Keith Jones WG1.18 Jon Davies WG1.19 Peter Ireland 1.7.1 Chapter 10
<u>OBJ0278</u>		Amanda Hurst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3)
<u>OBJ0279</u>		Mark Cottrell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology • Environment • Alternatives 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19 & 10.13-10.20) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Peter Ireland 1.7.1
<u>OBJ0280</u>		Darryl Spittle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology - Ornithology 		Simon Zisman WG 1.21

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0281</u>		Jane Brookes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Landscape • Air quality • Noise and vibration 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)
<u>OBJ0282</u>		Gwent Wildlife Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and Nature Conservation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Air Quality • Noise and vibration • Cultural heritage 		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0283</u>		Cardiff County Council Andrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Sustainable development • Economics 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0284</u>		Elizabeth Thomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Sustainable development • Economics 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.27-22.30 & 22.39-22.40) John Davies WG1.23) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0285</u>	Statutory	Barbara & James Ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Traffic • Economics • Shipping, Port Economics • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Landscape 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 Stephen Bussell WG1.3.5 (Paragraphs 3.3.8-3.3.10) Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (paragraph 4.18.6) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)
<u>OBJ0286</u>		John H & Mrs P Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Alternatives • Cultural heritage • Economics 		Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.27)
<u>OBJ0287</u>		Graham B Wynton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Traffic • Noise and vibration 		WG/REB/OBJ0287 - Mr & Mrs Wynton PIQ/096 PIQ/100
<u>OBJ0288</u>		D Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Alternatives • Air quality • Sustainable development 		Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraph 22.18 & 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8) John Davies WG1.23 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0289</u>	Statutory	Air Products Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0290</u>		E M Allan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Noise and vibration • Alternatives • Economics • Traffic 		<p>Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.4-5.4.3)</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 9, 13 & 22.19-22.26 & 22.28-22.30)</p> <p>Nicholas Rawson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4)</p>
<u>OBJ0291</u>	Statutory	Orign Uk Operations Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Shipping 		<p>WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0291</p> <p>ID/232</p>
<u>OBJ0292</u>	Statutory	Rontec Roadside retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design • Sustainable development • Environment • Economics • Traffic • Alternatives 		<p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Simon Turl</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mke Axon - by Dr P Ireland</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mike Axon - by Bryan Whittaker</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BWo Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 Bwo Erratum Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 JD Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Planning</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 MJ Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Decision Making and Policy</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Supplementary Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BS Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Engineering</p> <p>ID/078</p> <p>ID/089</p> <p>ID/091</p>
<u>OBJ0293</u>		P McCann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Ecology and nature conservation • Environment • Noise and vibration • Alternatives 		<p>Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.3-5.3.5)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p>
<u>OBJ0294</u>		Peter Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Air quality • Noise and vibration • Alternatives 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0295</u>		TJ Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Consultation • Alternatives • Sustainable development 		<p>Keith Jones WG 1.18.1 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Keith Jones WG 1.18</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.33-22.36)</p> <p>Richard Graham WG 1.15.1 (Paragraphs 11.2-11.22)</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0296</u>		Elizabeth and Nigel Cann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Flood consequences assessment • Sustainable development 		<p>Keith Jones WG1.18.1 (Chapter 4.11)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 3.18-20 and Chapter 23)</p> <p>PIQ/78</p> <p>ID/100</p> <p>Document 4.7.2</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0297</u>		Gwent Ornithological Society Trevor Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development • Consultation • Ecology - birds • Alternatives 		<p>WG/REB/OBJ0297 - Gwent Ornithological Society</p> <p>WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0298</u>		Bat Conservation Trust Steve Lucas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology - Bats 		<p>Rebuttal - NRW (Jean Elizabeth Matthews, Bats)</p> <p>Richard Green WG 1.20.1 (Paragraphs 7.8.1-7.8.16)</p>
<u>OBJ0299</u>		Nicholas Vittle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Ecology and nature conservation • Port Economics, Shipping • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Economics 		<p>Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7)</p> <p>Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 6-6.8)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5)</p> <p>Andrew Meaney WG1.4</p>
<u>OBJ0300</u>		Gleanda Lowe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Noise and vibration • Air quality • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Traffic 		<p>Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9)</p> <p>Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20)</p> <p>Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.27)</p> <p>Stephen Bussell WG 1.3</p>
<u>OBJ0301</u>	Statutory	Ashtenne (AIF) LTD & Ashtenne Industrial Fund Nominee No 1 Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0302</u>	Statutory	WE Dowds Shipping Ltd	• Land use		WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP WG/REB/OBJ0302 – W E Dowds (Shipping) Ltd. ID/246
<u>OBJ0303</u>	Statutory	Western Power Distribution G Strongman	• Land use	Withdrawn	ID/229
<u>OBJ0304</u>	Statutory	Surf Telecoms Limited Andrew Baker	• Land use	Withdrawn	ID/229

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0305</u>	Statutory	Hanson Uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Economics • Land use • Human Rights 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.27-10.29) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.210-5.213) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24)
<u>OBJ0306</u>	Statutory	Royal Ordnance (Crown Service) Pension Scheme Trustees Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0307</u>		Miss Ellen Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Economics • Traffic • Carbon • Alternatives • Sustainable development 		WG/REB/OBJ0307 - Ellen Law WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0308</u>	Statutory	Liberty Steel Newport Limited Richard Steed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	Withdrawn	WG/REB/OBJ0308 - Liberty Steel
<u>OBJ0309</u>		Catherine Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation • Environment • Economics • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 Paragraph 22.27 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0310</u>		Andrea Rodley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Ecology and nature conservation • Sustainable development • Traffic • Alternatives • Consultation • Flood consequences assessment • Shipping, Port Economics • Design 		<p>Stephen Bussell WG1.3 Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapters 9, 13, 19 & 22) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.6 Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraph 5.5-5.14 & 5.46-5.58) Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.1.9 & 9.6.1-9.6.8)</p>
<u>OBJ0311</u>		Dr Mario Bisi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives • Environment • Economics • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		<p>Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 Paragraph 22.27 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247</p>
<u>OBJ0312</u>	Statutory	CJN Engineering Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		<p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.278-5.284) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 19) WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP WG/REB/OBJ0312</p>
<u>OBJ0313</u>	Statutory	Jewson Ltd & Saint Gobain Building Distribution Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		<p>Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.285-5.291) Jonathan Vine WG 1.22.1 (Paragraphs 8.3.1-8.3.9) WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP WG/REB/OBJ0313</p>

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0314</u>	Statutory	Magor with Undy Community Council Beverly Cawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landuse, community and recreation • Sustainable development • Alternatives • Economics • Enviroment • Ecology and nature conservation • Flood consequence assessment • Traffic • Carbon 		WG/REB/OBJ0150 - Magor and Undy Community Council ID/090 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0315</u>	Statutory	Carol & Allan Beer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Shipping, Port economics • Economics • Alternatives 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Philip Evans WG 1.14 (Chapter 8) Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0316</u>	Statutory	Bulk hauliers UK & Europe Ronnie Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port Economics • Design 		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.292-5.298) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 19) WG/REB/OBJ0316
<u>OBJ0317</u>	Statutory	Technoplan Anstalt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.224-5.227) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.47-10.48)
<u>OBJ0318</u>		Keith Williamson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives • Traffic • Landscape 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ0319</u>		Ursula Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Document 4.7.2

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0320</u>		Helen Chambers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and Nature conservation 		Keith Jones WG1.18.1) Chapter 4.11)
<u>OBJ0321</u>	Statutory	Dwr Cymru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0322</u>	Statutory	Mark Williams Mark Skinner Mark Williams Pension Fund Clive Coulthard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives Land use Economics Construction 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.91) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.228-5.232) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.74-10.76 & 10.82) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ0323</u>		Judith Cornish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9 and Paragraphs 22.28-22.30)
<u>OBJ0324</u>		Tony Unstead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy.
<u>OBJ0325</u>		Mrs J K A Atkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Landscape 		Keith Jones WG1.18 Nicholas Rowson WG1.8
<u>OBJ0326</u>		Dr Steven Murray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18
<u>OBJ0327</u>		Ro Douglas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 3)
<u>OBJ0328</u>		Colin R. Cheesman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable development Alternatives Ecology and nature conservation Economics 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1 (Chapter 9 & 13 and Paragraph 22.27-22.30 & 22.39-22.40) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy Keith Jones WG 1.18 John Davies WG1.23

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0329</u>	Statutory	Marshalls Group Andrew Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use 		WG/REB/OBJ0329 - Marshall's WG/REB/OBJ0329 - Erratum to Marshall's Rebuttal ID/216 WG/REB/OBJ0329-2
<u>OBJ0330</u>	Statutory	Christopher & Wendy Perkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Noise and vibration Alternatives Carbon 		Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2-10.5, 10.8-10.11 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36 and Chapter 9) Phil Evans WG1.14 Tim Chapman WG1.13 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0331</u>		Graham Horder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI Mitigation Strategy. Keith Jones WG 1.18 Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0332</u>		Linda Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Cultural heritage Traffic Environment Economics 		Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraphs 22.33-22.36) Michael Bull WG1.12 Tim Chapman WG1.13 Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ0333</u>		Gavin Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 3.17) & SSSI
<u>OBJ0334</u>		James Hanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives Landscape 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Nicholas Rowson 1.8.1 (Paragraph 5.2-5.2.4) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0335</u>		Thomas Chinnick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Sustainable development Economics Alternatives Carbon 		WG/REB/OBJ0335 - Tom Chinnick
<u>OBJ0336</u>		Francesca Shrapnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG 1.18 (Chapter 5 and Paragraph 4.9.1-4.9.16 & 6.3.5-6.3.7) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ0337</u>		Fletcher Morgan Lorraine Nolan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and vibration 		Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5)
<u>OBJ0338</u>		Mr David Cheseldine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Traffic 		Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13 & 22.19-22.26) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) PID-43

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0339</u>	Statutory	UK Health Care Property 1 LLP	• Environment		Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.233-5.236)
<u>OBJ0340</u>	Statutory	Residual Lands Limited Nigel Phillips	• Land Use See Issue 008	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0341</u>	Statutory	CADW Matthew Coward	• Cultural heritage • Sustainable development	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0342</u>		Steve Albaya	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0343</u>		David Allan	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0344</u>		Katherine Ruth Allen	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0345</u>		Paul Anderton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0346</u>		Helen Arthur	Campaign - RSPB & Gwent Wildlife		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0347</u>		Chris Avanti	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0348</u>		Colin Balch	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0349</u>		Katy Beddoe	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0350</u>		A J Bennett	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0351</u>		David Biddles	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0352</u>		Sarah Binmore	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0353</u>		Hannah Blackaby	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0354</u>		Catherine Blundell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0355</u>		Godfrey Bradshaw	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ0356</u>		Wendy Brady	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0357</u>		Tansy Branscombe	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0358</u>		Keith Bucknall	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0359</u>		Bryn Burgess	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0360</u>		Ian Burns	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0361</u>		Anita Burrett	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0362</u>		Robert Campbell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0363</u>		Frances Cattanach	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0364</u>		Tony & Linda Clark	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0365</u>		Tim Colebrook	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0366</u>		Alison Colebrook	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0367		Dr Richard Cowie	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0368		Alan Cripps	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0369		Miss Dawn Cromwell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0370		Dr Rachael Daniels	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0371		Naomi Davis	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0372		Toity Deave	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0373		David Dewsbury	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0374		A Dillamore	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0375		Emily Downs	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0376		Ian Draycott	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0377		Richard Drew	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0378		Professor Brian I. Duerden CBE,MD	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0379		Marilyn Dunkelman	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0380		Barbara Dwyer	Same person as OBJ0141	Withdrawn	
OBJ0381		Ann Eggleton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0382		Chloe Elding	Same person as OBJ0029	Withdrawn	
OBJ0383		Susan Evans	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0384		The Rhodes Family	Same person as OBJ0186	Withdrawn	
OBJ0385		Wayne Forster	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0386		David Gale	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0387		Kate Gibbs	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0388		Jane Gibson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0389		Mrs T E Green	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0390		Paul Greenfield	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0391		Tom Grove	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ0392		Coral Guppy	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0393		Clive Hamersley	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0394		Roy Harris	Campaign - Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0395		Chris Hatcher	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0396		Robin Hayward	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0397		John David Hopkin	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0398</u>		Helen Houston	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0399</u>		Jadwiga Howell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0400</u>		Lynne Howles	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0401</u>		Sam Hughes	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0402</u>		Arwen Hutchings	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0403</u>		Mrs Helen James	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0404</u>		Gillian Johnson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0405</u>		Nicola Johnson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0406</u>		Lynn Astley Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0407</u>		Jenny Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ0408</u>		Morris Jones	Same person as OBJ0407	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0409</u>		Audrey B Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0410</u>		Ceri Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0411</u>		Gary Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0412</u>		William Jutton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0413</u>		Andy Karren	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0414</u>		Nigel Kempson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0415</u>		Paul Kinnersley	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0416</u>		Bleddyn Lake	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0417</u>		Jeanette Lawrenson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0418</u>		Hilary Lee	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0419</u>		Alicia Leow-Dyke	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0420</u>		Arwyn Lewis	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0421</u>		Rachel Locke	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0422</u>		Ruth Lovell	Same person as OBJ0194	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0423</u>		Jane MacFarlane	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0424</u>		Gwen Maggs	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0425</u>		Alice Marlow	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0426</u>		Clare Martin	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0427</u>		JK Mason	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0428		Rosemary Mason and Palle Uhd Jepsen	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0429		Vaughn Matthews MSc ACIEEM	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0430		Victoria Matthewson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0431		Liz McBride	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
OBJ0432		Paul McCarthy	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0433		Sean McHugh	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0434		Mary McMurrin PhD	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0435		Rachel & Julian Merriman	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0436		Chris Metters	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0437		James Moore	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0438		Paul Morton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0439		Annette Murray	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0440		Paul James Newton	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0441		Alison Nimmo	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0442		P J Nurse	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0443		Helen and Ian Okines	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0444		Elin Owen	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0445		Emily Parfitt-Croydon MA, BA (Joint Hons)	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0446		Andrew Parker	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0447		Jim Partington	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0448		Gillian Peace	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0449		Robert and Judy Pemberton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0450		Dr Sean Perkins	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0451		C M Pitman	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0452		Cyrene Powell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0453		Emlyn and Jennifer Powell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0454		John Putman	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0455		Martin Puzey	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
OBJ0456		Ella Grace Quincy	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0457		Ellen Quinton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0458		Alex Rhodes	Same person as OBJ0191	Withdrawn	
OBJ0459		David Richards	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0460		Lloyd Richards	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0461		Mrs Elaine Richardson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0462		Beth Roberts	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0463		Rebecca Robinson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0464		Steven Rogers	Same person as OBJ0198	Withdrawn	
OBJ0465		Keith Roylance	Campaign - Wildlife Trust Wales & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ0466		Roger Ruston	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0467		T. J. Sandles	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0468		Dr S P Satterthwaite	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0469		Angus Scott	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0470		Charles E Serafin	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0471		Miranda Seymour-Smith	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0472		Dr Graham Small PhD DLSHTM FRES MRQA	Same person as OBJ0028	Withdrawn	
OBJ0473		Jeremy Smith BSc MRes	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0474		Chris Stott	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0475		Angela Swan	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0476		Sarah Symondson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0477		Elspeth Thomas	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0478		Tom Pitts Tucker	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0479		Helen Varney	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ0480		Gavin Vella	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0481		Jonathan Vining BSc BArch MSc RIBA AoU	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0482		Christine Walby	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0483		Rebecca Ward	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0484		David Watkins	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0485		Kim Western	Campaign - RSPB & Gwent Wildlife		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0486		Dr Chris Williams	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0487		Frances Williams	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0488		Maggie Wilson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0489		Paul Wilson	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0490		Mr J Winder	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0491		Thomas Winstone	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0492		Georgia Witton- Maclean	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0494		Jim Wright	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0495		R	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0496		Wendy Tyler Batt	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0497		Aline Denton	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0498		Margret Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0499		Mrs Audrey Woodrow	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0500		Elaine Wright	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0501		Susan Campbell	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
OBJ0502		Ian S Vicary	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0503		Francis Lewis	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0504		Philip Jones	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0506		Evan Hopkins	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0507		Barbara M Heys	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0508		Diana Clark	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0509		Sandra Forster	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0510		Jane Adams	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0511		Ian Allen	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ0512		Saran Allott-Davey	Same person as OBJ0168	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0513		John Anderton	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0514		Malcolm Appleton	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0515		Lin Ashcroft	Same person as OBJ0057	Withdrawn	
OBJ0516		Lynn Astley -Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0517		Nicola Balmforth	Same person as OBJ0160	Withdrawn	
OBJ0518		Ken Barker	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0519		Phil Barnett	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0520		Enid Beckett	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0521		Nicholas Beswick	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0522		Haley Bowcock	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0523		Mr Godfrey Bradshaw	Same person as OBJ0355	Withdrawn	
OBJ0524		Julian Branscombe	Same Person as OBJ0013	Withdrawn	
OBJ0525		Dave Brassey	Same Person as OBJ0166	Withdrawn	
OBJ0526		Mrs Laura Bray	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0527		Chris Brown	Same person as OBJ0061	Withdrawn	
OBJ0528		Mrs Ruth Brown	Same person as OBJ0085	Withdrawn	
OBJ0529		John Butler	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0530		Natalie Buttriss	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0531		James Byrne BSc, MSc, CEnv, MCIEEM	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0532		Imogen Cavadino	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0533		Gillian Cawthorne	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0534		Karen Chadwick	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0535		Rich Chandler	Same person as OBJ0066	Withdrawn	
OBJ0536		Donna Chinnick	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0537		A P Clark	Same person as OBJ008	Withdrawn	
OBJ0538		David and Stella Collard	Same person as OBJ0158	Withdrawn	
OBJ0539		Helen Collis	Campaign - Wildlife Trust Wales & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ0540		Dr Michael Coogan	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0541		Sharon Cullen	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0542		Ian Cummings	Same person as OBJ0542	withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0543		Lucy Curtis	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0544		Susan Danziger	Same person as OBJ0037	Withdrawn	
OBJ0545		Kyleigh Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0546		Joan Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trust Wales & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ0547		Roger Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0548		Rhys Davies	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0549		Matt Davies	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0550		Naomi Davies	Same person as OBJ0371	Withdrawn	
OBJ0551		R L Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ0552		Bran Devey	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0553		Catrin Devonald	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0554		Anthea M. Dewhurst	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0555		Tim Dodman	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0556		Mrs Amy Doore	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0557		Jane Doyle	Same person as OBJ0202	Withdrawn	
OBJ0558		Ed Drewitt	Same person as OBJ0178	Withdrawn	
OBJ0559		Jon Dunkelman	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0560		Margaret Durkin	Same person as OBJ0102	Withdrawn	
OBJ0561		Chloe Elding	Same person as OBJ0029	Withdrawn	
OBJ0562		Sue Emlyn-Jones	Same person as OBJ0140	Withdrawn	
OBJ0563		Dr Huw Evans	Same Person as OBJ0040	Withdrawn	
OBJ0564		John Evans	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0565		Rachel Evans	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0566		Rhian Evans	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0567		S Evans	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0568		Alice Fairnie	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0569		Alice Farr	Same person as OBJ0267	Withdrawn	
OBJ0570		Sophie Faupel	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0571		C Field	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0572		M C Field	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0573		Dick Finch	Same person as OBJ0035	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0574		Roger & Sue Finn	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0575		C Furmage	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0576		L Furmage	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0577		Peter Gardner	Same person as OBJ0171	Withdrawn	
OBJ0578		Elizabeth Green	Same person as OBJ0054	Withdrawn	
OBJ0579		Andrew Green	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0580		Tim Green	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0581		Amy Green	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0582		Martin Griffett	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0583		Tom Grove	Same person as OBJ0391	Withdrawn	
OBJ0584		Linda Grove	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0585		Robyn Guppy	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0586		Steve Hale	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0587		Miss Alice Hanning	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0588		Judy Hanny	Same person as OBJ0129	Withdrawn	
OBJ0589		Roy Harris	Same person as OBJ0394	Withdrawn	
OBJ0590		Sue Harrison	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ0591		Andrea Hennessey	Same person as OBJ0138	Withdrawn	
OBJ0592		Ralph Hobbs	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0593		Andy Hodge	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0594		Susan Hodgkinson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0595		D C Hopkins	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0596		Samantha Horsburgh	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0597		Helen Houston	Same person as OBJ0398	Withdrawn	
OBJ0598		Natalie Howard	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0599		Robert K Hughes LRPS	Same person as OBJ0089	Withdrawn	
OBJ0600		Jayne Hunt	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0601		Dr Stephen Hussey	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0602		Kieron Huston BSc, MSc, MCIEEM	Same person as OBJ0161	Withdrawn	
OBJ0603		Pamela Ireland	Campaign - RSPB & Wildlife Trust Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ0604		Mal Jenkins	Same person as OBJ0105	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0605		Kelly-Louise Jennings	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0606		Helen John	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0607		Tanya Johnson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0608		Andrew Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0609		Andrew Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0610		Dr Charlotte Jones	Same person as OBJ0156	Withdrawn	
OBJ0611		Chris Jones	Same person as OBJ0081	Withdrawn	
OBJ0612		Elen Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0613		Nicky Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0614		David Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0615		Ceri Jones	Same person as OBJ0410	Withdrawn	
OBJ0616		Megan Jones	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0617		Robert Jones Parry	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0618		Chris Kelsey	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0619		Nigel Kempson	Same person as OBJ0414 RSPB Campaign	Withdrawn	
OBJ0620		Tom Killick	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0621		Sophie Lawrenson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0622		Philip A. Leicester	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0623		Kerry Lewis	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0624		James Loftus	Same person as OBJ0173	Withdrawn	
OBJ0625		John Loftus	Same person as OBJ0175	Withdrawn	
OBJ0626		Dr David Lonsdale	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0627		Helen Lyndon	Same person as OBJ0177	Withdrawn	
OBJ0628		Mark Lynn	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0629		Bill Mackie	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0630		Karen Maddock-Jones	Same person as OBJ0263	Withdrawn	
OBJ0631		Gwen Maggs	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0632		E.D Mantell	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0633		Vaughn matthews	Same person as OBJ0429 Gwent Wildlife Campaign	Withdrawn	
OBJ0634		Mr Donal McCarthy	Same person as OBJ0058	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0635		Mrs Ann McClean	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0636		Catherine C Mendez, BA Hons, MEng Hons	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0637		James Moore	Same person as OBJ0437	Withdrawn	
OBJ0638		Mike Morris	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0639		Tessa Murray	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0640		Peter Neale	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0641		Paul James Newton	Same person as OBJ0440	Withdrawn	
OBJ0642		Alison Nimmo	Same as OBJ0441	Withdrawn	
OBJ0643		Rob Nottage	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0644		B O'Hara	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0645		Richard & Gillian Osborne	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0646		Emily Parfitt-Croydon MA, BA (Joint Hons)	Same person as OBJ0445	Withdrawn	
OBJ0647		Howard Park	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0648		Mary Parker	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0649		Rosemary Parkhouse	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0650		Jim Partington	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0651		Catherine Pawson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0652		Mary Pearce	Same person as OBJ0064	Withdrawn	
OBJ0653		Abigail Pedlow	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0654		Barrie Peers	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0655		Philip Pell	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0656		Zelah Pengilley	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0657		Monica Peyton	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0658		Sarah Philpott	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0659		Dr William Picton	Same person as OBJ0162	Withdrawn	
OBJ0660		Ann Picton MBE	Same person as OBJ0203	Withdrawn	
OBJ0661		Chris Piddington	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0662		Megan Pitman	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0663		Margaret Pobjoy	Same person as OBJ0046	Withdrawn	
OBJ0664		Ms Rebecca Price	Same person as OBJ0244	Withdrawn	
OBJ0665		Julian Price	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0666		Sue Priestland	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0667		Ella Grace Quincy	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0668		Julie Rees	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0669		Michael Rees	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0670		Joanna Richards	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0671		Kevin Riddell	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0672		Christine Roberts	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0673		Caroline Robertson	Same person as OBJ0183	Withdrawn	
OBJ0674		Bob Roome	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0675		Keith Roylance	Same person as OBJ0465	Withdrawn	
OBJ0676		Tom Rugg	Same person as OBJ0253	Withdrawn	
OBJ0677		Nick Saunders	same person as OBJ0170	Withdrawn	
OBJ0678		Dr Deborah Sazer	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0679		Dr Ingo Schuder MCIEEM	Same person as OBJ0159	Withdrawn	
OBJ0680		Amanda Sergeant	Same person as OBJ0163	Withdrawn	
OBJ0681		Miranda Seymour-Smith	Same person as OBJ0471	Withdrawn	
OBJ0682		Gaye Sheridan	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0683		Wendy Smith	Same person as OBJ0067	Withdrawn	
OBJ0684		Christine Snape	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0685		Darryl Spittle	Same Person as OBJ0280	Withdrawn	
OBJ0686		John Staton	Same Person as OBJ0075	Withdrawn	
OBJ0687		Kath Stevens	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0688		Richard Stone	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
OBJ0689		Alison Stroud	Same person as OBJ0062	Withdrawn	
OBJ0690		Angela Swan	Same as OBJ475	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0691</u>		Sarah Symondson	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0692</u>		D Caroline Syred	Same person as OBJ0094	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0693</u>		Dr Katherine Syred	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0694</u>		Professor Nicholas Syred	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0695</u>		Andrea Thomas	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0696</u>		Elsbeth Thomas	Same person as OBJ0477	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0697</u>		Marc Tippler	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0698</u>		Julian Tubb	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0699</u>		Brian Tubb	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0700</u>		Norma Tubb	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0701</u>		Diana Tyler	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0702</u>		Stephanie Tyler	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0703</u>		Andrew Urquhart	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0704</u>		Dafydd Vaughn Lewis BA, BSc, MBA, CBiol, FRSB, MCLIP	Same person as OBJ0176	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0705</u>		Christine Walby	Same person as OBJ0482	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0706</u>		Natalie Waller	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0707</u>		Robert Waller	Personal response in addition to a campaign response - Wildlife Trust Wales • Traffic • Alternatives		WG/REB/OBJ0707 - Robert Waller WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust PIQ/071 PIQ/086 ID/073 ID/209 PIQ/156 and 156a (revised) WG/REB/OBJ0707-2
<u>OBJ0708</u>		Anne Warrell & Wayne Smith	Same person as OBJ0174	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0709</u>		Gail Watkins	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0710</u>		Mary Watkins	Same person as OBJ0063	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0711</u>		Dr Ruth Watkins	Same person as OBJ0250	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0712</u>		Daniel Webb	Same person as OBJ0059	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0713</u>		Madeleine Wells	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0714</u>		Jamie White	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0715</u>		April Wiggins	same person as OBJ0155	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0716</u>		Dr Lizzie Wilberforce	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0717</u>		Anna Williams	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0718</u>		Charlotte Williams	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0719</u>		Gareth Williams	Same person as OBJ0164	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0720</u>		Gerrard Williams	Same person as OBJ0027	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0721</u>		Iolo Williams	same person as OBJ0167	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0722</u>		Lindsay Williams	Same person as OBJ051	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0723</u>		David Williams	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0724</u>		Mrs Alison Willott	Same as OBJ0074		
<u>OBJ0725</u>		J Winder	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0726</u>		Mel Witherden	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0727</u>		Georgia Witton-Maclean	Same person as OBJ0492	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0728</u>		Helen Wood	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0729</u>		Ruth Wood	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0730</u>		John Woodruff	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0731</u>		David	Same person as OBJ0020	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0732</u>		C	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ0733</u>		Ruth Wood	Same person as OBJ0729	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0734</u>		Roger Puxley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0735</u>		Mrs Linda Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0736</u>		Miss Glen Oconnell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0737</u>		Ms Emma Spurgin Hussey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0738</u>		Mr Stephen Inglis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0739</u>		Miss Faye Munro	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0740</u>		Mr Peter Etheridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0741</u>		Dr Douglas Stannard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0742</u>		Mr John Gregory	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0743</u>		Mrs Helen Cross	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0744</u>		Mrs Janet Hyde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0745</u>		Mr Jeffrey Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0746</u>		Mr David Jarrett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0747</u>		Mr Nathan Tovey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0748		Mr Kristian Hallihan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0749		Mrs J Boardman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0750		Mr Bruce Moore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0751		Dr Steve Palmer	Same person as OBJ0093	Withdrawn	
OBJ0752		Dr Richard Miller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0753		Mr Tom Delaney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0754		Mr Tony Pritchard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0755		Miss Joy Roscoe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0756		Mr Jim Cunning	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0757		Mr Roy Rhodes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0758		Mr Ronald Kinrade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0759		Ms Jean Tomlinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0760		Mrs Tracy Gould	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0761		Mr Michael Trew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0762		Mr Richard Chew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0763		Mr Patrick Crowley	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0764		Mrs Angela Trew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0765		Mrs Michelle O'Neill-Kiddie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0766		Mr Rhys Aneurin	Same person as OBJ0194	Withdrawn	
OBJ0767		Miss Eleanor Morrison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0768		Mr Andrew Barnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0769		Mr Phillip Moore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0770		Mr Peter Newmark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0771		Mrs Valerie Mann	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0772		Mr Ken Maurice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0773		Mr David Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0774		Miss Alexandra Osborne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0776		Dr Timothy Maberly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0777		Mr Tim Corke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0778		Mr Jonathan Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0779		Ms Catriona Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0780		Mr Peter Cartwright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0781</u>		Dr Paul Gale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0782</u>		Mr Andrew Bladon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0783</u>		Mr Terence Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0784</u>		Mr Gareth Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0785</u>		Mr Joseph Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0786</u>		Mrs Susan Swift	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0787</u>		Miss Kate Newman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0788</u>		Mr Richard Hopkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0789</u>		Mr Colin Neale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0790</u>		Miss Rebekah Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0791</u>		Mr Martin Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0792</u>		Mr Roger Dunn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0793</u>		Mr Steve Howells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0794</u>		Dr Christine Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0795</u>		Mr Neil Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0796</u>		Mr James Bear	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0797</u>		Mr Michael Rook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0798</u>		Mr Paul Pearson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0799</u>		Mr Philip Palmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0800</u>		Mr Richard Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0802</u>		Mr Antony Pooles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0803</u>		Mr Martin Kerby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0804</u>		Mr Don Manhire	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0805</u>		Mrs Jane Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0806</u>		Mrs Rae Cecil	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0807</u>		Miss Jill Abbott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0808</u>		Ms Shusha Lamoon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0809</u>		Mr Chris Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0810</u>		Miss Kirsty Osman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0811</u>		Ms Elaine Dunn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0812</u>		Mr Michael Frost	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0813</u>		Dr Jennifer Woodward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0814</u>		Mr Michael Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0815		Al Reeve	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0816		Miss Elizabeth Armstrong	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0817		Miss Wayne Watkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0818		Mrs Elizabeth Ackroyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0819		Ms Danielle Styles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0820		Mrs Rebecca Wade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0821		Mrs Rita Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0822		Ms Jean Rainey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0823		Miss Evelyn Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0824		Mr Edward Crabtree	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0825		Mr Brian Lancaster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0826		Mr Robert Hopson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0827		Miss Alice Groom	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0828		Mrs Julie Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0829		Mrs Elizabeth Cornish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0830		Mr Mike Cleary	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0831		Mr Daniel Barrett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0832		Mr Anthony Newton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0833		Dr Chris Wooff	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0834		Mr David Carson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0835		Prof Oliver Watson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0836		Mr John Mackay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0837		Mrs Lorna Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0838		Mr Paul Coffman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0839		Mr David Pinner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0840		Mr & Mrs George and Mary Fricker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0841		Mrs Sandra Bletchly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0842		Mr Nikolas Bertholdt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0843		Mr Kit Roskelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0844		Miss Emmeline Hannelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0845		Mr Stephen Oddy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0846		Mr Laurence Pearce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0847</u>		Mr Jeffrey Hazell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0848</u>		Mrs Paula Howarth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0849</u>		Mr Adrian Jaques	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0850</u>		Mrs Susan Mellon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0851</u>		Mr Ian Elphick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0852</u>		Miss Alice Kirk	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0853</u>		Mr Michael Park	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0854</u>		Mr Peter Moore	same person as OBJ0091	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0855</u>		Mrs Barbara Loxley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0856</u>		Mr Dennis Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0857</u>		Mr Anthony Scoffield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0858</u>		Mrs Patricia Scoffield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0859</u>		Mr Ian Forsyth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0860</u>		Mr Jeremy Moore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0861</u>		Miss Eirian Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0862</u>		Dr Tony Gillie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0863</u>		Mr Joseph Fleming	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ0864</u>		Mr Martin Unwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0865</u>		Mr Chris Moorhouse	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0866</u>		Ms Emma Ordonez	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0867</u>		Mr David Lewis	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0868</u>		Mrs Mandy Gothorp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0869</u>		Mrs Dinah and Patrick Wise	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0870</u>		Dr Nigel G Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0871</u>		Ms Jo Fraser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0872</u>		Mr Edward Hutchings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0873</u>		Mrs Julie Shaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0874</u>		Mrs Gemma M Griffiths	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0875</u>		Mrs Elaine Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0876</u>		Mr Peter Wilkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0877</u>		Mr David Carter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0878</u>		Mr Alexander Stout	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0879</u>		Mr Andrew Stott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0880</u>		Mr Phill Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0881</u>		Mrs Hazel Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0882</u>		Mr Roger Milligan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0883</u>		Mr Tim Aske	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0884</u>		Mr David Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0885</u>		Mr Neal Moss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0886</u>		Mr Gordon Piper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0887</u>		Dr Christopher Jeans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0888</u>		Mrs Helen Rafferty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0889</u>		Mr Mike Brookes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0890</u>		Mr Simon Murray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0891</u>		Mr David Colls	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0892</u>		Mr Jonathan Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0893</u>		Mr John Seal	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0894</u>		Mr Roger Fickling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0895</u>		Mr Ralph Hobbs	Same person as OBJ05952	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0896</u>		Mr Roger Gilbert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0897</u>		Mr Michael Lindsey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0898</u>		Mr Derek Antropik	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0899</u>		Mr Chris Gooddie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0900</u>		Mr Richard Marsh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0901</u>		Mrs Ann Barratt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0902</u>		Same person as OBJ05952 C943:D956	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0903</u>		Ms Gill Finch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0904</u>		Mr Peter Perrott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0905</u>		Mr Leslie Etheridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0906</u>		Dr Stephen Preston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0907</u>		Mr Dave Powner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0908</u>		Mr David Saunders	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0909</u>		Miss Pat Armstrong	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0910</u>		Mr Nigel Pleass	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0911</u>		Mr Lee Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0912</u>		Mr Barrie English	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0913		Miss Charlotte Perry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0914		Mr Darren Matthews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0915		Mrs Susie Turnbull	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0916		Mr Peter Mellor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0917		Mr Richard Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0918		Mr Roger Hoodless	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0919		Mrs B Hutton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0920		Mr P Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0921		Mrs Juliet Hambleton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0922		Mr Richard Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0923		Mr Geoff Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0924		Mrs Julia Wawrzynowicz	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0925		Mr David Killon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0926		Mr John Lambert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0927		Mrs Georgia Eldridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0928		Mrs Trudi Kettle	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0929		Mr Michael O'Brien	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0930		Miss Emma Charles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0931		Mr Michael Charles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0932		Mrs Vivienne Charles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0933		Mr Stephen Dransfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0934		Mr Andrew Jayne	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0935		Miss Angela Kings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0936		Mrs Debra Hooper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0937		Mr Jamie Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0938		Mr Timothy Rowley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0939		Mr Steve Ashton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0940		Mr George Jacob	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0941		Ms Sarah Blake	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0942		Miss Patricia Loukes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0943		Mrs Elizabeth Butler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0944		Mr Dafydd Lewis	Same person as OBJ0176	Withdrawn	
OBJ0945		Ms Karen Neill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ0946</u>		Mr Stephen Ashby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0947</u>		Mrs Viktoria Nealis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0948</u>		Mr Matt Prince	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0949</u>		Mrs Jenny Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0950</u>		Mr Thomas Barker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0951</u>		Mrs Margaret Fishwick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0952</u>		Miss Llynn Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0953</u>		Dr Christine Farmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0954</u>		Mrs Heather Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0955</u>		Miss Alice Tribe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0956</u>		Mr Paul Braid	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0957</u>		Mrs Deborah Bowditch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0958</u>		Mr John Savery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0959</u>		Miss Alison Keedy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0960</u>		Miss Gabrielle Cleghorn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0961</u>		Mr Mike Welch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0962</u>		Mr Dean Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0963</u>		Mr Kevin Ilsley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0964</u>		Miss Patricia Kemp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0965</u>		Mrs Valerie Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0966</u>		Mrs Margaret Dittmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0967</u>		Mr Alan Parfitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0968</u>		Mr Peter Stilts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0969</u>		Mrs Julia McCord	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ0970</u>		Mr Robert Badcock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0971</u>		Mrs Fiona Yuill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0972</u>		Mr Guy Lawrence	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0973</u>		Mrs Liz Albert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0974</u>		Mr Ernie Scales	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0975</u>		Mr David Frost	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0976</u>		Mrs Valerie Higgon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0977</u>		Mrs Janet Piper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0978</u>		Mr Tim Barrett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0979</u>		Mrs Shanti Srinivas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ0980</u>		Miss Lorraine Leicester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ0981		Mr Roland Pitts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0982		Mrs Janet Burdon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0983		Mrs Sumi Olson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0984		Mr Kevin Bower	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0985		Mr Jonathan Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0986		Mr Alan Petrie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0987		Mr Madoc Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0988		Mrs Irene Kettle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0989		Mr Philip John	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0990		Mrs Diane Malpass	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0991		Dr M Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0992		Mr Andrew Keeble	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0993		Mrs Jane Corlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0994		Miss Robert Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0995		Mr Peter McSweeney	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0996		Mr Richard Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0997		Mrs Heather Marshall	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ0998		Mr L Stallard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ0999		Miss Zoe McMillan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1000		Dr David G Sanger	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1001		Mrs Annette Hardy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1002		Mr Stephen Blow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1003		Mr Maurice Hardy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1004		Ms Kay Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1005		Jeanette Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1006		Mrs Jill Nieuwenhuys	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1007		Miss Susanne Lane	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1008		Mr Robert Bish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1009		Mr David Kemish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1010		Mr David Preston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1011		Mrs Margaret Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1012		Mr Jonathan Angell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1013		Mrs Susan Gough	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1014		Mrs Joy Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1015		Ms Brigitte Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1016		Miss Rina Quinlan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1017		Miss Kenvin Dainton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1018		Mr Stephen Goddard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1019		Mr Ian Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1020		Mr Ian Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1021		Miss Katrina Day	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1022		Mrs Joyce Murray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1023		Dr Rob Best	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1024		Mr Wyn Mason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1025		Mr Adrian Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1026		Mr Mark Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1027		Wales Green Party Ms Pippa Bartolotti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • General 		WG/REB/OBJ1027 - Welsh Green Party ID/073
OBJ1028		Dr Robert Irving	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1029		Mrs Ann Leonard	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1030		Mr Alan Reynolds	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1031		Mrs Julie Pester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1032		Mr Oliver Grey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1033		Mrs Jean Stewart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1034		Dr Peter Varley	Same person as OBJ0087	Withdrawn	
OBJ1035		Mr Gareth Wainwright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1036		Miss Ellin Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1037		Ms Virginia Haines	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1038		Mr John Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1039		Mr Michael Bevin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1040		Mrs Julie Edge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1041		Ms Ilona de Souza	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1042		Mr Daniel Whitelegg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1043		Mrs Judith Whitmore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1044		Mr Norman Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1045		Rhys Dutson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1046		Miss Yvonne Locke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1047		Ms Georgina Jane Petty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1048</u>		Mr Robert Wallman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1049</u>		Mr Andy Atkins-Dotrice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1051</u>		Mrs Hazel Jessett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1052</u>		Mr Robert Coyne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1053</u>		Ms Lara Starr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1054</u>		Ms Susan Hedger	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1055</u>		Dr Dan Hoare	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1056</u>		Mr Michael Gorton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1057</u>		Mr Alun Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1058</u>		Miss Sally Murphy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1059</u>		Miss Alicia Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1060</u>		Mrs Anna Newson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1061</u>		Mr Trystan Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1062</u>		Mr David Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1063</u>		Mrs Lucinda Middleton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1064</u>		Mr Nicholas Page	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1065</u>		Mrs Sue Foot	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1066</u>		Mr Brian O'Leary	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1067</u>		Ms Linda Phelps	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1068</u>		Dr Rob Sheldon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1069</u>		Mr David Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1070</u>		Mr Paul Robertson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1071</u>		Miss Moira Chapman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1072</u>		Mr John Drewett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1073</u>		Mr Steven Shipway	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1074</u>		Mrs Nicola Taw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1075</u>		Mrs Karen Nicklin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1076</u>		Mr Mike Vickers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1077</u>		Miss Chantal Redley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1078</u>		Miss Natasha Murphy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1079</u>		Miss Helen Prandy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1080</u>		Mrs Christine Horsley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1081</u>		Mrs Susan Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1082</u>		Mr John Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1083</u>		Dr Chris Sherrington	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1084</u>		Mr Kenneth Newton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1085</u>		Ms Francesca Salmon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1086</u>		Mrs Judith Onger	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1087</u>		Mr Stephen Hinchley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1088</u>		Mr Martin Fidler Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1089</u>		Mr Graeme Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1090</u>		Mrs Patricia Fennell	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1091</u>		Mr Alec Fennell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1092</u>		Miss Peter Stronach	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1093</u>		Mr Richard Mash	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1094</u>		Mr Sam Valente	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1095</u>		Mrs Helen Phillips	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1096</u>		Mrs Sue Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1097</u>		Mr Paul Howard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1099</u>		Mrs Vicki Gardner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1100</u>		Mr Peter Harris	Same person as OBJ0017	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1101</u>		Mrs Lynnette Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1102</u>		Mr George Baldock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1103</u>		Miss Nancy Nussb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1104</u>		Mrs Diana Golding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1105</u>		Mr Peter Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1106</u>		Dr Katharine Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1107</u>		Ms Vicky Duckworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1108</u>		Mr Alan Chambers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1109</u>		Mr Sean Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1110</u>		Mr David Brede	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1111</u>		Mrs Alana Loughran	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1112</u>		Mr Chris Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1113</u>		Miss Jean Gerrard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1114</u>		Carlton Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1115</u>		Miss Louise McCartney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1116</u>		Mrs Wendy Gale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1117</u>		Mr Ben Payne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1118</u>		Mr Philip Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1119</u>		Mr Brian Daniels	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1120</u>		Mrs Pauline Rosenberg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1121</u>		Mr Julian Doyle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1122</u>		Miss Dawn Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1123</u>		Dorothy E. Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1124</u>		Lewis Thomson	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ1125</u>		Steven Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1126</u>		Miss Vicky Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1127</u>		Stephen Emery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1128</u>		Mr Hadyn Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1129</u>		Mr Mel Kemp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1130</u>		Jude BaileyMurfin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1131</u>		Miss Katie Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1132</u>		Mr Thomas Simcock	Same person as OBJ0111	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1133</u>		Andy Myles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1134</u>		Mrs Teresa Greally	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1135</u>		Mr Richard Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1136</u>		Mr Oliver Glenister	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1137</u>		Mr Mike Kellett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1139</u>		Mrs Heather Rowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1140</u>		Nicky Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1141</u>		Patrick Driscall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1142</u>		Mr John Cartlidge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1143</u>		Rachael Hopley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1144</u>		Christopher Kirby-Lambert	Same person as OBJ0109	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1145</u>		Miss Bethan Casseldine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1146</u>		Miss Natalie Wylde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1147</u>		Mrs Vera McCarthy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1148</u>		Shannon Francis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1149		Mr Chris Knapman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1150		Mr Gerard Fordham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1151		Pippa Bartolotti	Same person as OBJ1027	Withdrawn	
OBJ1152		Peter Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1153		Mr Hywel Arnold	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1154		Mr Stephen Dungey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1155		Mr Martin Clift	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1156		Mr Geri Foster-Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1157		Mrs Sarah Reed	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1158		Mr Christopher Brimble	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1159		Mrs J C Mackenzie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1160		Gillian Bourn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1161		Mrs Della Lack	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1162		Mrs Emma Cram	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ1163		Mr Daniel Jenkins-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1164		Mr Kevin Sparkes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1165		Dr Ian Francis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1166		Mrs Sophie Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1167		Geoff Gibbs	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1168		Dr Alasdair and Dr Susanna Jacks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1169		Mr Richard Groves	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1170		Mr Justin Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1171		Miss Annabel Osborn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1172		Miss Kate Reece	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1173		Miss Alex Hoffrock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1174		Miss Sara Watkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1175		Mr Stephen Shutt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1176		Jo Webb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1177		Mr Maurice Wilkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1178		Mrs Lynn Gazal	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1179		Mr Ian Johnstone	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1180		Mrs Anne Marie Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1181		Meyrick Jone	Same person as OBJ0143	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1182</u>		Mrs Linda Laurenson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1183</u>		Mrs Wendy Hartrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1184</u>		Mr Ian Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1185</u>		Mr Mike Ricketts Hein	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1186</u>		Miss Penny Kingsley Poynter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1187</u>		Eleanor Wade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1188</u>		Sharon Hodgkiss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1189</u>		Miss Gwenan Jenkins-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1190</u>		Mr Simon Hugheston-Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1191</u>		Kristibelle Hart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1192</u>		Mr Harry Bellew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1193</u>		Miss Alison Enticknap	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1194</u>		Dr Mark Donovan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1195</u>		Dr Chiara Ceci	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1196</u>		Phil Bennington	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1197</u>		Valerie Conniff	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1198</u>		Julia James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1199</u>		John Dransfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1200</u>		Barbara Spence	Same person as OBJ0128	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1201</u>		Ms Pat Barlow Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1202</u>		John Waters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1203</u>		Mr Mark Hipkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1204</u>		Iain Barclay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1205</u>		Dr Martin Kaye	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1206</u>		Mr Robert Leeder	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1207</u>		Camilla Edlin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1208</u>		Mr Grant Powney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1209</u>		Ms Alexandra Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1210</u>		Mr Antony Sanderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1211</u>		Miss Philippa Northcott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1212</u>		Miss Anna Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1213</u>		Miss C Alexander	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ1214</u>		Dr Stuart Pringle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1215</u>		Miss Shaun Steiner-Goldberg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1216</u>		Tom Eyles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1217</u>		Katharine Pitts-Tucker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1218</u>		Dr Mark Avery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1219</u>		Mr Christopher Goding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1220</u>		Mrs Jocelyn Gould	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1221</u>		Dr Oliver Fox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1222</u>		Mr Simon Crockford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1223</u>		Dr Barry Yates	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1224</u>		Mr Ben Andrew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1225</u>		Mr David Allan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1226</u>		Mr Robert Morsley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1227</u>		Mr Dean Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1228</u>		Mr Ben McCarthy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1229</u>		Mr Les Wallace	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1230</u>		Ms Ann Leeuwewerke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1231</u>		Mr Alan Turnbull	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1232</u>		Eliza Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1233</u>		Mr Joe Costley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1234</u>		Mr Tim Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1235</u>		Mr Tim Pankhurst	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1236</u>		Rob Hepworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1237</u>		Mrs Marion Moss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1238</u>		Mrs Ann Clemison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1239</u>		Mrs Liz O'Hanlon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1240</u>		Mr Brian Egan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1241</u>		Mr Mark Grieve	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1242</u>		Mr Matt Merritt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1243</u>		Mr John Olley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1244</u>		Ms Juliette Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1245</u>		Mrs Jean Hodgkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1246</u>		Lesley Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1247</u>		Mr Malcolm Ware	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1248</u>		Miss Jacqueline Fleet	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1249</u>		Mr Andy Field	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1250</u>		Miss Gabriella Keaney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1251</u>		Mr Tony James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1252</u>		Anita Howard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1253</u>		Mrs Marianne Longstaff	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1254</u>		Alissa Pemberton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1255</u>		Miss Karen R Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1256</u>		Michelle Househam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1257</u>		Mr Phil Hyde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1258</u>		Christine Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1259</u>		Miss Nicola Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1260</u>		Nigel Cottle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1261</u>		Mr Ron Walsh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1262</u>		Arnold Woolley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1263</u>		Sharon Nevin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1264</u>		Mr James Mowat	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1265</u>		Mrs Elisabeth Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1266</u>		Andrew Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1267</u>		Howard Mellett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1268</u>		Mr Dave Peck	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1269</u>		Frances Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1270</u>		Mr Carl Downing	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1271</u>		Mrs Jenny Nesbitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1272</u>		Miss Doris McLean	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1273</u>		Louise Sullivan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1274</u>		Miss Andrea Godsell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1275</u>		Miss Mark Flack	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1276</u>		Mr Peter O'Duffy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1277</u>		Miss Jean Johnston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1278</u>		Miss Sharon Caughey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1279</u>		Mrs Lindsay Osborn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1280</u>		Dr Alistair Galley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1281</u>		Miss Sian Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1282</u>		Alice Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1283</u>		Mr Brian Russell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1284</u>		Mr Joe Winstanley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1285		Mr Bob Crook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1286		Dr Andrew Cooke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1287		Mr Jeffrey Wragg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1288		Mr Ian Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1289		Miss Nina O'Hanlon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1290		Mr Pete Burgin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1291		Mr Alan Gribben	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1292		Mrs Lyndsey Maiden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1293		Mr Stuart Allington	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1294		Mrs Valerie Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1295		Miss Beth Aucott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1296		Mr Jim Peters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1297		Mr David Church	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1298		Mr Andrew Lucas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1299		Mr Stewart Abbott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1300		Mr Mike Douglas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1301		Miss Maria R	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1302		Mr Edward King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1303		Mr Robert Ince	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1304		Miss Samantha King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1305		Mrs Jane Mcvickers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1306		Mrs Michelle Iles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1307		Mr John Cromarty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1308		Mrs Natalie Avey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1309		Mr Robert Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1310		Mr Kevin Rush	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1311		Mr Martyn Fletcher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1312		Mrs Kirsty Brannan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1313		Mr John Butterfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1314		Miss Lis Daly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1315		Mr Robert Barnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1316		Mr Keith Bowser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1317		Mr Martin Pollard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1318		Mr Paul Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1319		Mr Paul Glading	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1320		Mr John Blewett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1321		Miss Leela O'Dea	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1322		Mrs Rosemary Ashworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1323		Mrs Linda Moore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1324		Mr Philip Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1325		Mr Jonathan Wallace	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1326		Mr Malcolm Hawkes	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1327		Mrs Sarah Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1328		Mr Graham Rowling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1329		Mr Greg Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1330		Ms Steph Elliott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1331		Mr Stuart Foster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1332		Mr Roger Pannell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1333		Julian Vallance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1334		Mr Bruce Martin	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1335		Mr Neil Heath	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1336		Andrew McDermid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon • Traffic • Flooding • Economics 		WG-REB-OBJ1336 WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB ID/073
OBJ1337		Mr Hugh Brazier	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1338		Miss Lehanne Thornton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1339		Miss Megan Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1340		Mr Steven Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1341		Mr Nick P Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1342		Mr Anthony Perry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1343		Ms Jenny Scholfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1344		Dr Mike Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1345		Mr G Edge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1346		Mr Erasmus zu Ermgassen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1347		Mr Jonathan Pinnick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1348		Miss Jill Rixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1349		Mr John Sleaford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1350		Mrs Jo Crabtree	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1351		Mr Mark Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1352		Ms R Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1353</u>		Dr Michael Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1354</u>		Rob McPherson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1355</u>		Mr Paul Walden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1356</u>		Miss Catharine Shellswell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1357</u>		Mr Will Soar	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1358</u>		Mr Terence Marsden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1359</u>		Mr Steve Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1360</u>		Mrs Anna Robertson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1361</u>		Ceri Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1362</u>		Mark Balch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1363</u>		Mr Terry Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1364</u>		Mr Neil Harnott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1365</u>		Mr Neville Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1366</u>		Dr Sally Huband	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1367</u>		Mrs Cristina Parker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1368</u>		C Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1369</u>		Mr Giles Bradshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1370</u>		Ms Susan Richardson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1371</u>		Mr Clive Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1372</u>		Mr Dean Fenton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1373</u>		Mr Mike Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1374</u>		Dr Russell Holden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1375</u>		Mr Craig O'Brien	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1376</u>		Dr Paul Horswill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1377</u>		Prof Steve Ormerod	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1378</u>		Mr Nigel Scriven	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1379</u>		Mr Jonathan Bye	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1380</u>		Mr Will Meredith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1381</u>		Mrs Donna Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1382</u>		Mrs Wendy Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1383</u>		David James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1384</u>		Mr John Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1385</u>		Mr Thomas Sutcliffe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1386</u>		Miss Alex Russell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1387		Genevieve Dalley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1388		Dr Andrew Baird	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1389		Sally Simmons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1390		Mr Adam Miller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1391		Mr John Ravenscroft	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1392		Mr Phil Burfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1393		Mrs Sophie McCulloch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1394		Ms Brianna Reid	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1395		Miss Laura Mears	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1396		Nia Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1397		Mr Mervyn Lowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1398		Miss Tanya Johnson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1399		Mr David Howell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1400		Mr Adam Bourns	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1401		Mr Matt Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1402		Dipti Patel	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1403		Ms Jessica Chappell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1404		Malcolm Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1405		Mr Samuel Witham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1406		Mrs Lucy Bjorck	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1407		Mrs Jo Koszel	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1408		Mr Nick Tribe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1409		Dr Nathan Richardson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1410		Miss Katharine Holmes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1411		Lizzie Dealey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1412		Mr Graeme Wallace	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1413		Dr Dieter Hoffmann	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1414		Miss Amy Batchelor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1415		Miss Carolyn Sherratt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1416		Mrs Caroline Masters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1417		Mr Edward Stevens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1418		Mr Phil Pickett	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1419		Miss Helen Bradley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1420		Scott Fryer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1421</u>		Lynda Clarkson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1422</u>		Ms Rosalind Sampson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1423</u>		Miss Rhianne Cakebread	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1424</u>		Mr John Landais	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1425</u>		Helen Croft	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1426</u>		Emily Cunningham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1427</u>		Miss Deborah Croker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1428</u>		Dr Ian McLean	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1429</u>		Mrs Sue Birchall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1430</u>		James Anderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1431</u>		Mr Thomas Lancaster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1432</u>		Mr Mali Halls	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1433</u>		Ms Claire Perrens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1434</u>		Helen Houghton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1435</u>		Mr Mark Black	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1436</u>		Mr Dennis Patton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1437</u>		Mr Martin Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1438</u>		Ms Steffeny McGiffen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1439</u>		Mrs Eleri Norris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1440</u>		Dr Sarah Manchester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1441</u>		Mr Alister Clunas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1442</u>		Mrs Laura Perkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1443</u>		Miss Zoe Parker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1444</u>		Clive Shakesheff	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1445</u>		Eleanor Hanrahan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1446</u>		Mr Dean Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1447</u>		Mrs Chrissy Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1448</u>		Mr Ben Jackson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1449</u>		Mr Daniel Grace	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1450</u>		Dr Alex Pollard MCIEEM MRSB	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1451</u>		Mr Jonathan Symons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1452</u>		Mrs Martha Halford-Fumagalli	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1453		Mr Roger Crofts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1454		Karen Hyde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1455		Mr Iain Johnson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1456		Dr Tom Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1457		Mrs Sharon Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1458		Mr Robert Hook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1459		Matt Davies	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1460		Anthony Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1461		Mr Ian Armstrong	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1462		Prof John Altringham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1463		Anthony Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1464		Mr Paul Thornton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1465		Max Barclay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1466		Miss Kerry Milligan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1467		Mr Simon Harrap	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1468		Mr Martin Kettell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1469		Mr Peter Otley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1470		Mr Neil Douglas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1471		Mx Anand Prasad	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1472		Renee LaScala	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1473		Bethia Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1474		Sinead Lynch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1475		Mr Michael Hoult	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1476		Miss Sandra Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1477		Charlotte Guillain	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1478		Mr Andrew Bevan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1479		Mr Daniel Turner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1480		Mrs Jane Baines-Holmes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1481		Mr David Roche	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1482		Mrs Jacqueline Venn-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1483		Mrs Kristina Carroll	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1484		Mrs Stella Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1485		Clare Harrington	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1486		Mr Ben Wynde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1487		Ms Irene Stowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1488		Gemma Bode	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1489		Mr Daniel Alexander	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1490		Mrs Caroline Rigg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1491		Peter Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1492		Mrs Joan Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1493		Mr William Jenman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1494		Rachel Hackett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1495		Mr Patrick Stirling-Aird	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1496		Henry Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1497		Ms Pamela Stevens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1498		Mr Ian Watson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1499		Mr Jonathan Heath	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1500		Mr Martin Wigley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1501		Mr Stephen Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1502		Mr Leigh Canham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1503		Mr Glenn Bishton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1504		Rachel Griffiths	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1505		Mrs Jacqueline Hull	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1506		Rev 'o-Dzin Tridral	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1507		Dr Michael Peacock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1508		Miss Lucy Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1509		Mr Paul Beevers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1510		Dr Chris Andrews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1511		Prof Timothy Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1512		Mr Daniel Heptinstall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1513		Mr Charles Nathan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1514		Mr Tim Weaver	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1515		Miss Michelle Flynn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1516		Mr Derick Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1517		Ms Julie Lee	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1518		Mr T Anderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1519		Mrs Sally Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1520		Mr Allan Hunton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1521		Mr Daniel Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1522		Prof David Norman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1523		Miss Caroline McAdam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1524		Mr John Miller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1525		Mr Marcus Rhodes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1526		Mr Keith Ballard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1527		Susan Hiscox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1528		Mr Anthony Wesselbaum	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1529		Mr Julian Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1530		Mrs H R Kirk [B.E.M.]	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1531		Mr Brian Horswill	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1532		Mrs Gwyneth Ramsey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1533		Miss Naomi Nelson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1534			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1535		Leanne Manchester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1536		Mr Douglas Radford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1537		Dr Emily Joachim	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1538		Mr Philip Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1539		Mr Christopher Woodham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1540		Mr Paul Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1541		Mr Matthew Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1542		Margaret Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1543		Karen Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1544		Ms Maggie Wilcox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1545		Dr Ieuan Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1546		Ms Kate Cartmell Done	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1547		Mrs Elizabeth Baum	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1548		Mr Rob Curtis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1549		Mr Brian Chapman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1550		Jonathan & Fiona Stone	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ1551		Miss Sue Hyde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1552		Eddie Urbanski	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1553		Mr William John Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1554</u>		Miss M A Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1555</u>		Miss Nathaniel Dargue	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1556</u>		Mr Richard Stow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1557</u>		Miss Alice Bricogne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1558</u>		Mr Justin Tunstall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1559</u>		Mr Michael Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1560</u>		Mr John Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1561</u>		Mr Steve Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1562</u>		Mr Peter Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1563</u>		Miss Margaret Nicholson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1564</u>		Dr Rob Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1565</u>		Mr Mark Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1566</u>		Ms Juliet Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1567</u>		Mr Jack Devlin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1568</u>		Estelle Bailey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1569</u>		Dr Anthony Caravaggi	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1570</u>		Mr Callum Peel	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1571</u>		Mrs Ingrid Budge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1572</u>		Ms Katie Fuller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1573</u>		Miss Lucy Rouse	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1574</u>		Miss Elinor Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1575</u>		Miss Rachel Stickler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1576</u>		Mr John Boorman	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1577</u>		Mr Stephen Meek	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1578</u>		Mr Christopher Baldock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1579</u>		Mr Nicholas Carter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1580</u>		Mr Chris Foster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1581</u>		Mr Colin Matthews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1582</u>		Mrs Pauline Greenhalgh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1583</u>		Mrs Karren Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1584</u>		John Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1585</u>		Ms Vicky Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1586</u>		Sophie Paterson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1587</u>		Miss Shannon Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1588</u>		Miss Zoe Deakin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1589</u>		Mrs Lausanne Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1590</u>		Dr Viola Ross-Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1591</u>		Mr Michael Lush	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1592</u>		Mr David Beveridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1593</u>		Mrs Sarah Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1594</u>		Mrs Kerry Swinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1595</u>		Mr Bill Bisgood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1596</u>		Mr Nicholas Foster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1597</u>		Miss Luned Defis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1598</u>		Mr Wayne Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1599</u>		Claire B Vallance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1600</u>		Mrs Celia Bryant	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1601</u>		Mrs Lynne Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1602</u>		Mr Gerry O'Rourke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1603</u>		Ms Sarah-Jane Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1604</u>		Mr Bob Elliot	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1605</u>		Mr Keith Nichols	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1606</u>		Ms Giselle Sterry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1607</u>		Ms Rebecca Pitman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1608</u>		Mr Paul Frost	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1609</u>		Mr Anthony Godber	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1610</u>		Ms Clare Birch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1611</u>		Miss Henry Rothwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1612</u>		Christine Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1613</u>		Miss Karen Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1614</u>		Miss Kate Thorpe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1615</u>		Mr Arne Swithenbank	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1616</u>		Miss Hayley Blackwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1617</u>		Fay Mansell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1618</u>		Mrs Liz Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1619</u>		Mr Ray Tier	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1620</u>		Mrs Jo Whitfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1621</u>		Miss Rachel Henson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1622</u>		Mr Allen Stevens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1623</u>		Mrs Sandra Padfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1624</u>		Miss Rosemary Holden	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1625</u>		Mrs Marilyn Jones Barnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1626</u>		Mr Simon Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1627</u>		Mrs Natalie Matthews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1628</u>		Miss Kirsty Franklin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1629</u>		Mr Ben Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1630</u>		Mr Alex Humphreys-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1631</u>		Mr John Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1632</u>		Mrs Gill Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1633</u>		Ms Sarah Blake	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1634</u>		Miss Jenny Donelan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1635</u>		Miss Stephanie Leese	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1636</u>		Mr Joe Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1637</u>		Miss Lis Daly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1638</u>		Mrs Sarah Fraser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1639</u>		Mr Ben Fraser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1640</u>		Mr Dylan Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1641</u>		Mr Steve Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1642</u>		Mr Steve Gillings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1643</u>		Mrs Elizabeth Postles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1644</u>		Lesley Dance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1645</u>		Mr Paul Irving	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1646</u>		Mr Albert Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1647</u>		Mr Graham Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1648</u>		Tom Hackett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1649</u>		Mr Drew Lyness	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1650</u>		Mr Ronald Kinrade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1651</u>		Miss Thea Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1652</u>		Mr Nick Roden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1653</u>		Dr Nuvraj Sanghera	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1654</u>		Mrs Christine Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1655</u>		Mr Scott Chalmers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1656</u>		Mr Jonathan Blackmore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1657</u>		Miss Julia Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1658</u>		Miss Margaret Payne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1659</u>		Mr Ian Spence	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1660</u>		Miss Sharon Locke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1661</u>		Mr Jon Barker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1662</u>		Mr Stephen Jennings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1663</u>		Mr Stewart Whitworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1664</u>		Miss Bethan Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1665</u>		Mr Howard Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1666</u>		Mr Phillip Thackeray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1667</u>		Ms Stephanie Samphire	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1668</u>		Mr Jack Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1669</u>		Mr Andrew Mart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1670</u>		Mrs Rebecca Micklem	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1671</u>		Mrs Karen Guthrie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1672</u>		Miss Jeremy Robson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1673</u>		Mr Geoff Jeffrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1674</u>		Mr Jerry Kinsley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1675</u>		Mr Tim Lennox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1676</u>		Mr Cody Levine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1677</u>		Mr Stephen Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1678</u>		Mr Oliver Clanford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1679</u>		Mr Giles Turnbull	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1680</u>		Mr Julian Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1681</u>		Mr Andy Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1682</u>		Miss Erin Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1683</u>		Mr Vic Doyle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1684</u>		Ms Katy Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1685</u>		Mr Julian Rosser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1686</u>		Miss Stella Woodman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1687		Dr Rosemary Cockerill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1688		Mrs Aby Harrison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1689		Mr John McKinnie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1690		Mr Chris Johnson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1691		Miss Philippa Lucas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1692		Mrs Julie Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1693		Mr Steven Savage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1694		Mrs Caroline Gellor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1695		Miss Sue Everett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1696		Mr Jon Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1697		Mrs Annette Soar	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1698		Mr Peter Rafferty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1699		Mr Colin Lougher	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ1700		Chris Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1701		Mrs Audrey Rafferty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1702		Mr Pete Martin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1703		Ms Jacqui Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1704		Stephen Le Quesne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1705		Ms Emily Lloyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1707		Mrs Christine Von Hagen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1708		Mr Cameron Keily	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1709		Mr Logan Steele	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1710		Mr Chris McNaghten	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1711		Mr Mike Smelt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1712		Mr Simon Webb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1713		Mrs Heather Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1714		Mr Matt Swaine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1715		Mrs Eve Templeton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1716		Ms Katherine Hamper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1717		Prof Nessa Carey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1718		Prof Tim Blackburn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1719		Mr Anthony Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1720</u>		Mrs Sophie Cooper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1721</u>		Mr Justin Hood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1722</u>		Mrs Sarah Haine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1723</u>		Alex	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1724</u>		Dr Pablo Orozco	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1725</u>		Miss Camille Felouzis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1726</u>		Prof Kevin Gaston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1727</u>		Mr John Ingham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1728</u>		Mrs Mel Stewart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1729</u>		Claire Deacon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1730</u>		Mr Mark Underhill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1731</u>		Mr Robert Walthew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1732</u>		Kevin Clements	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1733</u>		Miss B Kelly	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1734</u>		Mr Richard Mason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1735</u>		Mr Martin McGill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1736</u>		Mr Andrew Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1737</u>		Mr Christopher Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1738</u>		Mr Mike Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1739</u>		Mr Peter Massini	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1740</u>		Robert McEwen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1741</u>		Ms Jane Mason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1742</u>		Mrs Penny Richards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1743</u>		Mrs Isabel Jackson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1744</u>		Dr Renata Medeiros	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1745</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1746</u>		J M Gorry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1747</u>		Mrs Sarah Russell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1748</u>		Mr Philip Ayles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1749</u>		Mrs Jane Armitage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1750</u>		Miss Peter Alfrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1751</u>		Mr Andrew Crutchley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1752</u>		Mr Gary White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1753</u>		Mr Mark Duffell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1754</u>		Nicky Williamson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1755</u>		Mr Simon Tucker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1756</u>		Dr Adrian Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1757</u>		Miss Amy Liptrot	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1758</u>		Miss Sue Gent	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1759</u>		Mrs Kate Genesi	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1760</u>		Mrs Leigh Forman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1761</u>		Miss Holly Showell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1762</u>		Miss Alison Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1763</u>		Ms Trudi Clamp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1764</u>		Mr Steven Bradbury	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1765</u>		Mr Ed Goddard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1766</u>		Ms Kirstie Armitage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1767</u>		Ms Karen Maddock-Jones	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1768</u>		Lynne Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1769</u>		Oliver Gorrigan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1770</u>		Mrs Iona Macphie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1771</u>		Mr Paul Heare	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1772</u>		Miss Barbara Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1773</u>		Ms Sarah Jaques	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1774</u>		Mr Kevin Sharpe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1775</u>		Mrs Kay Ball	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1776</u>		Mrs Donna Dean	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1777</u>		Mrs Carol Chapmam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1778</u>		Mrs Gladys Grant	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1779</u>		Sally Harries	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1780</u>		Mr Andy Teasdale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1781</u>		Dr Richard Scorer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1782</u>		Miss Julia Migne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1783</u>		Mrs Therese Smout	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1784</u>		Mr Jim Baldwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1785</u>		Miss Bethan Dalton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1786</u>		Paul Chambers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1787</u>		Tamasine Stretton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1788</u>		Ms Amy Christie	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1789</u>		Mr Stuart Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1790</u>		Mr Geoff Sawers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1791</u>		Claire Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1792</u>		Miss C M White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1793</u>		Mr Andy Holden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1794</u>		Ms Anita Joysey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1795</u>		Mr Philip Hurst	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1796</u>		Mr Steven Penn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1797</u>		Miss Sally Hind	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1798</u>		Mr Steve Todd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1799</u>		Ms Ingunn Ruffles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1800</u>		Miss Diana Tuson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1801</u>		Miss Sophie Barrell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1802</u>		Mr Michael Clifford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1803</u>		Miss Lisa Mobley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1804</u>		Mr Marc Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1805</u>		Ms Erica Halliday	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1806</u>		Chris Wynne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1807</u>		Mr John Davis	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ1808</u>		Mr Tim Poole	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1809</u>		Miss Lesley Gore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1810</u>		Reverend Capt Charles Thody	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1811</u>		Mr David Carson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1812</u>		Mrs Jackie Stevens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1813</u>		Mr Peter Bagshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1814</u>		Mr Trevor Riddle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1815</u>		Jane Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1816</u>		James Byrne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1817</u>		Charlotte Rowley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1818</u>		Audrey Evans	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1819</u>		Alice Fairnie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1820</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1821</u>		Paul Wise	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1822</u>		Amanda Hurst	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1823</u>		Katrina Rigby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1824</u>		Mr Peter Bagshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1825</u>		Mr Cameron Keily	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1826</u>		Mrs Christine Von Hagen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1827</u>		Mr Howard Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1828</u>		Miss Bethan Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1829</u>		Mr Jack Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1830</u>		Mrs Jane Armitage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1831</u>		Mr Phillip Thackeray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1832</u>		Ms Stephanie Samphire	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1833</u>		Miss Lucy Rouse	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1834</u>		Mrs Karen Guthrie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1835</u>		Miss Jeremy Robson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1836</u>		Mr Martin Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1837</u>		Mr Dennis Patton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1838</u>		Mrs Rebecca Micklem	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1839</u>		Mr Geoff Jeffrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1840</u>		Mr Brian Horswill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1841</u>		Mrs Gwyneth Ramsey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1842</u>		Ms Teresa Fowler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1843</u>		Mrs Rhian Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1844</u>		Mr Stephen Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1845</u>		Mr Martin Bailey-Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1846</u>		Miss Hannah Scott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1847</u>		Mr Ashley Crombet-Beolens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1848</u>		Ms Susan Fleming	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1849</u>		Mrs Heather Clare	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1850</u>		Miss Helen Peck	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1851</u>		Mr Robert Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1852</u>		Mrs Margaret Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ1853		Dr Mike Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1854		Mr Simon Craft	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1855		Mr Alistair Lockett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1856		Mr David Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1857		Mr Matthew Wyre	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1858		Mrs Fiona Karbal	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1859		Mrs Jean Mottershead	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1860		Mr Peter Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1861		Ms Mandy Marsh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1862		Mr Alan Durham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1863		Miss Steve Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1864		Mrs Pamela James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1865		Mr David Husband	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1866		Ms Chriss O'Connell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1867		Miss Rachel Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1868		Miss Shelley Hamilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1869		Mrs Nicola Chester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1870		Miss Jean Gerrard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1871		Ms Michell Chubb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1872		Mr Andrew Twyman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1873		Mr David-John Newman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1874		Dr Paul Fitzpatrick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1875		Miss Sheila Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1876		Mrs Jennifer Vaudin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1877		Mr Ian Wicks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1878		Dr Gwyneth Denver Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1879		Mr Ken Barker	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1880		Mr Dave Hilliard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1881		Ms Gail Courtney	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ1882		Mr Mark Crutchley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1883		Miss Lisa Bromley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ1884		Mr Jim Flanagan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1885</u>		Mr Michael Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1886</u>		Mr Delwyn Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1887</u>		Dr Robert McEwen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1888</u>		Mrs Suzanne Finlay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1889</u>		Ms Sue Maguey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1890</u>		Mr Paul Glading	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1891</u>		Mr Michael Henwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1892</u>		Mrs Ellen Kershaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1893</u>		Miss Jeanette Harrison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1894</u>		Mrs Rachael Hayward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1895</u>		Mr Andrew Morton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1896</u>		Mr Marc Stanley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1897</u>		Mrs Tracey Mckay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1898</u>		Mrs Jennifer Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1900</u>		Miss Carrie-Anne Judge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1901</u>		Mrs Pamela Simmons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1902</u>		Mrs Jane Collett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1903</u>		Mr Bryan Collett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1904</u>		Mrs Sandra Gibbons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1905</u>		Mr David Harriss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1906</u>		Ms Shan Lloyd-Packer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1907</u>		Mrs Michele Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1908</u>		Miss Dianna Gunby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1909</u>		Mr Paul Curson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1910</u>		Mr Andy Wattson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1911</u>		Miss Gaynor Hodge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1912</u>		Mr Michael Burtenshaw	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1913</u>		Ms Judith Wilkings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1914</u>		Mr Peter Leppert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1915</u>		Mrs Patricia Mason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1916</u>		Mr A E King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1917</u>		Mrs Marjorie J Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1918</u>		Miss Carole Summers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1919</u>		Mrs Hazel Chadwick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1920</u>		Ms Ann Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1921</u>		Mrs Mary-Carol Gales	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1922</u>		Mr Nigel Bruce Ingleby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1923</u>		Miss George Short	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1924</u>		Mr Steven Haynes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1925</u>		Dr Sandra Domizio	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1926</u>		Mrs Amanda Stacpoole	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1927</u>		Mrs Alison Nash	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1928</u>		Mr Len Massey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1929</u>		Mr Kevin Pittman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1930</u>		Mr Simon Towers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1931</u>		Dr David Guyoncourt	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1932</u>		Mrs Jennifer Woodman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1933</u>		Miss Elaine St Leger	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1934</u>		Mr Martin Keefe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1935</u>		Ms Ceri Dunstan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1936</u>		Mr Robert O'Connor BSc. GradCIEEM	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1937</u>		Mr Gareth Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1938</u>		Mrs Rose Gill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1939</u>		Ms Helen Gough	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1940</u>		Ms Tracey Lovering	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1941</u>		Mr Geoffrey Walton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1942</u>		Mr Gerald Cannon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1943</u>		Mrs Laura Warner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1944</u>		Miss Charlotte McKeggie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1945</u>		Mrs Rachel Beardsmore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1946</u>		Mr Michael Rodwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1947</u>		Mr Hedley Nichols	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1948</u>		Mrs Sue Johncock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1949</u>		Ms Christine Toland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1950</u>		Miss Fran Hollinrake	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1951</u>		Miss Michele Speirs	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1952</u>		Mrs Samantha Clews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1953</u>		Mrs Janet Meredith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1954</u>		Mr Michael Pinnock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1955</u>		Mrs Jackie Butler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1956</u>		Mr Robert Sato	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1957</u>		Mrs Carrina Rowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1958</u>		Mrs Dawn Locke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1959</u>		Mr Jason Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1960</u>		Mr Mark Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1961</u>		Mr Peter Trigg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1962</u>		Ms Esther Roebuck	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1963</u>		Ms Ruthi Brandt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1964</u>		Mrs Ann Powrie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1965</u>		Miss Anne-Marie Hewitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1966</u>		Mr Daniel Middlewood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1967</u>		Mrs Heather Brayshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1968</u>		Mr Andrew White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1969</u>		Mrs Ann Johnson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1970</u>		Miss Rachel Hamilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1971</u>		Mrs Michelle Hennessy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1972</u>		Miss Claire Edmonds	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1973</u>		Mrs Jo Hollingshead	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1974</u>		Mr Stuart Fraser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1975</u>		Ms Margaret King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1976</u>		Mr Keith Gosling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1977</u>		Mrs Beverley Brock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1978</u>		Mrs S Watkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1979</u>		Mrs Angela Blackshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1980</u>		Mrs Jennifer Lees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1981</u>		Mr David Perks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ1982</u>		Mrs Glenis Blakiston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1983</u>		Mrs Brigitta MacMillan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1984</u>		Mrs Karan Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1985</u>		Mr Paul Lilley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1986</u>		Mr Ian Thomson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1987</u>		Mrs Claire Townsend	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1988</u>		Miss Jess D'Arcy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1989</u>		Mrs Caroline Dallimore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1990</u>		Mrs Denise Ramsden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1991</u>		Miss Emily King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1992</u>		Mr P Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1993</u>		Miss Annabelle Tipper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1994</u>		Dr Paul Hayes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1995</u>		Mrs Eileen Allan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1996</u>		Mr John Jakeman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1997</u>		Mr Mike Cleary	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ1998</u>		Mrs Vivien Thornber	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ1999</u>		Mrs Carol Anne Lloyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2000</u>		Miss Jane McKay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2001</u>		Ms Linda Cartlidge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2002</u>		Mrs Jean Coombes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2003</u>		Miss Diana Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2004</u>		Mr Chris Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2005</u>		Mr Brian Dorsett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2006</u>		Mrs Maureen Daniels	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2007</u>		Mrs Elaine Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2008</u>		Mr Roger Ackroyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2009</u>		Mrs Sarah Perrin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2010</u>		Rev Paul Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2011</u>		Mr Peter Sandell	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2012</u>		Miss Andrea Wiskin	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2013</u>		Mr Giles Broomfield	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2014</u>		Miss Sue Albiston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2015</u>		Mr Tim Fox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2016</u>		Miss Juliet Kavanagh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2017</u>		Miss Zoe Chappell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2018</u>		Mr Peter Mittins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2019</u>		Ms Tricia Rice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2020</u>		Mrs Philippa Pickworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2021</u>		Ms Rowan Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2022</u>		Mr David Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2023</u>		Mrs Lyn Goswell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2024</u>		Mrs Pamela Warren	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2025</u>		Mr Colin Rose	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2026</u>		Ms Sharron Goddard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2027</u>		Mr Tony Kilker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2028</u>		Miss M Jennifer Meredith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2029</u>		Mrs Marian Hussenbux	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2030</u>		Mr Philip Key	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2031</u>		Ms Annabel Brown	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2032</u>		Miss Patricia Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2033</u>		Mrs Cornelia Bower	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2034</u>		Mr Robert Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2035</u>		Mrs Amanda Price	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ2036</u>		Ms Julie Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2037</u>		Miss Hannah Withers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2038</u>		Mrs Chris Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2039</u>		Mr Pete Griffith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2040</u>		Ms Christine Shields	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2041</u>		Mrs Dawn Walton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2042</u>		Mr David Cohen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2043</u>		Mrs Mary Betteridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2044</u>		Mrs Jackie White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2045</u>		Mrs Tom and Sandra Unite	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2046</u>		Mr Brian Witty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2048</u>		Mr Gregory Snelgrove	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2049</u>		Miss Selma Rauf	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2050</u>		Mr Ray Poole	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2052</u>		Mrs Heather Procter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2053</u>		Mr Gavin Whitelock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2054</u>		Ms Nikki Titchard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2055</u>		Ms Dawn Bishop	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2056</u>		Mrs Gillian Hind	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2057</u>		Mr Tom Tamplin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2058</u>		Mr Athony Murray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2059</u>		Mrs Joanne Banks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2060</u>		Mr Nathanael Fisher	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2061</u>		Miss Fiona Banham	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2062</u>		Mrs Monica Cussens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2063</u>		Ms Dianne Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2064</u>		Mrs Christine Harding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2065</u>		Mrs Shirley Chesson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2066</u>		Mrs Helen Trebble	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2067</u>		Mr David Berry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2068</u>		Miss Rhian Jinny-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2069</u>		Mrs Irene Walker	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2070</u>		Mrs Joan How	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2071</u>		Mrs Priscilla Ingram	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2072</u>		Mrs Deborah McGregor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2073</u>		Mrs Margaret Meadows	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2074</u>		Mrs Gaynor Slaney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2075</u>		Mr Anthony Micklam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2076</u>		Mr Steve Beech	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2077</u>		Miss Sue Rose	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2078</u>		Mrs Natasha Welford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2079</u>		Mr John Johnson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2080</u>		Mrs Pet Rainer	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2081</u>		Mrs Pia Plummer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2082</u>		Mr Dave Perry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2083</u>		Mrs Helen Hinchley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2084</u>		Mrs Sheila Hartrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2085</u>		Mr Gerald Spencer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2086</u>		Mr Robert Spencer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2087</u>		Ms Sally Murphy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2088</u>		Mrs Anne Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2089</u>		Miss Chris Hight	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2090</u>		Mr Alan Baltzars	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2091</u>		Mr Jeremy Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2092</u>		Miss Marian McGinty	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2093</u>		Mrs Julia Jackson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2094</u>		Mr J Swinford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2095</u>		Mrs Barbara Wadsworth-Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2096</u>		Ms Jane R	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2097</u>		Mr Kevin Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2098</u>		Miss Marilyn Dance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2099</u>		Mr Keith Moores	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2100</u>		Dr David Matthews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2101</u>		Mr Paul Shorter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2102</u>		Mr Steve Carter	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2103</u>		Miss Sandra Gould	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2104</u>		Mrs Janet Bullock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2105</u>		Mrs Barbara Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2106</u>		Ms Jean Riley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2107</u>		Ms Renny Wodynska	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2108</u>		Miss Jean Mantle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2109</u>		Miss Alison Bullock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2110</u>		Mrs Gail Cartwright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2111</u>		Mr John Blewett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2112</u>		Miss Mark Doran	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2113</u>		Dr Sharon Patrick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2114		Mrs Christine Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2115		Miss G Wyatt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2116		Mrs Marilyn Jarrett	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2117		Mr Phil Thornton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2118		Miss Georgina Sherry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2119		Mrs Gaynor Slater	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2120		Dr Elizabeth Lees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2121		Miss Christine Dore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2122		Mr Graham Langston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2123		Mr John Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2124		Miss Jill Hedley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2125		Mrs Sarah Sparrow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2126		Mr Fred Boast	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2127		Miss Amanda Carson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2128		Miss Sara Garcia	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2129		Mrs Joanne Burgin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2130		Mr Vincent Savage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2131		Mr David Audley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2132		Mrs Linda Gregory	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2133		Ms Angela Coneron	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2134		Mr Matthew Cory	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2135		Mrs Pam Radford-Lamb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2136		Mr Peter Brimson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2137		Mr Richard Purcell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2138		Mrs Grettl Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2139		Mr Jonathan Ford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2140		Ms Helen Spencer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2141		Mrs Pat Hayes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2142		Mrs Christine Bennett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2143		Mr Nicholas Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2144		Mr Christopher Edgeley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2145		Miss Emma Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2146		Mr David Martens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2147		Ms Jan Hicks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2148		Miss Lorna Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2149		Miss Jennifer Wynn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2150		Mrs Maureen Shaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2151		Mrs Paula Craib	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2152		Mr Graham Crump	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2153		Mr Tim Kasoar	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2154		Mr Andrew Mackenzie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2155		Mr Julian Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2156		Mr Peter Carroll	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2157		Mrs Susan Colborne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2158		Miss Paula Prince	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2159		Mrs Linda Thomson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2160		Mrs Linda McDowell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2161		Ms Jenny Anderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2162		Miss Adam Hutt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2163		Mrs Linda Klein	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2164		Mr Lucian Warwick-Haller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2165		Mrs Lesley Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2166		Mrs Wendy Wiseman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2167		Miss Linda Sims	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2168		Mr Daniel Winter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2169		Mr Paul White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2170		Mr Hugh Tunks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2172		Mrs Margaret Houston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2173		Mr Barry Metcalfe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2174		Miss Lisa Scouler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2175		Mrs Joanne Chamberlain	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2176		Mr David Meanwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2177		Mr Jim Dustow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2178		Mr Paul Sutton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2179</u>		Mrs Jacqueline Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2180</u>		Miss Janet Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2181</u>		Mr Alan Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2182</u>		Mrs Margaret Foreman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2183</u>		Ms Annie Gregory	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2184</u>		Mr Richard Kite	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2185</u>		Ms Stephanie Hillier	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2186</u>		Mrs Karen Coombs	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2187</u>		Mr Gareth Vincent	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2188</u>		Mr Barry Harmsworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2189</u>		Mrs Sandra Leavy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2190</u>		Mrs Riki Johnson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2191</u>		Mr Mark Hollinrake	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2192</u>		Ms Catherine Glanfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2193</u>		Mr Ray Cottrell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2194</u>		Mrs Diane Fletcher	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2195</u>		Ms Janet Sherman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2196</u>		Mr Alan Street	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2197</u>		Mrs Joan Buckland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2198</u>		Ms Freni Chinoy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2199</u>		Mr Robert Dando	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2200</u>		Mr Malcolm Best	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2201</u>		Mrs Carole Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2202</u>		Mrs Lynne Potter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2203</u>		Ms Annie Bowdler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2204</u>		Miss Shelley Hamilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2205</u>		Miss Sheila Thurgood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2206</u>		Ms Rosemary Byrde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2207</u>		Mrs Janet Barnby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2208</u>		Mrs Geralyn Crooks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2209</u>		Mrs Barbara Coward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2210</u>		Mrs Debbie Wilcox	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2211</u>		Miss Francesca Severn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2212</u>		Mrs Sue McDonald	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2213</u>		Ms Judith Dyer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2214</u>		Mrs Pam James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2215</u>		Miss Alana King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2216</u>		Mrs Suzanne Mattock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2217</u>		Mrs Jill Studd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2218</u>		Mr Trevor Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2219</u>		Ms Trish Davidson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2220</u>		Mr John Grimes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2221</u>		Ms Judith Newton	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2222</u>		Mr Christopher Harrison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2223</u>		Miss David Turner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2224</u>		Mr James Abbott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2225</u>		Ms Karen Jennings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2226</u>		Mr John Saffrette	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2227</u>		Mrs Barbara Swift	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2228</u>		Mr Rui Barros	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2229</u>		Mrs Helen Brockway	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2230</u>		Miss Cheryl Lloyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2231</u>		Mr Edward Wiseman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2232</u>		Mrs Simone Higgins	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2233</u>		Ms Laura Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2234</u>		Mrs Margaret Foxcroft	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2235</u>		Mrs Susan Kneill-Boxley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2236</u>		Mrs Linsay Milne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2237</u>		Mrs Gwyneth Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2238</u>		Miss Mary Jordan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2239</u>		Mrs Stella Westmacott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2240</u>		Mrs Anne Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2241</u>		Mr Philip Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2242</u>		Mr Haydn Madge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2243</u>		Mrs Jean Snelling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2244</u>		Mr Charles Page	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2245</u>		Mrs Alison Paterson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2246</u>		Ms Alison Reboul	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2247</u>		Mrs Christine Osborne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2248</u>		David Ramsden MBE	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2249</u>		Miss Steve Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2250</u>		Mr John Mander	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2251</u>		Mrs Hazel Amati	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2252</u>		Miss Maxine Audley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2253</u>		Mr Andrew Budd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2254</u>		Mr Sean Chapman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2255</u>		Mr Peter Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2256</u>		Mr John Gascoyne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2257</u>		Mrs Victoria Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2258</u>		Mr John Irwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2259</u>		Mrs Fay Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2260</u>		Mrs Chris Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2261</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2262</u>		Mrs Marian Simmonds	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2263</u>		Miss Leanne Seymour	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2264</u>		Ms P J Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2265</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2266</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2267</u>		Mr David Herincx	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2268</u>		Mr John Ramsden	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2269</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2270</u>		Miss J Hinman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2271</u>		Mr Ray Mumford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2272</u>		Miss Kerry-Lynn Wortley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2273</u>		Mr Ian Cotgrove	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2274</u>		Miss Jane Breeze	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2275</u>		Mr Peter Kirby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2276</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2277			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2278		Mr Michael Strutt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2279		Mrs Denise Walecka	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2280		Mr Graham Stacey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2281		Mr Michael Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2282		Mr David Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2283		Mrs Violet Burchell	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2284		Mrs Janet Widdows	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2285		Mr Quentin Given	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2286		Mrs Elisabeth Bibbings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2287		Mrs Josephine Wallis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2288		Mr Leslie Weeks	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2289			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2290		Mr Jerry Campbell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2291		Mrs J V McNamara	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2292			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2293			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2294			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2295		Ms Anne Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2296		Mr Stephen Drew	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2297			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2298		Mr Richard Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2299		Philip Bradley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2300			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2301			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2302			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2303			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2304			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2305		K Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2306		John V Boys M.A	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2307		D Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2308		Michael Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2309		A J Wall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2310			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2311			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2312			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2313			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2314			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2315			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2316			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2317			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2318			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2320			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2321			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2322		Shirley Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2323			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2324			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2325			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2326			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2327			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2328			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2329			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2330			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2331			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2332		R B Wall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2333			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2334			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2335			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2336			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2338			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2339			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2340			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2341			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2342		Mary Kelsey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2343			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2344			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2345			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2346			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2347			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2348			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2349		Ms Helen Hennerley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2350			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2351			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2352			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2353		Ms Caroline Stedman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2354		Miss Judith Worton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2355			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2356		Mrs Helen Dwyer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2357			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2358		Ms Jane Liddiard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2359			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2360			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2361			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2362			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2363			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2364			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2365		Mr Keith Cheasman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2366			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2367			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2368			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2369		Mrs Lee James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2370			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2371		Mrs Janet Tompsett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2372			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2373			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2374		Dr Stella Goldberg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2375			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2376			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2377		Lesley Wheatley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2378			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2379			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2380			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2381			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2382		Kerry Forkner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2383		Mr Ronald Allum	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2384		Mr Cyril Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2385			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2386		Mrs Rose Ravenscroft	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2387		Mrs Amanda Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2388			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2389		E Allan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2390			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2391			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2392			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2393			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2394			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2395		Dr Norman Chamberlain	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2396			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2397		Anthony Bingham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2398			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2399			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2400			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2401		Chris Teitge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2402			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2403			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2404		P Rosamond	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2405			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2406		Kay A Wardle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2407		Mr L M Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2408			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2409			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2410		Mr Peter Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2411			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2412			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2413			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2414			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2415			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2416			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2417			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2418			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2419			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2420			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2421			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2422			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2423			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2424			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2425			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2426			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2427			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2428			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2429		N G Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2430			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2431			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2432			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2433			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2434			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2435			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2436			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2437		Mrs D Gosling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2438			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2439			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2440		Mr Roger Unsworth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2441		Alison Leigh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2442			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2443			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2444			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2445			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2446			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2447			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2448			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2449			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2450			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2451		Miss Maria Scullion	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2452			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2453			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2454			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2455		Mrs Angela Guerzoni	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2456			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2457			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2458			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2459			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2460			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2461			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2462			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2463			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2464			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2466			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2467			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2468			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2469			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2470			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2471			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2472			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2473			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2474			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2475			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2476		Jane Campbell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2477			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2478			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2479		Kim Western	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
OBJ2480			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2481		Deborah Fiddament	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2482			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2483			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2484			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2485			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2486			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2487			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2488			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2489			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2490			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2491			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2492		Miss Linda Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2493			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2494			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2495			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2496			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2497			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2498		Mary Robertson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2499			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2500		Mark Perry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2501		Mrs Anna Sandfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2502			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2503			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2504			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2505		R Crowdy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2506			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2508		Elaine Blackman	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2509			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2510		Glenmore Slack	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2511		Mrs Gill Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2512			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2513			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2514			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2515			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2516			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2517		Jean McGuire	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2518		Alan Baltzars	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2519		Miss Lindsey Hodkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2520			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2521			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2522		Miss Jo Hindley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2523			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2524			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2525			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2526		Miss Mel Wilmott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2527			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2528			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2529			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2530		David Blackman	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2531			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2532			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2533			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2534		Hazel Pears	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2535		Christine Stevenson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2536			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2537			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2538			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2539		Christine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2540		Ms Janina Pomian	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2541			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2542			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2543			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2544			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2545			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2546			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2547			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2548			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2549			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2550			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2551			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2552		Marian Prince	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2553			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2554		Ms Jane Somerville	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2555		Glenys Cartmell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2556			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2557			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2558			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2559		Miss Louise Hitchen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2560			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2561		Colin Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2562			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2563			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2564			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2565			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2566			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2567			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2568			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2569			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2570		Mrs Sylvia Bain	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2571			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2573		Cynthia Legge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2574		Vicky Hunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2575			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2576			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2577			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2578			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2579			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2580			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2581			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2583			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2584			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2585		Jane Bowers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2586		Jenny Raggett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2587		Liz Spencer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2588			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2589			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2590			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2591			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2592		Mark Eldridge	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2593			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2594			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2595			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2596			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2597			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2598			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2599			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2600			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2601			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2602			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2603		Stuart Chatwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2604			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2605			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2606		A D Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2607			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2608			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2609		Karen Bartlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2610			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2611			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2612			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2613			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2614			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2615		Josephine Spencer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2616			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2617			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2618			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2620			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2621			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2622			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2623			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2624			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2625			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2626			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2627			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2628		A J Knight	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2629			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2630			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2631			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2632			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2633			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2634		Stephen Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2635			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2636		Mr Carey Lodge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2637			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2638			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2639			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2640			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2641			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2642			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2643			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2644			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2645			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2646			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2647			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2648			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2649			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2650			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2651			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2652			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2653			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2654			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2655			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2656			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2657			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2658		Mr Alan Gomersall	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2659			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2660		A E Phillips	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2661		Mr A Mayall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2662			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2663			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2664			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2665			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2667			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2668			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2669			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2670		Richard Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2671			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2672			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2673		Mr John James	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2674			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2675			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2676			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2677			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2678			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2679		Eric G Sage	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2680			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2681			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2682			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2684			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2685		J P Carlile	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2686			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2687			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2688			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2689			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2690			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2691			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2692			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2693			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2694			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2695			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2696			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2697			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2698		John F Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2699			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2700			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2701		Alan Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2702			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2703			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2704			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2705		John Makin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2706			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2707			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2708		Julia Christie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2709		Carol Hancock	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2710			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2711			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2712			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2713			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2714			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2715			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2716			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2718			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2719			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2720			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2721			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2722			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2723			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2724		Anton Duignan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2725		K Morton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2726			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2727			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2728			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2729			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2730			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2731			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2732			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2733			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2734			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2735		Jason Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2736			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2737			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2738			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2739			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2740			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2741			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2742		Julie Rolls	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2743			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2744			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2745			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2746			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2747		Janet Evans	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2748			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2749			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2750			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2751			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2752			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2753			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2754			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2755			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2756			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2757			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2758			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2759			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2760			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2761			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ2762</u>		Jane Rosser	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ2763</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2764</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2766</u>		G G S Harries	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2767</u>		Ms Ena Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2768</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2769</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2770</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2771</u>		A Postlethwaite	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2772</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2773</u>		Harry Wheate	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2774</u>		Ms Sue Dare	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2775</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2776</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2777</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2778</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2779</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2780</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2781</u>		Mr Derek West	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2782</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2783</u>		Rod Robbin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2784</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2785</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2786</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2787</u>		Mrs Susan Drever	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2788</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2789</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2790</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2791</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2792</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2793</u>		Paddie Howes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2794</u>		Penny Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2795</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2796</u>		Marie Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2797</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2798</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2799</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2800</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2801</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2802</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2803</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2804</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2805</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ2806</u>		K G Charity	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2807</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2808</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2809</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ2810</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2811			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2812			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2813			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2814			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2815			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2816			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2817			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2818		Miss L Swinhoe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2819		Frances Mayo	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2820		Paul McClaughlin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2821			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2822			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2823			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2824			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2825			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2826			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2827			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2828			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2829			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2830			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2831		Margaret Brett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2832			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2833			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2834			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2835			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2836		Peter John Potts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2837			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2838		Mrs Mary Bowman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2839			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2840			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2841			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2842			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2843			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2844			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2845			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2846		G Blundell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2847		Michelle Moore	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2848			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2849			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2850			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2851			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2852			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2853		Clare Morrice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2854			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2855			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2856			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2857		Ann Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2858			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2859		Mr Gwynedd Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2860			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2861			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2862			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2863			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2864			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2865			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2866			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2867			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2868		K L Acton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2869			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2870		Stephen Aubin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2871		Elaine Osmond	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2872			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2873			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2874			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2875			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2876		Lisa Pritchard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2877			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2878			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2879		Annie Prosser	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2880			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2881			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2883			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2884			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2885			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2887			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2888			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2889			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2890			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2891			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2892		Christine Jackson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2893			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2894			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2895			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2896			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2897			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2898			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2899			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2900			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2901			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2902			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2903		J M Montgomery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2904			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2905		Yvonne Harvey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2906			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2907			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2908			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2909			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2910			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2911		Mr Alan Camfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2912			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2913		Helen Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2914			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2915			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2916			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2917			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2919		Roy Dale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2920		T M Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2921			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2922		Mrs Margaret Rowan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2923			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2925			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2926			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2927			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2928			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2929			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2930			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2931			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2932		R Yockney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2933			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2934			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2935			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2936			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2937			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2938			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2939			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2940			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2941			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2942		Mr Adam Wells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2943			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2944			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2945		Mrs Philippa James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2946			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2947			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2948			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2949			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2950			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2951			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2952			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2953		Karen Boardman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2954			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2955			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2956			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2957		Shirley Jukes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ2958		Mrs Jennifer Andrews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2959			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2960			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2961			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2962			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2963		Jayne Johnson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2964			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2965			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2966			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2967			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2968			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2969		Mrs Penelope Newman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2970			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2971			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2972		Thelma Potts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2973		Mrs P A Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2974			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2975			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2976		Cheryl Cummings	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2977			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2978			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2979		Mrs Wendy Hatton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2980			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2981			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2982			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2983			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2984			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2985			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2986			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2987			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2988			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2989			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2990			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2991			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2992		Raymond Parsons	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ2993			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2994			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2995			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ2996			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2997			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2998			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ2999			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3000			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3001			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3002			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3003			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3004			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3005			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3006			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3007			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3008			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3009		Richard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3010			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3011			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3012		Karen Sellwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3013			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3014			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3015			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3016			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3017			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3018			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3019			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3020		John Pibworth	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3021			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3022			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3023			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3024		Jan Harding	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3025		Anne Digby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3026		Richard Wilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3027			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3028		Marisa Benjamin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3029			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3030			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3031			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3032			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3033			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3034			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3035			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3036			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3037		N R Pinde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3038			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3039			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3040			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3041			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3042			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3043			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3044			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3045			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3046			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3047			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3048			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3049			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3050			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3051			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3052			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3053		Pamela M Towlson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3054			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3055			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3056			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3057			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3058			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3059			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3060			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3061			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3062			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3063			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3064			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3065			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3066			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3067			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3068			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3069			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3071			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3072		Tom Coomer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3073		Anne C Shannon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3074			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3075			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3076			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3077			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3078			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3079			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3080			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3081			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3082			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3083			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3084			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3085			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3086			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3087			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3088		Miss Joanne Maxwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3089			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3090		Mrs J D Bagnall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3091			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3092			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3093		Mrs Ruth Griffiths	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3094			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3095			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3096			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3097			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3098			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3099		Jean Prandy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3100			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3101		Pauline Richards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3103			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3104		Wayne Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3105			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3106			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3107		Kevin Harwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3108		Rosalind Danks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3109		Mr William Rich	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3110			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3111			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3112			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3114			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3115			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3116			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3117			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3118			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3119			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3120			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3121			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3122			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3123		Miss Melissa Dewsbery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3124		Mrs Christine Knox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3125			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3126			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3127			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3128			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3129			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3130			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3131			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3132			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3133			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3134		Noel Allan	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3135			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3136			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3137			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3138		Richard Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3139			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3140			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3141			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3142			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3143			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3144			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3145			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3146		Robert Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3148			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3149			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3150			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3151			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3152			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3153			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3154			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3155			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3156			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3157			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3158			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3159			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3160			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3161			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3162			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3163		M E Merrells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3164			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3165		D Marcham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3166			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3167			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3168		Sarah Steer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3169		Jilly Newham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3170			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3171			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3172			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3173			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3174			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3175			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3176			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3177			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3178			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3179		Elaine Plummer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3180			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3181			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3183			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3184			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3185			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3186			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3187			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3188			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3189			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3190			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3191			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3192			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3193		C A Clemson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3194			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3195			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3196			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3197		Mr Trevor Barton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3198			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3199			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3200		Steve Jerrams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3201			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3202			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3203			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3204			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3205			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3206			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3207		Roderick Lees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3208			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3209			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3210			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3211			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3212			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3213			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3214		Lesley Fleming	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3215		Ms Lynne Bartlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3216			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3217			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3218		Miss Rebecca Appleby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3219			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3220			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3221			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3222			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3223		Ann Turtle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3224			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3225			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3226		Miss J A Cook	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3227			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3228			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3229			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3230			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3231		R G Spiller	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3232			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3233			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3234			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3235		Helen Arthur	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3236		Stephen Shutt	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3238			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3239			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3240			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3241			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3242			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3243			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3244			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3245			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3246			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3247			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3248			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3249			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3250			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3251			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3252			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3254			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3255			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3256		Mr John Tyrrell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3257			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3258			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3259			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3260			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3261			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3262			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3263			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3264			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3265			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3266		Jill McKeown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3267			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3268			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3269			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3270			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3271			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3272			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3273			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3274			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3275			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3276		Carolyn Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3277			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3278			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3279			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3280			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3281			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3282			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3283			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3284			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3285			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3286			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3287			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3288			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3289			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3290			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3291			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3292			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3293			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3294		Ben Gale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3295			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3296			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3297			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3298			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3299			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3300			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3301			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3302			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3303			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3304			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3305			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3306			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3307			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3308			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3309			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3310			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3311			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3312			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3313			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3314			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3315			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3316			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3317			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3318			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3319		H J Phillips	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3320			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3321			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3322			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3323			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3324		Miss Tina Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3325			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3326			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3327		Janet Thorne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3328			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3329			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3330			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3331		Miss Julie Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3332			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3333			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3334			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3335			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3336			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3337			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3338		Mr Hywel Wyn Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3339			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3340			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3341			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3342			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3343			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3344			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3345			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3346			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3347			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3348			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3349			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3350			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3351			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3352			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3353			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3354			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3355			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3356		S J Livings	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3357			Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ3358		Pamela Ireland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3359		Miss Jane Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3360		Willie O'Neill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3361			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3362			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3363			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3364			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3365			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3366			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3367			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3368		Phil Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3369			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3370			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3371		S Godwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3372			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3373		A S Kilmurray	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3374			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3375			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3376			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3377			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3378			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3379			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3380			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3381		Revd S Newby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3382		Mrs Christine Stockley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3383			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3384			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3385			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3386		Mary Rice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3387			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3388			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3389			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3390			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3391		Anthony Hathaway	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3392			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3393			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3394		R Blocksidge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3395			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3396		J A Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3397			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3398			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3399		Mr Colin Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3400			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3401		Rachel French	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3402			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3403			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3404			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3405			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3406			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3407		Kate Hawkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3408			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3409			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3410			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3411		Miss Leigh Arthur	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3412			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3413			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3414			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3415			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3416			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3417			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3418			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3419			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3420			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3421			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3422			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3423		J Carroll	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3424			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3425			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3426			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3428			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3429			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3430			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3431			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3432			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3433			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3434			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3435			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3436			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3437			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3438			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3439			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3440		Howard Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3441			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3442			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3443			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3444			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3445			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3446			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3447		Alan Prosper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3448			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3449			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3450			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3451			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3452			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3453			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3454			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3455			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3456		M Clark	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3457		Stuart N Taylor	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3458			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3459			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3460			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3461			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3462			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3463			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3464		Janet Butt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3465			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3466		Anthony Bunday	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3467			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3468			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3469			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3470			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3471			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3472			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3473			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3474			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3475			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3476			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3477			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3478			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3479			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3480		L Potts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3481		Mrs Sian Howley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3482			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3483		Andrew Warner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3484			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3485		Kathryn Rhys	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3486			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3487			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3488			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3489			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3490			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3491		Leonard Jessup	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3492			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3493			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3494			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3495			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3496			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3497			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3498			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3499			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3500			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3501			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3502			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3503			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3504			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3505		Gareth Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3506		Neil Beattie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3507			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3508		Miss Christine Lassam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3509			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3510			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3511			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3512		E Kay Milburn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3513			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3515			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3516			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3517			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3518			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3519			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3520		Jeremy Spoor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3521			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3522			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3523			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3524			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3525			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3526			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3527			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3528			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3529		Nicola de Val	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3530			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3531			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3532			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3533			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3534			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3535			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3536			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3537			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3538			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3539			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3540		David Gilbert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3541			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3542			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3543			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3544			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3545			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3546			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3547			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3548			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3549			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3550			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3551			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3552			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3553			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3554			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3555			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3556		Mrs Annette Stokes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3557			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3558			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3559		Mrs Mona McFarlane	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3560			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3561			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3562			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3563		Alec Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3564		Susan Miller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3565			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3566			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3567			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3568			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3569		N Wilkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3570			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3571			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3572			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3573			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3574			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3575			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3576			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3577			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3578			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3579			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3580			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3581			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3582			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3583			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3584			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3585			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3586			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3587			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3589			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3590			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3591			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3592			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3593			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3594			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3595			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3596		N Duce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3597			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3598			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3599			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3600			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3601			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3602			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3603			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3604			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3605			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3606			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3607		Glyn James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3608			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3609			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3610			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3611			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3612			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3613			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3614			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3615			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3616			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3617			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3618			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3619			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3620			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3621		L Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3622			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3623			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3624			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3625			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3626			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3627			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3628			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3629		Sarah Morgan	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3630			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3631			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3632			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3633			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3634			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3635			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3636			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3637			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3638			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3639			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3640			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3641			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3642			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3643			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3644			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3645			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3646			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3647			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3648			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3649			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3650			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3651			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3652			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3653			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3654			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3655		Bev Khan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3656			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3657			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3658			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3659			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3660			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3661		Roger Lucken	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3662			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3663			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3664			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3665			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3666			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3667			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3668			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3669			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3670			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3671			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3672			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3673			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3674			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3675			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3676			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3677			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3678			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3679			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3680			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3681			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3682		Zoe Buswell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3683			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3684			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3685			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3686		Sophy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3687			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3688			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3689			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3690		J A Bennett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3691			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3692			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3693			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3694		Pauline Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3695		S Warren	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3696			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3697			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3698			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3699		Mr Martin Parsons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3700			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3701			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3702			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3703			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3704			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3705		Gillian Howarth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3706			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ3707</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3708</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3709</u>		Jennie Osborn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3710</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3711</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3712</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3713</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3714</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3715</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3716</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3717</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3718</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3719</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3720</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3721</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3722</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3723</u>		Miss Katie Nethercoat	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3724</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3725</u>		Ben Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3726</u>		Ian Barrett	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3727</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3728</u>		Miss Faya Patterson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3729</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3730</u>		L Colley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3731</u>		Mr Steve Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3732</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3733</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3734</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3735</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3736</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3737</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3738</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3739</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3740</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3741</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3742</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3743</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3744</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3745</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3746</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3747</u>		Mr Harry Drew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3748</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3749</u>		Laura Warren	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3750</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3751</u>		Miss Josie Hewitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3752</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3753</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3754</u>		Mr Robert Magee	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3755		Jennifer Lusty	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3756			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3757		Ms Katie Luxton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3758			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3759			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3760			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3761			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3762			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3763			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3764			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3765			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3766		Nick Barwick	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3767			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3768		Beverley Anne Ockwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3769			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3770			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3771			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3772			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3773			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3774			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3775			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3776			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3777		jean elliot	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3778			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3779			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3780			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3781		Allan Dowson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3782			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3783			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3784			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3785			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3786			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3787			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3788			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3789			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3790			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3791			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3792		Judy Impey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3793			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3794			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3795			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3796		Loretta Smart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3797			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3798			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3799			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3800			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3801			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3802			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3803			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3804		Christine Chilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3805			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3806			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3807		Bob and Margaret Marsland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3808			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3809			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3810			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3811			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3812			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3813			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3814			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3815			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3816			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3817			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3818			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3819			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3820			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3821		Mrs R M Bray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3822		Miss Julie Donaldson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3823			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3824		Charlene Davies	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3825			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3826			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3827			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3828			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3829			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3830			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3831			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3832		Pat Haley	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3833			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3834			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3835			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3836			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3837			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3838			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3839			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3840			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3841			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3842			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3843			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3844			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3845		Mrs Michele Harrison	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3846			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3847			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3848		Brian Kemplay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3849			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3850			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3851			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3852		K Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3853			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3854			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3855		Sybil Mizon-Hind	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3856			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3857			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3858			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3859			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3860			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3861			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3862			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3863			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3864		M Seymour	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3865			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3866		Vicky Gaunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3867			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3868			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3869			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3870			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3871			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3872		Miss Carol Jacklin	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3874		Mrs Sarah Blyth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3875		Mrs Jayne Dunajko	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3876		Mr Robert Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3877		Miss Sylvia Jay	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3878			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3879			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3880		Mr John Cook	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3881		Mr John Winder	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3882		Mr Jamie Allan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3883		Mr Murray Orchard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3884		Miss Tim Hughes	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3885		Miss Chloe Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3886		Miss Sandra Egan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3887			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3888			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3889		Charmaine Hulbert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3890		Mr Michael Welsh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3891		Mrs Sue Dewhurst	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3892		Mrs Corinne Ponsford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3893		Mrs Teresa Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3894		Mr Andrew Bissitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3895		Miss Joan Potter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3896		Mr Norman Ives	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3897		Mrs Joanne Lowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3898		Mr John Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3899		Miss G Lewis	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3900		Miss Sarah Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3901		Mr Keith Symonds	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3902		Mr J C Rolls	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3903		Mrs Lynne Cornock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3904		Mr Mike Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3905		Mr George Rowden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3906		Mrs Debbie Bardo	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3907		Miss Katie Parkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3908		Mr David Graham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3909			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3910		Mr Julian Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3911		Mrs Diane Emms	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3912		Miss Diane Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3913		Miss Linda Beard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3914		Mrs Rachel Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3915		Dr Martin Miller	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3916		Miss Terina Notz	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3917			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3918		Judith Flynn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3919		Miss Marilyn Jones	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3920		Ms Hilary Rosser	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3921			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3922		Keith Rose	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3923		Miss Gemma Simmons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3924			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3925			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3926		Mrs Elisabeth Mulholland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3927			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ3928		Neil Hopkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3929			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3930			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3931			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3932			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3933		Mr David Brear	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3934			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3935			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3936			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3937			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3938			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3939			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3940			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3941			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3942			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3943			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3944			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3945			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3946			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3947		Mr Paul Gilbert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3948		Miss Catherine Dawson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3949			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3950			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3951		Jenny Thomas	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ3952		T P Lewis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3953			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3954		Mrs Janet Blackburn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3955		Miss Nadia Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3956		Mrs Alison Guy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3957			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3958		Mr Roger Lloyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3959		Miss Rebecca Saunders	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3960		Miss Beth Thoren	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3961			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3962			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3963		M Bailey	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3964		Mr John Cawley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3965			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3966			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ3967			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3968		Mr Tom Biddulph	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ3969		Ms Emma Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ3970</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3971</u>		Jill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3972</u>		Mr David Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3973</u>		Mrs Rita Myatt-Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3974</u>		Mr John Goodwin	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ3975</u>		Mr Neil Gaskin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3976</u>		Miss Lauren Foster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3977</u>		Mr Christopher Wells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3978</u>		Dr David Martin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3979</u>		Miss Sue Everett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3980</u>		Dr Helen Sims-Coomber	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3981</u>		Mrs Val Jackson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3982</u>		Mr Andrew Jenkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3983</u>		Dr Melissa Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3984</u>		Miss Nadia Shaikh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3985</u>		Mr Fiona Underhill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3986</u>		Ms Jo Williamson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3987</u>		Ms Heather Bridgland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3988</u>		Mr Chris Hudson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3989</u>		Mr David Petre	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3990</u>		Miss Shani Allan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3991</u>		Ms Lesley Bryson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3992</u>		Mr Darryl Spittle	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ3993</u>		Mr Daniel Trotman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3994</u>		Mrs Juliet Michael	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3995</u>		Mr Duncan Watson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3996</u>		Miss Flavia Lungu	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3997</u>		Mr Owen Erasmus	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3998</u>		Ms Sarah Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ3999</u>		Mrs Prudence Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4000</u>		Mr David Bateson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4001</u>		Miss Katherine Lambeth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4002</u>		Mr Ken Maurice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4003</u>		Mrs Dawn Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4004</u>		Mrs Charlotte Denovan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4005</u>		Mr Mike Skelton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4006</u>		Mr John Badley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4007</u>		Mr Titus Leskov	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4008</u>		Mrs Caroline McManus	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4009</u>		Mr Brian Ashfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4010</u>		Mr Des McKenzie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4011</u>		Miss Jennifer Caffrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4012</u>		Mr David Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4013</u>		Mr Ray Roche	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4014</u>		Mr Michael Hogan	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ4015</u>		Mr Oliver Clanford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4016</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4017</u>		Mrs Gill Saunders	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4018</u>		Mrs Elspeth Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4019</u>		Mrs Anthea Unsworth	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4020</u>		Nic Gande	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4021</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4022</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4023</u>		Mrs Jackie Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4024</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4025</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4026</u>		Mrs Patricia Gillan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4027</u>		Mrs Martine Sommers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4028</u>		Mrs Carol Silvers	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4029</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4030</u>		Miss Sally Woolacott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4031</u>		Dr Anthony Temple	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4032</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4033</u>		Mrs Kerry Wheatley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4034</u>		Mr David Bevan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4035</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4036</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4037</u>		Mrs Anne Coker	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4038</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4039</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4040</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4041</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4042</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4043</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4044</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4045</u>		Miss Susan Bloss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4046</u>		Mr Mark Cocker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4047</u>		Mrs Janet Aunins	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4048</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4049</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4050</u>		Mr Wayne Hodges	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4051</u>		Mrs Mary Jamieson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4052</u>		Mr Martin Jefferies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4053</u>		Mrs Jillian McCauley	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4054</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4055</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4056</u>		Mr David Elias	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4057</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4058</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4059</u>		Ms Annie Irving	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4060</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4061</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4062</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4063</u>		Miss Mark Waters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4064</u>		Mrs Suzanne Morris	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4065</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4066</u>		Mrs Linda Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4067</u>		Mr Martin Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4068</u>		Mr Richard Hopkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4069</u>		Ms Jean Rainey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4071</u>		Mr Tom Gale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4072</u>		Mrs Alison Bevin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4073</u>		Mr Simon Gould	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4074</u>		Mr Terence Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4075</u>		Mr Donald Pugh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4076</u>		Mrs Alice Hardiman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4077		Mrs Sheila Corns	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4078		Mr Mike Cleary	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4079		Miss Liz Kerr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4080		Mr Chris Morris	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4081		Mrs Valerie Mann	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4082		Mr Tim Corke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4083		Mrs Susan Swift	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4084		Mr David Burns	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4085		Ms Danielle Styles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4086		Dr Guy Anderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4087		Mr Perry Pericleous	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4088			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4089			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4090			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4091			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4092			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4093		Ms F Collier	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4094		Miss Donna Elliott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4095			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4096		Michael Harvey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4097			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4098		Mrs Vivienne Luxton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4099			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4100		Ms Polly Pearshouse	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4101		Mr Richard Beason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4102		S Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4103		Mr Mark Roske	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4104		Mrs Karen Corley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4105		Mr and Mrs Bewley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4106			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4107		D Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4108			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4109			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4110		Mr Peter Collins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4111			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4112			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4113		Sue Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4114			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4115			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4116			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4117		Mr Chris Rose	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4118</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4119</u>		Diane Griffiths	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4120</u>		Mrs Rebecca Wade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4121</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4122</u>		Ms Adrienne Stratford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4123</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4124</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4125</u>		Mrs Jan Sim	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4126</u>		J Logie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4127</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4128</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4129</u>		Mr Kevin Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4130</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4131</u>		Mrs Sarah Bird	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4132</u>		Ms Marguerite Walters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4133</u>		Mr Paul Squires	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4134</u>		Dr Adam Hudson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4135</u>		Mrs Susan Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4136</u>		Mr Shane Enright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4137</u>		Mr Ben Dickinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4138</u>		Mrs Barbara O'Hara	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4139</u>		Dr Mark Fishpool	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4140</u>		Mrs Elsie Keymer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4141</u>		Mr Ralph Lilley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4142</u>		Miss Alison Hope	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4143</u>		Mrs Lyn Snowdon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4144</u>		Dr Susan Rands	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4145</u>		Mrs Valerie Adamson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4146</u>		Mr William Aldred	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4147</u>		Mr Alfie Temple	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4148</u>		Mr Geraint Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4149</u>		Mr Les Stretton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4150</u>		Mrs Ros Hammerton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4151</u>		Mr Colin Barthorpe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4152</u>		Mr Jeffrey Wragg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4153</u>		Mr Michael Butler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4154</u>		Dr Michael Fogden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4155</u>		Miss Katy Fielding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4156</u>		Mrs Alison Hartley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4157</u>		Mr Stephen Proctor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4158</u>		Miss Salma Haidrani	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4159</u>		Ms Gail Clarke Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4160</u>		Mr Sean Browne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4161</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4162</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4163</u>		Miss Sarah Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4164</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4165</u>		Kevin Henry	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ4166</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4167</u>		Mr Gareth Brookfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4168</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4169</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4170</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4171</u>		Mrs Jill Dunnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4172</u>		Mrs Elizabeth Higman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4173</u>		Miss Sophie Ponsford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4174</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4175</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4176</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4177</u>		Mr Richard Hutt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4178</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4179</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4180</u>		Sheila Gardner	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4181</u>		Mr Douglas Landman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4182</u>		Mr Mark Bannister	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4183</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4184</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4185</u>		Miss Miranda Michels	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4186</u>		Mrs Rita Carr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4187</u>		Mr James Foster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4188</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4189</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4190</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4191</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4192</u>		Catherine Waddington	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4193		Mrs Ann Southern	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4194		Mr Carl Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4195		Mr Anthony Pawson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4196			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4197			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4198			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4199			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4200		Mrs Clare Mullaney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4201			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4202			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4203			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4204			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4205		Miss Susan Monteiro	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4206		Miss Janet Palmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4207			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4208		Helen Jackson	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4209		Malcolm Waters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4210			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4211		Mr Paul Pearson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4212		Elaine Cooper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4213		Mr Jeff Clarke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4214			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4215		Mr Roger Dunn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4216			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4217			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4218		Sheila Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4219			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4220		Miss Hilary Parker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4221			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4222			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4223		Mr David Perrow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4224			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4225		Miss Elizabeth Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4226			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4227		Mr Stephen Grubb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4228		Mr Stuart Becharas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4229			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4230			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4231			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4232			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4233		Mr Graham Piner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4234		Mrs Carol Eyden	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4235		Mrs Jennifer Western	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4236			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4237		Miss Roslyn Swanston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4238			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4239		Mr Howard Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4240			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4241			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4242		Mr Tim Suggitt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4243		Miss Jan Hunter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4244		Jo Humphreys	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4245		Ms Diane Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4246			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4247			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4248		H Prabucki	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4249		Mr John Linnell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4250			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4252		Mr Guy Lawrence	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4253			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4254			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4255			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4256			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4257			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4258		Mr Ian Dobson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4259			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4260			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4261		M D Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4262		Ms Catriona Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4263		Mr Thomas Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4264			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4265			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4266			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4267			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4268			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4269			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4270		Mr Robert Tunstall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4271			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4272			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4273			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4274		Mr Mark Wildman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB / Keith Jones WG1.18 PID-43
OBJ4275			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4276			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4277			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4278		Dr Paul Gale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4279			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4280			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4281		Mr Keith Sharman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4282		Miss Sallu Conyers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4283			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4284			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4285			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4286		Mr James Bevin	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4287		Ms Elizabeth McGowan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4288			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4289		Mr Gareth Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4290			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4291			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4292			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4293		Mrs Claire Hogg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4294			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4295		Miss Patricia Speed	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4296		B Wootton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4297			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4298		Mrs Jennifer Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4299			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4300			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4301			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4302			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4303		Miss Eleri Wynne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4304			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4305			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4306		John Waldon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4307			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4308			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4309		Carol D Fordy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4310			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4311		Miss Margaret Rhodes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4312			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4313		Dr Gillian Lang	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4314		Ms Sara Goodwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4315		Robert Chappell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4316			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4317		Mr Craig Leitch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4318			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4319			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4320		Mr Robert Maher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4321			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4322			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4323		Miss Paula Redmond	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4324			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4325			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4326		D A Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4327			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4328			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4329			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4330			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4331		Mr Michael Ledlie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4332			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4333			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4334		Miss Beth Wild	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4335		Mrs Elaine Pleasance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4336			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4337		Mr Michael Rook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4338			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4339			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4340			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4341			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4342		Mr Fred Chance	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4343			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4344		Mrs Pam Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4345		Mrs Mary Maidment	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4346			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4347			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4348			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4349			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4350			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4351			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4352		Miss Jasmine Buckle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4353		Dr Maya James	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4354		Mr Mark Wells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4355			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4356		Mrs Judy Jones	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4357		Mr Steve Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4358			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4359		Mrs Sera Parry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4360		Beverley Banyard	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4361		Miss Sara Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4362			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4363			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4364		Anthony J Attwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4366		Karla Elms	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4367			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4368			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4369			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4370			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4372		Dr Helen Beardsell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4373			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4374		Mr Mike Burdekin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4375			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4376			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4377			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4378			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4379			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4380		Mr Andrew Barnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4381			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4382			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4383		Mr Llyr Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4384		Mrs Mo Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4385		Mr Ian Barthorpe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4386			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4387			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4388		Mrs Diane Jefferies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4389		Miss Tamsin Leah	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4390		Mr Samuel Whitfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4391		Miss Amelia Bennett Margrave	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4392			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4393		Mrs Sue Belcher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4394		Mrs Monica Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4395			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4396		Mr Alan Pennells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4397			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4398			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4399			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4400			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4401			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4402		Mrs Wendy Flockton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4403			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4404		Mrs Eveline Clarke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4405		Mrs Margaret Brett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4406			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4407		Jill Abell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4408		Miss Gloria Pearce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4409		Miss Dafydd Pleming	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4410		Mrs Amanda Hatter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4411			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4412			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4413			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4414			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4415			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4416		Mrs Alexandra Coopey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4417			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4418			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4419			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4420			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4421		Mrs Jennifer Bignall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4422			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4423		Mrs Sue Large	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4424			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4425		Miss Carol Johnston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4426			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4427		Miss Lorraine Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4428			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4429			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4430			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4431			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4432		Dr Sarah Money	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4433			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4434			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4435			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4436			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4437		Mrs Natalie Brunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4438			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4439			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4440			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4441			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4442		Miss Jackie Day	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4443			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4444			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4445			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4446			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4447			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ4448			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4449		Roy Hambleton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4451			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4452			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4453		Ms Elizabeth Hanson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4454			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4455			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4456			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4457			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4458		Mrs Rosemary Fisher	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4459			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4460			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4461			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4462			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4463			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4464		Ms Samantha Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4465			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4466			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4467		Janine Wimhurst	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4468			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4469		D R Keeling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4470			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4471		Mrs Wendy Kennison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4472			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4473			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4474		Mr Toby Branston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4475		Elizabeth Brazier	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4476			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4477		Ms Catherine Best	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4478			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4479		Marylyn Bothamley	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4480		Mr Noah Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4481		Mrs Josna Matthew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4482			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4483			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4484		Mr Robert Eade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4485			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4486			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4487			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4488			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4489			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4490			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4491		Mrs Diane Gillborn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4492		Mrs Alison Vaspe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4493			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4494			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4495		Dr Olly Watts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4496			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4497			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4498		Mr David Andrew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4499			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4500		Miss Carmel Oakton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4501		Barry Atkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4502			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4503		Mrs Penny Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4504		Robert Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4505		Mrs Awel-Haf Elias	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4506			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4507		Mr Michael Casey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4508		Mr Stephen Lipscombe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4509		Mrs Alicia Holliday	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4510			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4511			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4512			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4513		Mrs Anne Thackray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4514			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4515			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4516			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4517			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4518		Ms Joan Adamson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4519			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4521		Dr James Hrastelj	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4522		Mr Nicholas Pomiankowski	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4523			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4524			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4525			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4526			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4527			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4528		Mr Antony Edwardes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4529			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4530			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4531			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4532		Mr Roger Luxton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4533			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4534			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4535		Steve penny	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4536			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4537		Mrs Polly Donaldson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4538		J Cottam	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4539			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4540		Mr Peter Tams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4541			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4542			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4543			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4544			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4545			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4546			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4547			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4548		Mrs Julie White	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4549		Mrs Sharon Lord	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4550			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4551			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4552			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4553		Miss Cath Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4554			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4555			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4556			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4557		Mr Andy Butler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4558		Mrs Helen Crow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4559			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4560			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4561			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4562			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4563		Barbara Reeves	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4564		Mrs Philippa Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4565			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4566		Mr Andrew Bunting	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4567			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4568		Mrs Zoe Foster	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4569		Mr William John Harding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4570			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4571			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4572		Miss Stephanie Landymore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4573		Mr Brian Collins	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4574			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4575			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4576			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4577			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4578			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4579		Mr Ian Boyle	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4580			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4581			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4582		Mrs Beverley Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4583			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4584			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4585			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4586		Mrs Gillian Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4587		Shirley Webb	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4588		Mr Bob Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4589		Mrs Nicola Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4590			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4591			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4592		Mr Terry Sibley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4594		Mr John Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4595			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4596			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4597			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4598		Mr Steven Conroy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4599		Prof Oliver Fulton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4600		Janet Coles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4601			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4602			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4603		Mr Huw Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4605			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4606			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4607		Miss Emma Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4608			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4609			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4610			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4611			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4612		Mr Rhys Davies	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ4613		Mr James Cooper	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4614		Rosemary Waters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4615			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4616			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4617			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4618		Ms Barbara Drummond	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4619			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4620		Steve Slack	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4621			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4622			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4623			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4624			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4625			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4626		Mrs Laura Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4627			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4628			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4629			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4630			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4631		Mrs Sarah Reed	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4632		Ms Shirley Broughton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4633		Ms Gillian Parrish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4634		Mrs Janet Sherwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4635		Mrs Sarah Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4636			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4637			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4638			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4639		Ms Ann Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4640		Mr Philip Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4641			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4642			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4643		Ms Ann Nutley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4644		Hermione	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4645		Mr Colin Neale	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4646			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4647			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4648		Sara Rees	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4649			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4650			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4651			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4652			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4653		Mr Eric Beard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4654			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4655		Mr Andrew Cunningham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4656		Mrs Barbara Miles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4657			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4658			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4659			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4660		Gwynneth Flitters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4661		Mrs Val Thompson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4662		Miss Sara Salvatore	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4663			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4664			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4665			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4666			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4667		Nicola Brophy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4668</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4669</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4670</u>		Mrs Laurinda Luffman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4671</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4672</u>		Mrs Helen Strong	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4673</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4674</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4675</u>		Thomas Martin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4676</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4677</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4678</u>		Ms Ann Dixon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4679</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4680</u>		Miss Jill Calvert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4681</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4682</u>		Mr Edward Crabtree	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4683</u>		Miss Elizabeth Clipson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4684</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4685</u>		Mr Adrian Cash-James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4686</u>		Mrs Diane Slaughter	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4687</u>		Miss Annette Waddington	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4688</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4689</u>		Mr Chris Gee	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4690</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4691</u>		Ms Susan Sutton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4692</u>		Mrs Stella Procter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4693</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4694</u>		Miss Judith Riches	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4695</u>		J Read	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4696</u>		Mrs Judith Bambridge	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4697</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4698</u>		Mrs Janet Hamon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4699</u>		Anna-Marie Clear	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4700</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4701</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4702</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4703</u>		Ms Zoe Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4704</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4705</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4706</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4707</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4708</u>		Miss Kate Newman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4709			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4710		Philip Plummer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4711			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4712			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4713			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4714		Mr Spike Webb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4715		Ann Green	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ4716		Miss Bryony Thomson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4717			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4718		Mrs Jacqueline Parkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4719		Ms Elaine Dunn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4720			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4721			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4722		Paul McCarthy	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ4723			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4724		Mr Robert Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4725			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4726			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4727			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4728			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4729			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4730		Mr Robert Taylor	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4731			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4732			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4733			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4734			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4735		Miss Amy Vanstone	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4736		Mr Hugh Baggaley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4737		Miss Louise Secker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4738			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4739			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4740			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4741		Mrs Carolyn Scantlebury	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4742			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4743			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4744			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4745		Mr James Craigie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4746		Miss Andrea Valentine	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4747		Ms Tracey Field	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4748		Nikki Browne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4749			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4750		Miss Rosalind Launchbury	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4751			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4752		Mr Nick Folkard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4753		Mrs D Alsford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4754			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4755		Mr Michael Frost	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4756		Mrs Belinda Jane Markham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4757		Mrs Vicky Bernays	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4758		Mr Andrew Rock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4759		Miss Jackie Buckle	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4760			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4761			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4762			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4763			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4764			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4765			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4766		Mrs Lynn Loader	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4767			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4768			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4769			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4770			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4771			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4772			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4773			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4774			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4775			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4776		Mrs Natalie Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4777		Prof Gruffydd Aled Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4778		Mr Ian Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4779		Pauline Dillworth	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4780			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4781			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4782			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4783			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4784		Ms Bethan Lloyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4785			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4786			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4787			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4788		Roger Moon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4789			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4790		Mrs Elizabeth Ackroyd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4791		Mr Gordon Haycock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ4792</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4793</u>		Mr Michael Birley	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4794</u>		Mrs Rae Cecil	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4795</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4796</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4797</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4798</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4799</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4800</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4801</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4802</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4803</u>		Mrs Sandra Payne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4804</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4805</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4806</u>		Mrs Sarah Jackson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4807</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4808</u>		Miss Sarah Chilton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4809</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4810</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4811</u>		Miss Eleanor Wise	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4812</u>		Peter Gaunt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4813</u>		Mr Ken Maurice	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4814</u>		Prof Bill Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4815</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4816</u>		Mrs Hannah Brightman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4817</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4818</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4819</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4820</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4821</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4822</u>		Mr Alfred Clarke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4823</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4824</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4825</u>		Mrs Gillian Duffy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4826</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4827</u>		Miss Sam Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4828</u>		Mrs Lisa Morgan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4829</u>		Miss Sian Wilks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4830</u>		Mr Richard Jeynes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4831</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ4832</u>		Mr Raymond Sanderson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ4833</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4834			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4835			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4836		Mr Kevin Rylands	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4837			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4838			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4839		Mr Erroll Dowman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4840			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4841		Mrs Norma Kinnison	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4842		Miss Elisabeth Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4843			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4844			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4845			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4846			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4847			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4848			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4849			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4850			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4851		Ms H Simmonds	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4852			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4853		Mrs Ann Lee	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4854		Mrs Caroline Irwin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4855			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4856		Mrs Moyra Galliford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4857		Roger J Daniel	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4858			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4859		Miss Helen Amanda Lubin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4860		Mr Mark Bould	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4861		Mr David Nursaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4862			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4863			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4864			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4865			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4866		Dawn Sprake -Follett	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4867			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4868			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4869		Diana Hayman-Joyce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4870			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4871			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4872			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4873		Mr Geoff Harding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4874		P M Harris	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4875			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4876		Miss Alison Young	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4877			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4878			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4879			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4880		Mr David Frost	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4881			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4882			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4883			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4884		Miss Gina Thomson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4885		Amanda Collins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4886			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4887			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4888		Ms Sally MacEachern	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4889		Mrs Helen Richards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4890			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4891		Nikki Barnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4892			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4893			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4894			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4895			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4896		Lynne Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4897			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4898			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4899		Miss Angela Joyce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4900		Mr Richard Brown	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4901		Mr Peter Basterfield	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4902			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4903		Mrs Elizabeth Cornish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4904			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4905			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4906			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4907		Mrs Susan Moizer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4908		Mr Ken Blake	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4909			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4910			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4911			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4912		Mr Raymond Critchley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4913			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4914			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4915		Miss Valerie Jarrett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4916			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4917		Mrs Alyson Bartlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4918		Ms Shusha Lamoon	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4919		Mr Julian French	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4920			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4921		Mr Graham Allcock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4922			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4923			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4924		Mr David Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4925			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4926			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4927			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4928		Mr Roger Gibbs	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4929		Prof Nicholas Keep	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4930			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4931			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4932			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4933		Dr David Burnett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4934			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4935		Mrs Frances Tilbrook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4936		Mr Henry Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4937			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4938		Mr Philip Burnham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4939			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4940		Mrs Janet Scott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4941			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4942			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4943			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4944		Mrs Margaret Boyes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4945		Mr Steve Howells	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4946			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4947		Mr Ray Allden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4948		Miss Wayne Watkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4949			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4950			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4951		Mrs Judith Roseblade	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4952			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4953		Miss Kirsty Osman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4954			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4955			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4956			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4957			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4958		Mrs S Aindow	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4959			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ4960		Lizzie Cork	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4961			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4962			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4963			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4964			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4965			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4966		Dr Joanna Crawshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4967			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4968			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4969			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4970			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4971			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4972		Mr Josh Petzoldt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4973		Colin Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4974			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4975			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4976			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4977			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4978			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4979		Mr A H McCoy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4980		Mr Ray Reedman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4981		Linda Osborn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4982			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4983		Mrs Sandra Aulton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4984		Mr Martin Kerby	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4985			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4986			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ4987			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4988			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4989			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4990			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4991			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4992		Miss Emma McCauley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4993		Miss Gaynor Aston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4994			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4995		Mrs Helen Kavanagh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4996			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4997		Tim Pye	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4998			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ4999		T Dola	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5000		Mrs Lois Bradberry	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5001			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5002			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5003			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5004		Mrs Laura Curtis-Moss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5005</u>		Mr Alan Postlethwaite	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5006</u>		Mrs Mary Hayward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5007</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5008</u>		Mr Anthony Hopkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5009</u>		Mr Brian Tooze	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5010</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5011</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5012</u>		Mr Julian Weeks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5013</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5014</u>		Ms Pat Williams	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5015</u>		Sylvia Collingwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5016</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5017</u>		Mrs Liz Albert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5018</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5019</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5020</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5021</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5022</u>		Mrs Laura Thornley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5023</u>		Mr Fred Towers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5024</u>		Mr Colin Slator	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5025</u>		Andy Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5026</u>		Mr Robert Stephens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5027</u>		Miss Christophe Patterson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5028</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5029</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5030</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5031</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5032</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5033</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5034</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5035</u>		Ms Bev Maxwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5036</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5037</u>		Mr Brian Lancaster	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5039</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5040</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5041</u>		Mr Lyn Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5042</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5043</u>		Mr Malcolm Curtis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5044</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5045</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5046</u>		Mrs Vicki James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5047		Mr Gavin Jacobsen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5048			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5049			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5050			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5051			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5052			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5053			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5054			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5055			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5056		Jeanette and Roger Bethell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5057		Mr Christopher Gerrans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5058			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5059			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5060			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5061		Miss Alice Tribe	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5062		Mr Nicholas Goulden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5063			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5064		Miss Sally Nicholls	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5065			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5066		Mr Chris Grocock	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5067			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5068		Mrs Robert Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5069		Elizabeth Sampson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5070			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5071		Jane Gulliver	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5072		Miss Elizabeth Armstrong	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5073			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5074			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5075			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5076		Mr Malcolm Pike	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5077			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5078		Mr Mike Levett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5079			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5080			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5081			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5082			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5083			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5084			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5085		Miss Danielle Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5086			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5087			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5088</u>		Mrs Jean Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5089</u>		Mr Robin Sandham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5090</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5091</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5092</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5093</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5094</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5095</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5096</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5097</u>		Dr Gerard Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5098</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5099</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5100</u>		D Knowles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5101</u>		Alan Ashmead	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5102</u>		Dr Brian Sutton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5103</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5104</u>		Miss Melanie Fryer	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5105</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5106</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5107</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5108</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5109</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5110</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5111</u>		Mrs Fiona Sharp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5112</u>		Mr David Denney	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5113</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5114</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5115</u>		Ms Sally Johns Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5116</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5117</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5118</u>		Mr Richard Andrews	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5119</u>		Mrs Fiona Yuill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5120</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5121</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5122</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5123</u>		Mr Keith Aldersley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5124</u>		Miss Michelle Merrill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5125</u>		Miss Glen O'Connell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5126</u>		Miss Andrew Dove	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5127</u>		Dr Christine Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5128</u>		Mrs Celia Rickers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5129</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5130</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5131		Mr Dominic Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5132			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5133			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5134		Miss Jill Leason	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5135			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5136		Mrs Emma Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5137			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5138			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5139		Mrs Eileen Covill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5140		Mr Simon Rose	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5141		Miss Christine Goodchild	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5142			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5143			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5144			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5145		John Eastaugh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5146		Mr Michael Hinks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5147			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5148		Dr Alan Cushway	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5149		Miss Rachel Carless	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5150			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5151		Ms Claire Ritchie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5152			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5153		Mr Andy Moss	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5154			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5155			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5156		James D Suart	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5157		Mr Steven Ward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5158		Miss Lena Kuztelska	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5159			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5160		Mr Don Manhire	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5161			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5162		Mrs Mary Earp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5163		Miss Penny Insole	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5164			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5165		Mr Kim Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5166			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5167			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5168			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5169			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5170			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5171			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5172			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5173			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5174			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5175			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5176		M J Richards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5177		Mrs Julie Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5178			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5179		Mrs Rowena Quantrill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5180		Miss Lyn Ibbitson-Elks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5181		Mr Alastair Wilson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5182			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5183			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5184			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5185		Mr Jonathan Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5186			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5187			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5188			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5189		Mr Hugh Rattray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5190			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5191			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5192			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5193			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5194		Miss Sioned Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5195			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5196		Miss Claire Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5197			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5198			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5199		Mr Howard Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5200		Jean Florence	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5201		Miss Betty Day	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5202			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5203		Mrs Leonie Shepherd	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5204			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5205			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5206		Mrs Jennifer Rowlands	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5207		Mr Peter Hickman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5208		P Loukes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5209			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5210			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5211			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5212		Barbara Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5213			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5214		Miss Ali Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5216</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5217</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5218</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5219</u>		Mr Michael Langtree	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5220</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5221</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5222</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5223</u>		Leslie Brooks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5224</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5225</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5226</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5227</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5228</u>		Mr Ian Hartrey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5229</u>		Mr Graham Sutton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5230</u>		Mr Stuart Bartlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5231</u>		Mrs Betty Maton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5232</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5233</u>		Miss Sheila Ryan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5234</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5235</u>		Jo Dando	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5236</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5237</u>		Miss Debbie Lawson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5238</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5239</u>		Alex Wood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5240</u>		Cedwyn Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5241</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5242</u>		Mr Kevin Cox	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5243</u>		Janet Noall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5244</u>		Mr Michael Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5245</u>		Mrs Dorothy Joyce Cox	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5246</u>		Mrs Margaret Ruston	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5247</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5248</u>		Mr David Watkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5249</u>		Miss Patricia Loukes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5250</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5251</u>		Mrs Sarah Francis	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5252</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5253</u>		Mrs Carol Peacock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5254</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5255</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5256</u>		Pamela Cook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5257</u>		Mrs Pauline Colsell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5258</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5259			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5260			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5261			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5262		Mr Mark Piper	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5263		Mr Joseph Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5264			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5265		Louise Wilkinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5266			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5267			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5268		Miss Evelyn Marshall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5269		Phil Rock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5270			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5271		Miss Fiona Deighton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5272			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5273		Mr Tim Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5274			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ5275		Mr Alex Pilling	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5276		Mrs Jenny Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5277			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5278			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5279			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5280			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5281		Ms Marion Bader	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5282			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5283			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5284		Mrs Ann Gray	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5285			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5286		Mr James Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5287		Dr Timothy Maberly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5288		Miss Jane Birch	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5289			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5290			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5291		Mr Martin Hastings-Herbert	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5292		Ms Susan Allen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5293		Ms Kay Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5294		Mrs Pat Limb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5295			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5296		Helen S Hayward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5297			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5298			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5299		Miss Pauline Evans	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5300			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5301			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5302		Mr Nigel James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5303		Mr Neil Robinson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5304			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5305			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5306			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5307		Miss Alison Goodhew	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5308			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5309		Mrs Gillian Hudson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5310		C E Cotter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5311		Ms Verna Akers	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5312		Miss Alice Groom	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5313			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5314			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5315			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5316		Ms Lynn Leverett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5317		Miss Elizabeth Else	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5318		Mr Iain Alasdair Gordon	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5319			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5320		mary johnson	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ5321		Mrs Carolyn Robertson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5322		Mr Ian Bond	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5323		A Kennett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5324		Ms Daphne Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5325		Mrs Eileen Wiggins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5326		Mrs Janet Budd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5327			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5328		Mr Roger Puxley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5329			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5330			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5331			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5332			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ5333			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5334		Mr Michael Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5335			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5336			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5337			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5338			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5340		Mr Daniel Hulmes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5341			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ5342		Sue Netherton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5343			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5344			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5345			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5346		Dr Jennifer Woodward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5347			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5348			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5349			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5350		Mr Lee Lockett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5351			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5352		Mr Craig Reed	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5353			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5354		Mr Alan Cobb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5355			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5356			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5357			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5358			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5359			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5360			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5361			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5362		Steve Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5363			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5364			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5365		Mr Neil Benham	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5366			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5367		Mr Simon Allan-Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5368			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5369			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5370		Mr Norman Hooks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5371			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5372			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5373		Mrs Hilary May	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5374			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5375			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5376			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5377			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5378			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5379			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5380			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5381		Mr Martin Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5382			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5383			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5384			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5385			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5386		Miss Mary Ledlie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5387		Dr Eirian Dafydd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5388		Cliff Carnell	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ5389		Mr John Ingram	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5390			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5391		Mr Stefan Majer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5392			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5393			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5394		Mr Jonni Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5395		Ms Roberta Goodall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5396		Miss Christina Paddock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5397			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5398		Mrs Margaret Storr	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5399		Mr Rob Macklin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5400		Mr David Parker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5401		Miss Jill Abbott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5402			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5403			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5404		Christine Harding	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ5405			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5406			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5407		Dr Julie Light	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5408		Miss Yvonne Boles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5409			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5410			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5411			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5412		Mr A Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5413			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5414		Mr Cellan Michael	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5415		Mr Geoffrey Cranwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5416			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5417			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5418		Mr John Turton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5419			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5420			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5421		Miss Sandra Palme	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5422			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5423			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5424		Wendy Cottis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5425			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5426			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5427		Mr Derek Flockton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5428		Mr Andrew Sutherland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5429		Mr Andrew Bladon	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5430			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5431		Mr Jay Beirne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5432		Mr Stephen Bishop	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5433			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5434		Miss Beryl Bashford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5435			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5436			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5437			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5438			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5439			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5440		Mr Brad Rosentritt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5441		Mr Chris Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5442			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5443		Miss Nicole Loh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5444		Sally Beynon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5445			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5446			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5447			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5448		Mr Peter Cartwright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5449		Miss Claire Pritchard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5450			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5451			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5452			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5453		Miss Chris Larkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5454			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5455			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5456		Miss Carys Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5457		Mr Richard Jones	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5458			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5459		Dr Jeremy Smallwood	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5460		Mr Jonathan Ball	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5461			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5462			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5463			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5464			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5465			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5466		Mr Daniel Barrett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5467		Mrs Jane Hill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5468			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5469			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5470			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5471</u>		Mr Chris Hogg	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5472</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5473</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5474</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5475</u>		C A Mitchell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5476</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5477</u>		Mr Mark Hucket	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5478</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5479</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5480</u>		Mr Andrew Lambeth	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5481</u>		Ms Madelaine Morris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5482</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5483</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5484</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5485</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5486</u>		Mrs Margaret Hamerton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5487</u>		Mrs Valerie Pericleous	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5488</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5489</u>		Miss S Malden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5490</u>		Mr Antony Pooles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5491</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5492</u>		Mrs Geraldine Rowland	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5493</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5494</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5495</u>		Mr John Topham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5496</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5497</u>		Mrs Rosemary Sprenger	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5498</u>		Miss Kim Fenton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5499</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5500</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5501</u>		Celia Busby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5502</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5503</u>		Mrs Helen Harman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5504</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5505</u>		Natalie Wrangham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5506</u>		Helen Nienow	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5507</u>		Dr Gillian Davies	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5508</u>		Miss Elizabeth Green	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5509</u>		Mr Stephen Coker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5510</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5511</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5512</u>		Miss Alexandra Osborne	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5513</u>		Mr Peter Riley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5514</u>		Mrs Brenda Hadley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5515</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5516</u>		Mrs Jill Pike	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5517</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5518</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5519</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5520</u>		Mr Adrian Halliday	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5521</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5522</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5523</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5524</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5525</u>		Mrs Karen Sweet	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5526</u>		Miss Bethan Kean	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5527</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5528</u>		Jane Clarke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5529</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5530</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5531</u>		Miss Rosy Pearce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5532</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5533</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5534</u>		Mr David Lowe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5535</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5536</u>		Mr Robert Badcock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5537</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5538</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5539</u>		Mr Richard Walden	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5540</u>		Mr Ernie Scales	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5541</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5542</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5543</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5544</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5545</u>		Mr Peter Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5546</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5547</u>		Mrs Susan Helm	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5549</u>		Mrs Christine Astbury	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5550</u>		Miss Rebekah Davies	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5552</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5553</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5554</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5555</u>		Mr Leonard Seelig	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5556		D Mottershead Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5557			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5558			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5559		Miss Charlotte Painter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5560			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5561		Mr Keith Ballard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5562			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5563		Ms Claire O'Kell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5564			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5565			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5566		M J Bartrop	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5567			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5568			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5569			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ5570			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5571			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5572		Mrs Susanne Renshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5573		Mrs Jan Green	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5574		R V Llewellyn	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5575		Ms Lorraine Pooley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5576			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5577		Andrew M Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5578		P W Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5579			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5580			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5581			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5582		Miss Sam Devine-Turner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5583			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5584		Mr Mark Farmaner	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5585			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5586		Miss Sadie Ezard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5587		Mr Robert Laughton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5588			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5589		Mr Luke Klein	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5590			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5591		Miss Rosanna Rapacchietta	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5592		Miss Kate Williamson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5593			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5594		Mr John Earp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5595			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5596			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5597			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5598			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5599			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5600			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5601			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5602		Mrs Emma Cornish	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5603		Sian Watkin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5604			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5605			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5606			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5607		Anna N	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5608			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5609		Dr Nicola Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5610			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5611			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5612			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5613			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5614			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5615		Mrs Sarah Groenendijk	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5616			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5617		Ms Ruth Coulthard	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5618			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5619			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5620			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5621		Mrs Susan Palmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5622			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5623		Pam Mercer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5624			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5625			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5626		Steve Edwards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5627			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5628			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5629			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5630			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5631			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5632			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5633			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5634		Ms F Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5635		Miss Gabrielle Norton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5636			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5637			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5638		Mr Ralph Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5639		Bernard Picton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5640			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5641			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5642			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5643			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5644		Mr Mark Thornber	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5645		D Woodroffe	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5646		Mr Robert Hopson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5647		David Parsons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5648		Mrs Sarah Pagdin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5649		Dr Sean Perkins	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ5650		Jane Porter	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5651		Margaret Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5652		Charlotte Guillain	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5653		Mrs Jane Knight	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5654		R M Price	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5655		Steve Walker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5656		Mrs Ann MacSorley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5657		Mr Cameron Quigley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5658			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5659		Mr John Light	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5660			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5662			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5663		Mr Thomas Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5664			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5665			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5666			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5667			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5668			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5669			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5670			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5671			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5672		Mrs Julie Balaam	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5673			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5674			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5675			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5676		Mrs Rachel Matthey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5677			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5678			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5679			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5680		Kate Samuels	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5681		Mr R A Heal	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5682			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5683		Natalie Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5684			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5685		Miss Lucy Kelly	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5686		Carol Sootheran	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5687		Simon Cull	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5688		Bethan Wynne-Cattanach	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5689		Catherine Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5690		Matt Postles	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5691		Amanda Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5692		Katie Trent	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5693		Rob	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5694		Emma Robertshaw	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5695		Sarah Coulstock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5696		Mr Barry O'Dowd	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5697			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5698			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5699			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5700		C Owen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5701			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5702			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5703		Z Kristel	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5704		Mrs Lindsey Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5705		Susanna McIntyre	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5706		Cyrene Powell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5707			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5708		Miss Holly Booker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5709		Louisa Mills	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5710			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5711			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5712		Mrs Pam Peacock	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5713		Mr David Hughes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5714			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5715		Patrick Driscall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5716			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5717			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5718			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5719			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5720		Mr V A Gregory	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5721		Oliver Kennedy	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5722			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5723			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5724		Peter Wright	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5725		Jo Webb	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5726		Rachael Hopley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5727		Clare Catto	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5728		Al Reeve	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5729		Gwyneth Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5730		Jeanette Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5731		Linda Newton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5732		Samantha Elson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5733		Sandra Evans	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5734		Rose Revera	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5735			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5736		Mr Anthony Kavanagh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5737			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5738			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5739		Giles Alder	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5740		Mr Paul Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5741		Dr Peter Tilbrook	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5742			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5743		Darren Kempson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5744		Mary Ann Brocklesby	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5745			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5746			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5747		Jane Leicester	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5748		Zelah Pengilley	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ5749			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5750		Cheryl Cummings	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5751		Mr Philip Palmer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5752		Ella Nia Morgan	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5753		Mrs Judith Mair	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5754		Alan Orange	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5755		Dr Samantha Horsburgh	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5756		Cleo	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5757		Mrs Jean Brill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5758		Andrew McDermid	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5759		Penny Powdrill	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5760		Gillian Stevens and Dylan Fowler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5761		Margaret Barford	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5762		Phillip Graham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5763			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5764			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5765		Miss Emily Cluer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5766			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ5767</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5768</u>		Jannine Parkhouse	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5769</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5770</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5771</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5772</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5773</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5774</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5775</u>		Mr John Bright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5776</u>		Anthony Hall	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5777</u>		Sarah Davis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5778</u>		Malcolm Wright	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5779</u>		Gillian Brooks	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5780</u>		Faye Mear	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5781</u>		Janet Broadway	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5782</u>		Richard Bakere	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5783</u>		Linda Newton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5784</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5785</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5786</u>		Dana Barringham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5787</u>		Matthew Pitman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5788</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5789</u>		Gwydion Kempson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5790</u>		R Alley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5791</u>		Caroline Wynn	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5792</u>		Andrew Baker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5793</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5794</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5795</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5796</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5797</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5798</u>		Lesley Cannon	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5799</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5800</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5801</u>		Laura Arillotta	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5802</u>		Mrs Helen Mears	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5803</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ5804</u>		Mr Paul Knight	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5805</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5806</u>		Miss Kate Sullivan	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5807</u>		Mr Steve Jeggo	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5808</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5809</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5810</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ5811</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5812			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5813		Andy Hodge	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5814			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5815			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5816		Mr Richard Tyler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5817			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5818		Mr Stefan Majer	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5819		Mrs Jinny Hayward	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5820		Mrs Julia Thynne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5821			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5822			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5823		Ms Robyn Caldecott	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5825		Mr David Jones	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5826			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5827			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5829		David S Roberts	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5830			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5831			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5832			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5833			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5834		Miss Jan Fowler	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5835			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5836		Miss Alison Mawdsley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5837		Mr James Adams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5838			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5839			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5840			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5841			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5842		Gavin Vella	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife	Withdrawn	
OBJ5843			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5844			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5845			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5846		Rhiannon Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5847			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5848			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5849			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5850			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5851			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5852		Mr Steven Anstey	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5853			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5854			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5855		Mr Peter Holt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5856			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5857			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5858			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5859		Sparkie	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5860			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5861			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5862			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5863			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5864			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5865			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5866			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5867		Mr Ian Mossop	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5868			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5869			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5870			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5871			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5872			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5873			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5874			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5875			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5876			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5877			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5878			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5879		Dr Sylvia Davidson	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5880			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5881		Les Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5882			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5883			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5884		Mr Richard Doore	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5885			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5886		Mr Gareth Ellis	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5887			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5888			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5889			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5890		Mrs Maureen Buckingham	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5891			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5892			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5893		B Hulmes	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5894		Rebecca Goss	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5895		Mrs Sue Morris	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5896			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5897			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5898		Mr Malcolm Clarke	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5899			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5900			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5901		Mr Dominic Templeman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5902		Mrs Nahara Hanson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5903			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5904			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5905			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5906		Mr Roy Betts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5907			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5908			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5909			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5910		Mrs Rosalind Collier	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5911		Mrs Siwan Thomas	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5912		Laurence Pearce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5913			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5914			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5915			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5916		Mrs Gail Pickett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5917			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5918			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5919			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5920			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5921		Helen Williamson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5922		Mrs Margaret Rosentritt	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5923			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5924			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5925			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5926			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5927			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5928			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5929			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5930			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5931			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5932			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5933			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5934			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5935			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5936			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5937		Mrs Sonja Browne	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5938			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5939			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5940			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5941		Mrs Heather Walton	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5942			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5943			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5944			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5945			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5946			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5947			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5948		Mrs Gill Hirons	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5949		Ms Deb Hewlett	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5950			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5951		L James	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5952			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5953			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5954			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5955			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5956			Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ5957			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5958			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5959			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5960			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5961		John Wilde	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5962			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5963		Elaine David	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5964			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5965			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5966		Ms Briony Baxter	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ5967			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5968			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5969			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5970			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5971			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5972			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5973		Dr Alison Searl	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5974			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5975			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5976			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5977			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5978			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5979			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5980			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5981		Marian Ashwell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5982			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5983			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5984			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5985			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5986			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5987		Irene Bound	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5988		Mr Jeremy Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5989		Mr James Bear	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5990			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5991			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5992			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5993		Mr Leslie Dubery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5994			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5995			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ5996		Mrs Lindsey Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5997			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ5998			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ5999		Ms Yvonne Griffiths	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6000			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6001			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6002			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6003			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6004			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6005		Mr Gordon McQueen	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6006			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6007		Rebecca	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6008		Mr Peter North	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6009			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6010		Mrs C Schaffer	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6011			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6012			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6013		Mr Richard Chapman	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6014			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6015			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6016			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6017		Peter Wright	Campaign - RSPB & Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6018			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6019		Mrs Marie Eyres	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6020		Nigel Polding	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6021		Dr Patricia Anne Appleyard	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6022			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6023			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6024			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6025			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6026			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6027			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6028		Dean Pepperell	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6029			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6030		Ms Vanessa Bryson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6031			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6032			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6033		Mrs Sylvia Smith	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6034		Mr Michael Walters	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6035			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6036			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6037		Mr Francis Lawson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6038			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6039			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6040			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6041		Susan R Brittain	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6042		Miss Layla Haidrani	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6043			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6044			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6045		Mrs Faye Boswell	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6046			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6047			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6048			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6050			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6051			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6052			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6053		Mrs Janice Minich	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6054		Ms Sally Kemp	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6055			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6056			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6057			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6058			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6059		Ms Sandra Veasey	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6060			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6061			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6062			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6063		Lisa Williams	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6064			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6065			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6066			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6067			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6068			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6069			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6070		Miss Jessica Wheatley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6071			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6072			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6073			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6074			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6075			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6076			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6077		Jackie Clark	Campaign - RSPB and Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6078		Ms Ruth Roberts	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6079		Mr Kerry Douce	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6080		Mr Gareth Richards	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
OBJ6081		Mr David Hobbs	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6082</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6083</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6084</u>		Miss Sarashka King	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6085</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6086</u>		Mr Andy Field	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6088</u>		Mr Graham Barker	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6089</u>		M Daniel	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6090</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6091</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6092</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6093</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6094</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6095</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6096</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6097</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6098</u>		M Fairbrother	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6100</u>		Sarah Isherwood-Harris	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6101</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6102</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6103</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6104</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6105</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6106</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6107</u>		Mr M Puxley	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6108</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6109</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6110</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6111</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6112</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6113</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6114</u>		Mr Edric Ovens	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6115</u>		Rosemary Jeffery	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6116</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6117</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6118</u>			Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6119</u>		Miss S Gleeson	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6120</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6121</u>		Mr Nick Clark	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6122</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6123</u>		Gavin	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6124</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6125</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6126</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6127</u>		Ms Christine Yana Goode	Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB
<u>OBJ6128</u>			Campaign - RSPB		WG/REB/OBJ0030 - RSPB

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6129		Pat Jones-Jenkins	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6130		Mr Allan Cowhig	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6131		Pam Webb	Campaign - RSPB	Withdrawn	
OBJ6132		Susan Simmonds	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6133		Ann James	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6134		alan pearson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6135		alison bevin	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6136		Graham Cox	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6137		adrian corless	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6138		Andris Erglis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6139		Hilary Kehoe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6140		Allan Hopkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6141		Anne Hordley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6142		Aideen Stacey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6143		Anne Collie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6144		Angharad Westmore	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6145		Anne Kurmos	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6146		Alan Hagan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6147		Alan Williamson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6148		Alan Prosper	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6149		Alex Harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6150		Alexandra Paterson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6151		Rebecca Kellaway	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6152		Alice Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6153		Alice Hayes	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6154		Alisha Brown	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6155		Alison Broughton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6156		Alison Morse	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6157		Alison Holland	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6158		Christina Allen	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6159		Alun Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6160		Alyson Cairns	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6161		AMAL OUAHANI	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6162		Amanda John	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6163		Amanda Cozens	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6164		Andrew Hamblin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6165		andrew cotterill	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6166		Andrew Middleton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6167		Andrew Darke	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6168		Andy Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6169		Andy Tyler	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6170		Andy Lambie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6171		Andy Green	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6172		ANGELA ALI	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6173		Angela Mawle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6174		Angela Griffiths	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6175		Anja Stracey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6176		Ann Savage-Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6177		Anna Trotman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6178		Anne Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6179		Christine Harding	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6180		Ann Green	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6181		Ann Leeuwerke	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6182		Ann Roberts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6183		Anthony McCaffrey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6184		Antoinette Hookway	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6185		Andrew Michie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6186		Annie Prosser	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6187		Avril Lord	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6188		Richard Greenwood	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6189		Barbara Court	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6190		Linda Batsleer	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6191		Rebecca Gibbins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6192		belinda glascoed	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6193</u>		Ann Pritchard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6194</u>		Elizabeth Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6195</u>		Bethan Morris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6196</u>		Bethan Mosley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6197</u>		Betsan Rosser	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6198</u>		Beverly Horrell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6199</u>		Beverley Roche	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6200</u>		joseph berry	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6201</u>		Brett Harrison	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6202</u>		Patricia Birch	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6203</u>		Pauline Tomkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6204</u>		Barbara Jamieson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6205</u>		Kate Boddington	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6206</u>		Martin Boyett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6207</u>		Bernadette Purnell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6208</u>		Brenda Nicholas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6209</u>		Mandi Dunlop Ferraro	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6210</u>		Bronwen Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6211</u>		Sheila Manning	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6212</u>		Bryan Dillon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6213</u>		Sarah Caunt	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6214</u>		Charles Kingsley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6215</u>		Andrew Caine	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6216</u>		David Callaghan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6217</u>		camilla newton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6218</u>		carol smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6219</u>		Carole Turner	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6220</u>		Caroline Hill	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6221</u>		Caroline Smyth	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6222</u>		Caroline Mason	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6223</u>		Caroline Prince	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6224</u>		Steve penny	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6225		Carys Rogers	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6226		Linda Castle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6227		C E O Shaw	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6228		Cate Hargreaves	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6229		Catherine Abbott	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6230		Catherine Hipperson Barker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6231		Catherine Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6233		Catrin Hanks-Doyle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6234		Caroline Juler	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6235		Mark Eldridge	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6236		Ceinwen Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6237		Catherine Lea	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6238		Barbara Hetherington	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6239		Richard Eade	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6240		Chantal Cumming	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6241		carla vickers	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6242		Charlene Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6243		c alexander	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6244		Charlotte Vigar	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6245		Charlotte Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6246		Charlotte Copik	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6247		Cheryl Cummings	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6248		Cheryl Brown	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6249		Christopher Fray	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6250		Chris Ramus	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6251		Chris Baillie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6252		chris bird-jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6253		Chris Edwards	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6254		Christine Farthing	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6255		Christine Wiltshire	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6256		Christopher Beynon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6257		Colin Lougher	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6258		Carol Oakes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6259		Claire Kingman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6260		Claire Taylor	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6261		Clare Burns	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6262		clare conway	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6263		Clare Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6264		Clare Russell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6265		Cliff Carnell	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6266		Clive Hodged	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6267		clive atkinson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6268		Clyde Watkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6269		e mainwaring	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6270		Meirion Rees	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6271		lynette dubery	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6272		Mr & Mrs C.B. Sim	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6273		Colin Sim	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6274		connor Flewitt	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6275		clare Saunders	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6276		Peter Reynolds	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6277		Cori Ryan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6278		annie craze	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6279		clare m	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6280		Deb Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6281		David Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6282		Denise Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6283		Daniel Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6284		Daniel Boyce	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6285		Daphne Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6286		Emma Darling	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6287		Darryl Spittle	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6288		Dave Carron	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6289</u>		David Livingstone	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6290</u>		D P O'Shea	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6291</u>		David Blackman	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6292</u>		Dave Bannister	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6293</u>		David Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6294</u>		david Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6295</u>		Dave Stacey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6296</u>		David and Eva Moy	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6297</u>		David Shapland	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6298</u>		Enfys Rennie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6299</u>		Diane Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6300</u>		Kevin Blackmore	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6301</u>		Dean Pepperell	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6302</u>		Debbie Bardo	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6303</u>		Debbie Tamplin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6304</u>		DEL PAGE	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6305</u>		Sarah Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6306</u>		Denise Laurent	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6307</u>		Denise Baker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6308</u>		Derek Burston	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6309</u>		Rhys Michael	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6310</u>		Delyth Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6311</u>		David Hytch	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6312</u>		Hywel Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6313</u>		Diana Grimwood-Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6314</u>		Diana Gordon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6315</u>		Jeanette Dobson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6316</u>		Jude Powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6317</u>		Dominic North	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6318</u>		Douglas Hatton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6319</u>		David Ryder Owen	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6320		Dave Noble	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6321		Leonora Matthews	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6322		Euron Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6323		Emma Karidian	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6324		Edward Baker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6325		Esther Buckley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6326		Edmund McMahon Turner	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6327		Karl Blom	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6328		Eileen Pritchard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6330		Elaine Blackman	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6331		elaine masci	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6332		eliot baron	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6333		Elizabeth Owens	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6334		Elizabeth Milner	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6335		Elizabeth Talboys	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6336		Elle Trevitt	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6337		Eleanor Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6338		Elsa Harflett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6339		Myles Bidder	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6340		Arthur Brooker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6341		elyssa noble hook	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6342		Emma Cram	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6343		Emma Creasey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6344		emma lloyd	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6345		Emma Hipkiss	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6346		Emma Ross	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6347		Emma Alabaster	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6348		Emma Spacey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6349		Enys Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6350		eric fletcher	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6351		Esther Phillips	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6352</u>		Eve Merrick-Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6353</u>		Faith Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6354</u>		Phil Panton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6355</u>		Stephen Finch	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6356</u>		Findlay Wilde	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6357</u>		Fiona Bailey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6358</u>		Francis Buxton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6359</u>		Frances Ballin	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6360</u>		gareth beynon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6361</u>		Gareth Marston	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6362</u>		Gary Cowell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6363</u>		Gary Northeast	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6364</u>		Gawain Barnard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6365</u>		Gaynor Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6366</u>		Gaynor Ball	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6367</u>		Gareth Bowen	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6368</u>		Gareth Clubb	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6369</u>		Gregory Page	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6370</u>		Geraint Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6371</u>		Zoe Foster	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6372</u>		Gwen Macnair	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6373</u>		Gemma Dickson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6374</u>		meg spiers	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6375</u>		Amanda Skull	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6376</u>		Rhisiart ap Gwilym	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6377</u>		Geoffrey Lincoln	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6378</u>		Carol Jackson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6379</u>		George Lawrance	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6380</u>		Georgia Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6381</u>		Gerald Francis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6382</u>		Gerwyn Caradoc ap Glanmor Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6383		Gethin Sugar	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6384		JAMES WILLIAMS	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6385		Aimee Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6386		Gordon Allison	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6387		Godfrey Bradshaw	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6388		Julie Rolls	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6389		Gordon Watson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6390		Graham Hart	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6391		Justin George	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6392		Gregory Spittle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6393		Carl Griffiths	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6394		Gillian Tennant-Eyles	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6395		Graham Thomas Thorne	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6396		Gary Loch	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6397		Gwydion ap Wynn	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6398		G Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6399		HELEN Varney	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6400		Haraldur Bjornsson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6401		Helen Hawkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6402		Hannah Sharp	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6403		Kevin Hargreaves	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6404		Simon Harlock	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6405		Donna Harvey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6406		Kate Hawkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6407		Hayley Farthing	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6408		Hayley Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6409		Heidi Traunecker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6410		Heini Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6411		Helen Jackson	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6412		Helen Collis	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6413		Helen Richards	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6414		Roy Scourfield	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6415		Kevin Henry	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6416		Berni Cavanagh	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6417		Gwynfor Roberts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6418		Holger Burkhardt	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6419		David Hands	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6420		Honor Maughan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6421		Howard Martin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6422		Hsiujung Lee	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6423		Hugh Mackay	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6424		Hugo Perks	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6425		HUGO PETTINGELL	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6426		Peter Hunt	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6427		michelle Penny	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6428		Hywel Wyn Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6429		Ian Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6430		Ian Rae	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6431		Ian Armer	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6432		Roger Lougher	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6433		Amy Jackson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6434		clare parry	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6435		Brian Burnett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6436		ian sellick	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6437		Ingrid Maughan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6438		Julia Francis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6439		Julie Roberts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6440		Ian Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6441		Ismene Cole	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6442		Isobel Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6443		Jenny Rogers	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6444		j watts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6445		Jonathan Stone	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6446		Jackie Clark	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6447		James D'sa	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6448		James Roden	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6449		Jan Neary	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6450		Jane McIntyre	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6451		Jane Read	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6452		jane sinclair	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6453		Janert Hrbury	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6454		Janet Lilley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6455		Jan Harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6456		Janice Waight	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6457		Jason Latham	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6458		John Spencer	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6459		Jennifer Protheroe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6460		Julie Englefield	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6461		James Clark	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6462		jean elliott	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6463		Jeane Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6464		Jessica King	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6465		Janet Diamond	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6466		Jeff Bartlett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6467		Jenny Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6468		Rebecca Dewsbury	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6469		Jennifer Lock	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6470		Jennine Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6471		Jenny Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6472		Jennifer Tetlow	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6473		Jenny Stevens	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6474		jennifer penney	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6475		J inglis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6476		Jess Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6477		Jayne Greenwood	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6478		John Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6479		james bevin	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6480		Julia BARTLETT	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6481		Josephine Burrells	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6482		Joanna Taylor	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6483		Joseph Fleming	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6484		John Deering	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6485		Jihn Dewsbury	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6486		John Higgon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6487		John Keates	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6488		John Probert	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6489		Jackie Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6490		John Goodwin	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6491		john park	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6492		John Powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6493		Jonathan Butcher	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6494		jonathan mead	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6495		Keith Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6496		Lesley Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6497		Josephine Bishop	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6498		Josie Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6499		Jane Rosser	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6500		John Davis	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6501		julia Barrell	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6502		Jessica Stokes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6503		Jude Aldridge	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6504		Judith Pendrous	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6505		Phil Bennett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6506		julie maffey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6507		Julian Langston	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6508		Emma Jackson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6509		June and John Bowler	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6510		Louise Burrows	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6511		Dawn Billett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6512		Jeanie Gray	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6513		Keith Roylance	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6514		Karen Carmichael-Timson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6515		Karen Frere-Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6516		Karis Dunford	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6517		Kate Blair	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6518		Kathryn Faulkner	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6519		Kathleen Mailer	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6520		Katherine Pritchard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6521		Katy Powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6522		kayleigh williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6523		karen ridout	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6524		Karen Collins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6525		Kevin Knowles	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6526		keith vaughton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6527		keith Mountain	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6528		Kenneth Brewer	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6529		Kerry Andrews	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6530		Kerryann Peat	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6531		Kevin Donovan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6532		Kevin Wood	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6533		Katie Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6534		Keith Gregory	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6535		Kim Dewsbury	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6536		Kim Westcott	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6537		Kirstin Chapman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6538		Kit Waring	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6539		Kit Warwick	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6540</u>		Kevin Stables	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6541</u>		Tessa Roberts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6542</u>		Kylie Jones Mattock	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6543</u>		Lila Cahue	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6544</u>		Lucy Greenwood	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6545</u>		ELAINE OREILLY	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6546</u>		Laura Griffiths	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6547</u>		Lauren Clark	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6548</u>		Lewis Thomson	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6549</u>		Lea Connelly	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6550</u>		Lee Haskins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6551</u>		Leighann Briggs	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6552</u>		Lesley Doggett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6553</u>		Lesley Mullan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6554</u>		Lesley Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6555</u>		vaughan lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6556</u>		Libby Tucker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6557</u>		Linda Booth	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6558</u>		lindsey Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6559</u>		Lisa Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6560</u>		Lis Parsons	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6561</u>		Christine Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6562</u>		Elizabeth Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6563</u>		Mike Ronan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6564</u>		Elizabeth Roberts	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6565</u>		Llewellyn James	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6566</u>		Gerhard Lohmann-Bond	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6567</u>		Louise Harvey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6568</u>		Louise Fitzpatrick	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6569</u>		Louise Cook	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6570</u>		Louise Redfearn	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6571</u>		Louise Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6572</u>		Irene Goldie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6573</u>		Bob Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6574</u>		Lucia Doni	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6575</u>		Lucie Sporle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6576</u>		Lucinda Bailey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6577</u>		lucy campbell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6578</u>		lorraine ward	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6579</u>		Lyn McFarlane	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6580</u>		Lynda Barnes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6581</u>		Lynda Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6582</u>		Lynda Hickling	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6583</u>		Lynda Gripton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6584</u>		Lynette Green	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6585</u>		Lyn Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6586</u>		Margred Scholey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6587</u>		Michaela Hollyfield	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6588</u>		mary johnson	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6589</u>		Maria Teresa Agozzino	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6590</u>		Madeleine Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6591</u>		madeline warhurst	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6592</u>		Maeve Caplin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6593</u>		Maggie Powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6594</u>		Ian HOPKIN	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6595</u>		elizabeth sandeman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6596</u>		Polly Pearshouse	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6597</u>		Mal DELAMARE	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6598</u>		malcolm hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6599</u>		Murray MacFarlane	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6600</u>		Marc Harries	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6601</u>		Margaret Cannings	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6602		margaret rensaw	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6603		MARGARET THOMAS	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6604		Maria Kloess	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6605		Mark Blackburn	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6606		Audrey Keppie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6607		Mark Prina	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6608		Mark Watson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6609		Martin Fry	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6610		Martin Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6611		Mary Wallis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6612		Mary Chances	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6613		Marylyn Bothamley	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6614		Mathew McCall	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6615		Matt Powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6616		Matthew Esh	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6617		Maya James	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6618		Melissa Wilkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6619		Meg Radley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6620		Megan Hayhurst	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6621		melissa compton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6622		Russell Halliday	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6623		Merryn Tully	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6624		Melanie Fritz	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6625		Mary Fiona Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6626		Michael Hogan	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6627		MICHAEL THOMAS	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6628		mike benjamin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6629		mike benjamin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6630		Michael White	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6631		Michael Alexander	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6632		Michael Heminsley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6633		Mike Hamblett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6634		Gwyneth Grahame	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6635		Michael McKenzie	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6636		Marilyn Everrson-Davis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6637		Angela Porter	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6638		miranda mugford	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6639		Maureen Paterson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6640		Alison Rigg	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6641		Clare Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6642		Aaron Pascall-Willis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6643		Ed Lord	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6644		jason hill	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6645		Kate Dunning	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6646		Emma Buckley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6647		Sarah McCarthy	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6648		Brian Murphy	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6649		Miranda Whitten	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6650		Dr Norman Chamberlain	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6651		Nathalie Yonow	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6652		ANN YOUNG	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6653		Nigel Douglas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6654		Nell Bridges	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6655		Richard Power	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6656		nerys jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6657		Annette Brown	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6658		nicola Blackburn	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6659		Nicky Jevon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6660		Nicola Rossiter	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6661		Nicola Bradbear	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6662		Nigel Devlin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6663		Norman Lowe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6664		Yvonne Allan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6665		Neil Ryding	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6666		Catherine John	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6667		Natalie Curtis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6668		kate leigh-powell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6669		Adrian Deere-Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6670		Peter Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6671		Elaine Olsen	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6672		Osian Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6673		Owain Grant	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6674		Joan Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6675		Brian Palmer	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6676		Pam Wesson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6677		pam lightfoot	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6678		Clare Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6679		Jemma Thompson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6680		Stephen Parker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6681		PAT MCKENNA	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6682		Patricia Prabhu	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6683		Paul Wimpory	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6684		Paul Swann	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6685		PAULA HUNT	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6686		Paula Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6687		Paula Keen	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6688		Paula Harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6689		Paul Phillips	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6690		Paul Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6691		Paul Gilhooley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6692		paul standley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6694		Lara Peachey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6695		Pete Bushell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6696		tom moses	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6697		Penny Johnson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6698</u>		penny Lyttle	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6699</u>		Angela Thomas-Collins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6700</u>		Peta Yapp	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6701</u>		Peter Wright	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6702</u>		Katherine Jezukiewicz	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6703</u>		Peter Ainsworth	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6704</u>		Peter Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6705</u>		Peter Martin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6706</u>		Annie Thompson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6707</u>		Philip Pritchard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6708</u>		Wendy Phillips	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6709</u>		Karen Picton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6710</u>		Hannah Phillips	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6711</u>		Paul Seligman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6712</u>		Pippa Stanier-Moore	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6713</u>		Helen Okines	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6714</u>		Janet Phillips	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6715</u>		Richard Podger	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6716</u>		Jeff Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6717</u>		Sandra veasey	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6718</u>		Daf Rogers	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6719</u>		Craig Fergus-jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6720</u>		Amanda Price	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6722</u>		paul webster	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6723</u>		Paul Summerside	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6724</u>		Tony Pullen	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6725</u>		Rosemary Howell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6726</u>		Ellen Routley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6727</u>		Rachel Oram	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6728</u>		Robert Dennison	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6729</u>		Rhiannon Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6730		Rhian welham	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6732		Sarah Habersberger	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6733		Rhys Aram	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6734		Sue Fudge	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6735		Richard Evans	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6736		Richard Goss	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6737		Richard Jenkins	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6738		Richard Chainey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6739		Richard Menmuir	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6740		rob rowe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6741		Rob Edwards	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6742		Julia Bourne	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6743		Rod Walters	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6745		Roger Bennett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6746		roger brown	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6747		Caroline Hernon-Biggs	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6748		Rory Francis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6749		Rosalind Foskett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6750		kathryn hayler	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6751		Rosemary Lang	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6752		Rosella D'Alesio	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6753		sue rose-martin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6754		ROSEMARY BASHFORD	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6755		Madeline Sadler	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6756		Rosemary Parkhouse	Campaign - Wildlife Trusts Wales	Withdrawn	
OBJ6757		Rosey Mitchell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6758		Roshan Devonish	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6759		Rosemarie Whitley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6760		Rachel Owens	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6761		Raymond Parsons	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6762		Russell Amos	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6763		Ruth Bastawy	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6764		Ruth Griffiths	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6766		Ruth Lovell	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6767		Sally Parker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6768		samantha williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6769		Samantha Kay	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6770		Samantha West	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6771		Sam Bull	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6772		Sam Strong	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6773		Sandra Beynon	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6774		Sara Davis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6775		Sarah Cox	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6776		sarah attwood	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6777		sarah reece	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6778		Sarah Mills	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6779		Saran Allott-Davey	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6780		Sawsan Bastawy	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6781		Sarah Willey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6782		Susan Harrison	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6783		Scott Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6784		Selena Brenchley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6785		Jayne Turner	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6786		Sheelagh Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6787		Susanne Eidens	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6788		Sherrie pember	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6789		Shirley Elwell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6790		Shona Roach	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6791		Cathrine Plumridge	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6792		Steve Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6793		Siani Palfrey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6794		Siany Humphries	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6795		Simon Hession	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6796		Simon Lewis Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
OBJ6797		Rebecca Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6798		Glenn Ibbitson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6799		Sonia Kiernan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6800		Nik Southwell	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6801		Amie Desmond	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6802		Jon Scott	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6803		Sarah Rowlands	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6804		D Driends	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6805		Susan Stubbs	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6806		Stan Townsend	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6807		Steffan Ellis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6808		Stephanie Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6809		Stephanie Burgess	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6810		Stephen Redpath	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6811		stephen mullard	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6812		Steve Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6813		steve attwood-wright	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6814		Steve Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6815		Steve Bennett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6816		Stuart Laslett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6817		susan wakefield	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6818		Susan Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6819		Sue Fellows	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6820		susan Furber	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6822		Susan Fisher	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6823		Susan Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6824		susan lowe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6825		Jennifer West-Jones	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
OBJ6826		Sue harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6827		Loraine Surringer	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6829		Susan Squire	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
OBJ6830		Steve Brown	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6831</u>		Simon Walpole	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6832</u>		Jenny Monteiro-Ryan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6833</u>		Susan Woodland	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6834</u>		Michelle Waldman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6835</u>		Talat Chaudhri	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6836</u>		Tav Ratcliffe	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6837</u>		Terry Wells	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6838</u>		terry abraham	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6839</u>		John James	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6840</u>		Fiona Clark	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6841</u>		Alexis Gorton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6842</u>		Robert Iles	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6843</u>		Greg Robinson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6844</u>		Darryl Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6845</u>		Margaret Iggulden	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6846</u>		Tim Hughes	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6847</u>		Timm Frenzel	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6848</u>		Tina Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6849</u>		Tina martin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6850</u>		Mark Jennings	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6851</u>		Tiffany Emmett	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6852</u>		Tracy Hanks	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6853</u>		Muriel Harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6854</u>		Tony Comley	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6855</u>		Anthony Hathaway	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6856</u>		Robert Peel	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6857</u>		O-Dzin Tridral	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6858</u>		Tristan Morgan	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6859</u>		Teresa Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6860</u>		Sandra Plaister	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6861</u>		Laura Shewring	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6862</u>		Valerie Brooker	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6863</u>		John Davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6864</u>		Val Short	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6865</u>		vanessa thornton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6866</u>		Vanessa Elphick	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6867</u>		R. Williams	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6868</u>		justin vickery	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6870</u>		Vanessa Mordin	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6871</u>		William Maidlow	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6872</u>		Sharon Chapman	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6873</u>		lisa davies	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6874</u>		Wendy Furminger	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6875</u>		Clare Thomas	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6876</u>		Leila Kiersch	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6877</u>		William Smith	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6878</u>		E Wilson	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6879</u>		karen malvisi	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6880</u>		william harris	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6881</u>		Hugh Parry	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6882</u>		roger houghton	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6883</u>		Wendy Beever	Campaign - Woodland Trust	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6884</u>		Wendy Bates	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6885</u>		Sophie Lewis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6886</u>		John Ellis	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6887</u>		Andrew Bailey	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6888</u>		Ramunas Grabauskas	Campaign - Woodland Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0271 - Woodland Trust
<u>OBJ6889</u>		Katie May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Alternatives 		Keith Jones WG1.18 Nicholas Rowson WG1.8 Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 9) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
<u>OBJ6890</u>		Dr & Mrs N H Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and nature conservation • Environment • Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 23) Document 4.7.2

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6891</u>	Statutory	Mr M Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality Sustainable development Economics Ecology and nature conservation 		Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.92) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.237-5.240) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 Michael Bull 1.12
<u>OBJ6892</u>		Mr Arthur Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 23) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ6893</u>		Frank Crockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 23) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ6894</u>		Ian Warren	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Alternatives (also part of OBJ0206 Rogiet CC). 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 23) Document 4.7.2
<u>OBJ6895</u>		Rhydian Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Alternatives 		Bryan Whittaker WG1.2.6 (Chapter 9.6) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 23) Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ6895-1-LEWIS
<u>OBJ6896</u>		Matthew Parry	Campaign - Gwent Wildlife Trust		WG/REB/OBJ0270 - Gwent Wildlife Trust
<u>OBJ6897</u>	Statutory	Openreach - BT	Not an objection	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6898</u>		Tom Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24)
<u>OBJ6899</u>		Christine Stitfall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6900</u>		Gwent Ornithological Society Trevor Russell	Same as OBJ0297	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6901</u>		Light Rail Transit Association (LRTA) Alan Douglas Wilkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ6901 - Light Rail Transit Association (Alan Wilkins) PIQ/040 PIQ/120 ID/073
<u>OBJ6902</u>		Marshfield Community Council Chairman: Mr Mathew Tindale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		WG/REB/OBJ6902 - Marshfield Community Council
<u>OBJ6903</u>		Llangattock Community Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment 		WG/REB/OBJ6903 - Llangattock Community Council
<u>OBJ6904</u>		Wentlooge Community Council Richard S Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		WG/REB/OBJ6904 - Wentlooge Community Council
<u>OBJ6905</u>		Pace Transportation Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		WG/REB/OBJ6905 - PACE ID/073
<u>OBJ6906</u>		Jenny Rathbone AM and Steve Howell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ6906 - Jenny Rathbone AM and Steve Howell
<u>OBJ6907</u>		Cllr Brian Miles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		WG/REB/OBJ6907 - Cllr Brian Miles
<u>OBJ6908</u>		Mr John Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ6908 John Evans
<u>OBJ6909</u>		Alwyn Jenkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 	Withdrawn	

Respondent Number	Statutory Objector	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Topics Raised by Respondent	Objection withdrawn	EVIDENCE RESPONSE
<u>OBJ6910</u>		Jane Blank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable development 		WG/REB/OBJ6910 - Jane Blank ID/073 ID/195 ID/222 WG/REB/OBJ6910-3
<u>OBJ6911</u>		Louise Davies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Ecology and nature conservation Environment 		WG/REB/OBJ6911 - Louise Davies WG/REB/OBJ6911 - Supplementary Rebuttal to Louise Davies
<u>OBJ6912</u>		Matthew Williams	Unsuitable for numerous reasons	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6913</u>		Victoria Yeates	No statement received	Withdrawn	
<u>OBJ6914</u>		John Robertson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology - birds 		WG/REB/OBJ6914 - John Robertson
<u>OBJ6915</u>	Statutory	The Representative Body of the Church in Wales Neil Connor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use 		Supplementary (no.2) CPO
<u>OBJ6916</u>		John Holiday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		Matthew Jones WG1.1.1
<u>OBJ6917</u>		Benjamin Potts-Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ6917 - Mr Potts Johnson
<u>OBJ6918</u>		Catherine Grady	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Economics Alternatives 		WG/REB/OBJ6918 - Catherine Grady
<u>OBJ6919</u>		Dr Diana Callaghan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood consequence assessment 		WG/REB/OBJ6919 - Dr Callaghan PIQ/113
<u>OBJ6920</u>		Phil James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic 		WG/REB/OBJ6920 - Phil James
<u>OBJ6921</u>		Jeremy Randles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General 		WG/REB/OBJ6921 - Jeremy Randles and Jane Blank
<u>OBJ6922</u>		Elwyn Richards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and Nature conservation 		Correspondence Response Ref: qA1174612/OBJ6922
<u>OBJ6923</u>		Future Generations Commissioner for Wales Eurgain Powell/Sophie Howe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable development 		WG/REB/ISU0024/2 ID/033 ID/072
<u>OBJ6924</u>		D M Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		Correspondence Response Ref: qA1174612/OBJ6924
<u>OBJ6925</u>		Moth Foster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Noise & Vibration Economics 		Correspondence Response Ref: qA1174612/OBJ6925
<u>OBJ6926</u>		Nerys Lloyd-Pierce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		Correspondence Response Ref: qA1174612/OBJ6926
<u>OBJ6927</u>		Alastair McDougall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 		WG/REB-OBJ6927 - Alastair McDougall
<u>OBJ6928</u>		Lisa Buchholz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecology and nature conservation 		The Welsh Government's rebuttal was issued as ID181
<u>OBJ6929</u>		Campaign Against the Levels Motorway (CALM) Catherine Linstrum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics Environment 		The Welsh Government's rebuttal was issued as ID182

Annex 2 - Table of Statutory Objectors whose rights under Protocol 1 Article 1 and/or Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights are engaged

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0003	Jeff Neale	Tyn-y-Brwyn Farm	Private Means of Access. Proposed closure of one of two access routes to his property. A maintenance right taken over the other.	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.59-8.62) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2-10.5 & 10.8-10.11)
OBJ0026	Road Chef Simon Turl, Chief Executive, RoadChef	Magor Services. J23 M4, Caldicot, NP26 3YL	Woodland areas within the Roadchef Freehold	WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Simon Turl WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mke Axon - by Dr P Ireland WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mike Axon - by Bryan Whittaker WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BWo Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 Bwo Erratum Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 JD Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Planning WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 MJ Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Decision Making and Policy WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Supplementary Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BS Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Engineering PIQ/123 ID/078 ID/091 ID/094 (Statement of Common Ground)
OBJ0049	Parc Golf Club TG Hicks	Parc Golf Club	Part of Golf Course (commercial enterprise) taken as title.	WG/REB/OBJ0049 - Parc Golf Club
OBJ0068	IAC Systems Peter Lewis	Industrial Automations and Control (IAC) Holdings Limited	Part of internal access route for commercial property.	Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 and Chapter 23) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.13-5.16)
OBJ0095	Port Security Authority Ian Meredith	Newport Docks	Commercial operations (Newport Docks). Land and rights acquired over Newport Docks.	WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP PIQ/012 PIQ/032 PIQ/039
OBJ0145	Mr John Watts-Baker & Mr Peter Watts-Baker	Maerdy Farm	Agricultural land taken as title mitigation. Agricultural land is away from place of home (which is Great Osbaston Farm, Monmouth).	Michael Vaughan WG 1.17.1 (Paragraphs 4.46-4.58) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.4-8.9) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.30-5.32) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.17) Paul Canning WG 1.16.1 (Paragraph 7.1 & Chapter 4 & 5)
OBJ0148	Railway Paths Ltd Howard Jones (on behalf of Sustrans)	Footpath / cycleway adjacent to Corporation Road, Newport.	Title and rights taken to footpath over which Sustrans have a right.	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.116) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.33-5.36) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 3.3.1-3.3.8 & 4.1-4.9) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.124-4.127)
OBJ0152	Mrs S E Phillips	Green Farm, Llanfihangel Rogiet.	Agricultural land taken as title	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.13-10.24) Bryan Whittaker WG 1.2.6 (Paragraph 4.1-4.9) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Chapter 13) Mick Rawlings, 1.9.1
OBJ0207	Nicholas Victor Clarke Rebecca Jane Clarke	Whitecross Farm, St. Brides, Wentloog	Access to property included for tying in to new overbridge	Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.37-5.41) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82)

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0209	Clive William Rabbitt	Daffodil Lodge & Unit 3 Knollbury Business Park	Title & Essential Licence taken to part of back garden of residential property	WG/REB/OBJ0209 - Mr Rabbitt, Daffodil Lodge ID/086
OBJ0211	T.C. F. Allen	Myrtle Cottage	Whole of residential property and garden	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.45-5.49)
OBJ0212	R.P Richardson Mrs D. Alred	45 Ffos y Fran, Bassaleg	Agricultural farmland taken as title. (Agricultural land is located away from place of residence)	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.10-8.11) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.50-5.52) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.18)
OBJ0213	JS & RE Anstey	Old Court Farm	Agricultural holding taken as title for building road & associated infrastructure. Part of access track leading to the home taken as easement for discharge pipe maintenance	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.12-8.17) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.53-5.59) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.22)
OBJ0214	SG Anstey	Court Farm	Agricultural holding taken as title for building road & associated infrastructure. Part of access track leading to the home taken as easement for discharge pipe maintenance	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.18-8.23) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.60-5.69)
OBJ0215	D Colley	Great House, Undy	Agricultural field taken for essential mitigation Field not located near the property.	ID191
OBJ0216	Mr Derek Trevor David	Fair Orchard Farm, St. Brides, Wentloog	Agricultural land taken as title, front garden taken as essential licence, & amendment to one of his points of access into his farm holding.	Modification 30
OBJ0217	Huw Richard Edwards Brenda Kathleen Edwards	New Dairy Farm	Agricultural land taken as title. New means of access provided to severed land. Commercial farmland.	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.36-8.41) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.83-5.88) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82)
OBJ0219	Executors of DG Harris	Land lying next to Green Moor Lane, Magor	Agricultural field taken as title for motorway and title mitigation Not part of home. Not next to home.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.43) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.90-5.95) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.28)
OBJ0220	M.D.W Hazell	Cefn Henllan, Caerleon	Part of agricultural field taken as title for the new highway. Rights taken over same field for maintenance of environmental fencing. Not near to home.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.44) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.96-5.100) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.29)

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0223	David Howard James	North Court Farm, North Row	Title taken over agricultural land (under both freehold and tenanted) for construction of new motorway and associated infrastructure. Not by the home.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.45-8.47) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.102-106) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.30)
OBJ0224	Trustees of FH James Joyce Doubleday Frank Jones Diane Price Heather Richards Kathleen Harris Rosemary Ballard Janet Corbett Judith Parry Trustees of FH James Partnership	Penterry Farm, Chepstow	Agricultural fields taken as title for new motorway and for environmental mitigation. Not near the home.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.107-5.112) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.31-10.33)
OBJ0225	R.M Jenkins	Red House Farm, Llandeenny	Agricultural fields taken as title for new motorway and for environmental mitigation. Not near the home.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.48-49) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.113-5.117) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.34 & 11.24-11.30)
OBJ0227	Roger Jones Gillian Jones Kate Jones Matthew Jones Rhiannon Jones	New Park Farm, Castleton	Agricultural fields and part of rear garden taken as environmental mitigation. Rear garden of family home.	WG/REB/OBJ0277 - New Park Farm
OBJ0228	William David Jones	Carrowhill Farm	Agricultural field taken as essential licence (i.e. temporary). Right taken over part of field for maintenance of drainage pipe, and title taken for a drainage headwall. Not in immediate vicinity of farm.	PID191 Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.59-8.62) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.129-5.135) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.8-10.11)
OBJ0229	John & Joan Major	Langley Villa, Magor	Agricultural paddocks taken for attenuation ponds. Part of rear garden taken as dedication for footpath	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Chapter 3 & paragraph 5-5.5) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.118-8.119) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.136-5.140) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.40-11.46)
OBJ0230	Laura Neville	Cefn Llogell Fach, Coedkernew	Agricultural land taken as title and title mitigation. Not in immediate vicinity of house.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.63-8.65) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (Paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.141-5.146) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.38 & 11.47-11.53)
OBJ0231	Nicholas Simon Park Alicia Sarah Sophie Rebecca Verity Lydia Adam Brandon	White House Farm, Abergavenny	Agricultural land taken as title mitigation on Caldicot Levels, and part of agricultural field taken as essential licence (i.e. temporary) for access route to Ifton Quarry. Land not near the home.	PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0231 - Mr N S Park

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0232	Christine Margaret Phillips	Green Farm, Llanfihangel Rogiet.	Agricultural land taken as title Agricultural land surrounding the home	PID191 WG/REB/OBJ233 - Phillips PIQ/117 Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.69-8.76) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.151-5.154) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.54-11.61)
OBJ0233	Stephen Charles Phillips	Green Farm, Llanfihangel Rogiet.	Agricultural land taken as title Agricultural land surrounding the home	PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0233 - Mr S C Phillips PIQ/112 PIQ/117
OBJ0235	Llewellyn Morgan Pritchard	The Beeches, Magor	Agricultural land taken as essential licence (i.e. temporary) for works. Title taken to agricultural field for new highway. Title taken to rear garden for provision of new private means of access for use by Mr Pritchard.	PID191 WG/REB/OBJ0235 - Mr L Pritchard - The Beeches
OBJ0236	William Reece	16 Highfield, Caerwent, Monmouth	Agricultural fields taken as title for new motorway and for environmental mitigation	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.81) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.172-5.176) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.43 & 11.66-11.67)
OBJ0237	Jane Renton	Land between M48 and B4245	Agricultural field taken as title for building new Bencroft Lane Overbridge. Ms Renton lives in Weymouth, but owns this parcel of land.	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.69-8.76) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.163-5.166)
OBJ0238	Arthur George Smith	Orchard Farm	Agricultural fields taken as title for new side road alignment. Title Mitigation taken for sheltering building from motorway. Title taken for new PMA for use by Mr Smith Not near to home.	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.82-8.84) Philip Evans WG 1.14.1 (paragraphs 4.8.1 - 4.8.9 & 10.3.4-10.3.5) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.177-5.181) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19 & 10.82)
OBJ0239	Messrs. J.J. & A.D. Turner & Sons	Church Farm, St. Brides	Title taken over agricultural land (under both freehold and tenanted) for construction of new motorway and associated infrastructure.	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.182-5.184)
OBJ0240	Alan James Williams	Hendrew Farm, Llandeuvad	Agricultural fields taken as title and title mitigation.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraphs 5.185-5.190) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraph 10.44)
OBJ0241	Lyndon James Williams		Agricultural field taken as easement for the right to flood Not immediately adjacent to home.	PID191 Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.82) Michael Bull WG 1.12.1 (Paragraph 11.1) Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.85-90) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.191-5.197) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 11.68-11.69)

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0270	Gwent Wildlife Trust Ian Rappel	Magor Marsh	Environmental land (marshland) taken as title for construction of new highway.	WG-REB-OBJ0270.1 - Prof Marsden WG-REB-OBJ0270.2 - Prof Calvin Jones WG-REB-OBJ0270.2 – Prof Calvin Jones Addendum WG-REB-OBJ0270.3 – Prof John Whitelegg WG-REB-OBJ0270.4 - Prof Kevin Anderson WG-REB-OBJ0270.4 - Errata to Rebuttal to Prof Kevin Anderson WG-REB-OBJ0270.5 - Prof Lorrain Whitmarsh WG-REB-OBJ0270.6 – Prof John Altringham WG-REB-OBJ0270.6 - Prof John Altringham Addendum WG-REB-OBJ0270.7 – David Boyce WG-REB-OBJ0270.8 - Richard Bakere WG-REB-OBJ0270.11 - Geoff Liles WG-REB-OBJ0270.11 - Geoff Liles Erratum WG-REB-OBJ0270.12 - Prof John Lawton WG-REB-OBJ0270.13 - Lindi Rich WG-REB-OBJ0270.14 - Neil Ward WG-REB-OBJ0270.15 – Mike Webb WG-REB-OBJ0270.17 - Iolo Williams PIQ/055 ID/051 ID/068 ID/073
OBJ0273	Claire Rose	Ty'n y Brwyn	Private Means of Access. Proposed closure of one of 2 access routes to his property. A maintenance right taken over the other.	Ben Sibert WG1.5.1 (Paragraphs 4.217-8 Julia Tindale WG1.10.1 (Paragraphs 8.59-62)
OBJ0291	Origin UK Operations Ltd	Newport Docks	Part of commercial premises taken for new access way for ABP & all associated tenants / leaseholders	WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP
OBJ0292	Rontec Roadside retail	Newport Docks	Woodland areas within the Roadchef Freehold	WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Simon Turl WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mke Axon - by Dr P Ireland WG/REB/OBJ0026 - Rebuttal to Mike Axon - by Bryan Whittaker WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BWo Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 Bwo Erratum Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Construction WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 JD Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Planning WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 MJ Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Decision Making and Policy WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 SB Supplementary Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Economics WG/REB/OBJ0026 ; OBJ0292 BS Rebuttal - Roadchef & Rontec - Engineering ID/078 ID/089 ID/091
OBJ0302	WE Dowds Shipping Ltd	Newport Docks	Part of commercial building required to route new means of access for ABP and associated tenants	WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP
OBJ0305	Hanson Uk	Stephenson Street Industrial Site, Newport	Part of commercial operational equipment required as land for temporary works.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.27-10.29) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.210-5.213) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24)

Respondent Number	Company / Organisation / Respondent Name	Property	Description of land or interest interfered with	Evidence Response
OBJ0312	CJN Engineering Ltd	Leasehold at Eastway Road, Newport Docks	Commercial leasehold premises required during construction	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.278-5.284) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 19) WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP
OBJ0313	Jewson Ltd & Saint Gobain Building Distribution Limited	Leasehold off Westway Road, Newport Docks	Commercial storage land required during construction	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.285-5.291) Jonathan Vine WG 1.22.1 (Paragraphs 8.3.1-8.3.9) WG/REB/OBJ0031 - ABP
OBJ0316	Bulk hauliers UK & Europe Ronnie Evans	Newport Docks	Commercial operations leasehold within Port of Newport	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.292-5.298) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 19)
OBJ0317	Technoplan Anstalt	Burnt House Farm, Newport	Title taken over potential Residential Development Land.	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.224-5.227) Peter Ireland WG 1.7.1 (Paragraphs 10.47-10.48)
OBJ0322	Mark Williams Mark Skinner Mark Williams Pension Fund Clive Coulthard	Agricultural land at Castleton	Title taken over part of Agricultural holding Not near the home(s)	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.91) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.228-5.232) Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.74-10.76 & 10.82) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 (Chapter 24) Document 4.7.2
OBJ0329	Marshalls Group Andrew Johnson	Newport Docks	Essential Licence taken over commercial enterprise and works	WG/REB/OBJ0329 - Marshall's WG/REB/OBJ0329 - Erratum to Marshall's Rebuttal ID/216
OBJ0330	Christopher & Wendy Perkins	Ty'n y Brywn, Castleton	Private Means of Access. Proposed closure of one of 2 access routes to his property. A maintenance right taken over the other.	Barry Woodman WG 1.6.1 (Paragraphs 10.2-10.5, 10.8-10.11 & 5.8-5.10 & 5.16-5.19) Matthew Jones WG 1.1.1 (Paragraph 3.18-20 & 22.28-22.30 & 22.33-22.36 and Chapter 9) Phil Evans WG1.14 Tim Chapman WG1.13 Document 4.7.2 WG/REB/OBJ0247
OBJ0339	UK Health Care Property 1 LLP	Bryn Ivor Lodge Care Home	Rights for maintenance of environmental fencing taken over gardens of Residential Care Home	Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.233-5.236)
OBJ6891	Mr M Waters	Great House Farm, Nash	Title taken to leasehold agricultural land for the construction of a new attenuation pond. Land not located near residential home	Julia Tindale WG 1.10.1 (Paragraph 8.92) Ben Sibert WG 1.5.1 (Paragraph 5.237-5.240) Matthew Jones WG1.1.1 Michael Bull 1.12
OBJ6915	The Representative Body of the Church in Wales Neil Connor	Woodland House / Magor Vicarage	Title taken to property known as Woodland House / Magor Vicarage, as well as surrounding land.	Supplementary (no.2) CPO

ANNEX 3

Note on Habitats Directive, Regulations and Waddenzee C-127/02

1. Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of wild Fauna and Flora

1.1 The Directive broadly covers 2 topics of ecological significance – protected sites (Natura Sites – in the UK, SACs, SPAs and RAMSAR sites) and protected habitats and species.

1.2 The objectives of the Directive in respect of each are connected but the provisions relating to them are distinct and, of course, different considerations arise in relation, on the one hand, to large areas of land or water and, on the other, an extensive list of individual habitat types and faunal/plant species. Its main aim, however, is described in the Recitals as *“to promote the maintenance of biodiversity, taking account of economic, social, cultural and regional requirements”* making a contribution to the *“general objective of sustainable development”*.

1.3 With regard to protected species, the objective is *“to conserve them”*.

1.4 Art. 1 definitions include :

“‘Conservation’ means a series of measures required to maintain or restore the natural habitats and the populations of species of wild fauna and flora at a favourable status as defined [below]”

“‘Conservation status of a species’ means the sum of the influences acting on the species concerned that may affect its long-term distribution and abundance of its populations within the territory referred to in Art. 2”

“The ‘conservation status’ will be taken as ‘favourable’ when:

- population dynamics data on the species concerned indicate that it is maintaining itself on a long-term basis as a viable component of its natural habitats, and

- *the natural range of the species is neither being reduced nor is it likely to be reduced for the foreseeable future, and*
- *there is and will probably continue to be, a sufficiently large habitat to maintain its populations on a long-term basis.” (Emphasis added).*

1.5 Art. 2 provides:

1. “The aim of this Directive shall be to contribute towards ensuring biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora in the European territory of the Member States to which the Treaty applies.

2. Measures taken pursuant to this Directive shall be designed to maintain or restore, at favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest.

3. Measures taken pursuant to this Directive shall take account of economic, social and cultural requirements and regional and local characteristics.” (Emphasis added).

1.6 Arts. 3 to 11 are headed “Conservation of natural habitats and habitats of species.” These Articles deal with the Natura 2000 Sites – i.e. SACs and designations of similar status such as SPAs. They relate to habitat and species types set out in Annexes I and II to the Directive. Art. 6 is the provision which was in issue in the Waddenzee case (C-127/02).

1.7 Arts. 12 to 16 are headed “Protection of Species”.

1.8 The Commission’s guidance on the Directive refers to these two parts as two closely interlinked “pillars” of protection and points out that the Natura sites pillar requires positive maintenance, restoration/ improvement, whereas the second pillar concerning species is of a preventative character.¹

¹ ‘Guidance document on the strict protection of animal species of Community interest under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC’ (February 2007) produced by the Commission in close consultation with Member States

1.9 Art. 12 provides for the compulsory introduction of measures for the strict protection of certain species of fauna, as follows:

1. "Member States shall take the requisite measures to establish a system of strict protection for the animal species listed in Annex IV (a) in their natural range, prohibiting:

(a) all forms of deliberate capture or killing of specimens of these species in the wild;

(b) deliberate disturbance of these species, particularly during the period of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration;

(c) deliberate destruction or taking of eggs from the wild;

(d) deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places.

2. For these species, Member States shall prohibit the keeping, transport and sale or exchange, and offering for sale or exchange, of specimens taken from the wild, except for those taken legally before this Directive is implemented.

3. The prohibition referred to in paragraph 1(a) and 1(b) and paragraph 2 shall apply to all stages of life of the animals to which this Article applies.

4. Member States shall establish a system to monitor the incidental capture and killing of the animal species listed in Annex IV (a). In the light of the information gathered, Member States shall take further research or conservation measures as required to ensure that incidental capture and killing does not have a significant negative impact on the species concerned".

1.10 Art. 13 makes equivalent provision in relation to plants listed in Annex 4b.

1.11 Arts. 13 to 15 provide for the discretionary qualified protection of other lists of plants and species listed in Annex V. They are species which are regularly hunted in Europe for example wolves, salmon and hares. The Commission guidance refers to the Annex V list as including species which

may be “exploited”, subject to such exploitation not jeopardising their conservation status. Art. 15 prohibits certain means of killing, taking etc species listed in Annex V or Annex IVa species in respect of which there has been a derogation granted under Art. 16 these are, broadly speaking, methods which might be deemed unnecessarily cruel or “unsporting” or indiscriminate or invasive.

1.12 Art. 16 provides for derogations from the provisions of Arts. 12–15 and reporting on them as follows; (Emphasis added).

1. *“Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and **the derogation** is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):*

(a) in the interest of protecting wild fauna and flora and conserving natural habitats;

(b) to prevent serious damage, in particular to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries and water and other types of property;

(c) in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

(d) for the purpose of research and education, of repopulating and re-introducing these species and for the breedings operations necessary for these purposes, including the artificial propagation of plants;

(e) to allow, under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent, the taking or keeping of certain specimens of the species listed in Annex IV in limited numbers specified by the competent national authorities.

2. *Member States shall forward to the Commission every two years a report in accordance with the format established by the Committee on the derogations applied under paragraph 1. The Commission shall give its opinion on these derogations within a maximum time limit of 12 months following receipt of the report and shall give an account to the Committee.*

3. *The reports shall specify:*

- (a) the species which are subject to the derogations and the reason for the derogation, including the nature of the risk, with, if appropriate, a reference to alternatives rejected and scientific data used;*
- (b) the means, devices or methods authorized for the capture or killing of animal species and the reasons for their use;*
- (c) the circumstances of when and where such derogations are granted;*
- (d) the authority empowered to declare and check that the required conditions obtain and to decide what means, devices or methods may be used, within what limits and by what agencies, and which persons are to carry out the task;*
- (e) the supervisory measures used and the results obtained.”*

1.13 Art. 16 provides for the reports to specify: the species in respect of which derogations are granted, and the reason for it, including **“if appropriate.....scientific data used”**. (Emphasis added)

1.14 Art. 6, dealing with Natura 2000 sites, provides as follows:

- 1. *“For special areas of conservation, Member States shall establish the necessary conservation measures involving, if need be, appropriate management plans specifically designed for the sites or integrated into other development plans, and appropriate statutory, administrative or contractual measures*

which correspond to the ecological requirements of the natural habitat types in Annex I and the species in Annex II present on the sites.

- 2. Member States shall take appropriate steps to avoid, in the special areas of conservation, the deterioration of natural habitats and the habitats of species as well as disturbance of the species for which the areas have been designated, in so far as such disturbance could be significant in relation to the objectives of this Directive.*
- 3. Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives. In the light of the conclusions of the assessment of the implications for the site and subject to the provisions of paragraph 4, the competent national authorities shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned and, if appropriate, after having obtained the opinion of the general public.*
- 4. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.*

Where the site concerned hosts a priority natural habitat type and/or a priority species, the only considerations which may be raised are those relating to human health or public safety, to beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment or, further to an opinion from the Commission, to other imperative reasons of overriding public interest.”

1.15 Pausing there, we should note the following points:

- (a) that the Natura sites are intended to form a European ecological network and are therefore areas which are of sufficient substance, individually, to operate, as it were, in a transboundary way.
- (b) That Art. 6(3) sets up a two-stage process, as has been recognised and developed in the UK in the wake of Waddenzee – an initial threshold stage (likely to have a significant effect on the Euro site, alone or in combination) and a determination stage (after Appropriate Assessment (AA)) if necessary, having applied the threshold test). In our case, we have decided that the threshold test was not passed and have therefore gone on to do the AA, which is uncontroversial as between Welsh Government and Natural Resources Wales.²
- (c) That, in the event that a plan or project fails both the Art. 6(3) tests and Art. 6(4) permits a derogation for IROPI, with an attendant duty on the Member State to take relevant compensatory measures.
- (d) Waddenzee related to the Art. 6(3) process, not the Art. 6(4) derogation process; the question arose at the Art. 6(3) stage – should there have been an AA and, if so, what standard of proof should have applied to it before the competent authority could properly decide that it had “ascertained” that the plan or project would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC? Derogation was not considered in the decision.

² GWT has a separate objection to the SIAA on the basis of otters

(e) Art. 16, on the other hand, starts from the position that there **will be** a contravention of Art. 12. For example that there will be some form of relevant impact on a feature [in this case, a species or habitat] which is the subject of the Directive's protection; in other words, if one is comparing it to Art. 6, it starts at a stage equivalent to Art. 6(4) (not the subject of Waddenzee) rather than Art. 6(3) (the threshold and post AA stages, devoted to asking and answering the question whether or not there will be relevant harm to a feature [in that case, a site] which is the subject of the Directive's protection).

(f) Waddenzee is silent on the question of derogation generally.

(g) The Art. 6(3) questions are:

- whether the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on the site in view of the site's conservation objectives? (The threshold stage).

- whether it has been ascertained that the plan or programme will not adversely affect the integrity of the site?

Waddenzee established that these questions are to be asked and answered on the basis of exclusion of reasonable scientific doubt (a very high standard of proof involving the establishment of a negative). We must remember that each of the individual sites in question is, by definition, of international significance and that Art. 6(3) is not concerning itself with the separate question of a derogation.

- (h) No question of whether or not the conservation status of any species is favourable arises under Art. 6. The Art. 6 questions are related to significant effects upon and the integrity of Natura sites; the terms “*significant effects*” and “*integrity*”, unlike “*favourable conservation status*” are not defined in the Directive.
- (i) The ecological precondition to be established under Art. 16 is that the derogation would not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range; the causal test, therefore, links the effect of the activity authorised by the relevant derogation to the conservation status of the relevant species.³
- (j) Returning to the definitions in Art. 1, we can note the following:
- conservation status of a species relates to the territory of the Member States in Europe; this must either mean the status of that species across all the Member States or the relevant Member State; the wording is not entirely clear but, given the objectives of the Directive, the better view would appear to be that it means the territory of all the Member States. Arts 16(3) and 17 require Member States to forward information on derogations and also implementation of measures generally under the Directive to the Commission, which is consistent with a pan-Europe approach to interpreting Art. 2; however, the Commission’s guidance at para 50 states:

³ Since Annex IV specifies “all species” under Microchiroptera (‘microbats’ , an old fashioned term now taken to mean bats generally (Wikipedia), as opposed to the more general term ‘chiroptera’ used in Annex II), the relevant tests are to be applied individually to each species of bat, eg. Lesser Horseshoe, Common Pipistrelle etc rather than collectively to bats in general

(50) Considering the first question, it should be recognised that the conservation status of the (local) population of a species in a certain geographical area might well be different from the overall conservation status of populations in the biogeographic region in the Member State (or even the range). Both situations should be considered and taken into account in any decision.

That guidance would suggest, (in my view, contrary to the wording of Art. 2) that we are dealing here with a smaller series of areas which will be different for each relevant species concerned.

Favourable conservation status is to be judged by reference to 3 factors: population dynamics data, natural range neither being reduced or likely to be reduced for the foreseeable future and present and probable future existence of sufficiently large habitat to maintain populations on a long-term basis.

Therefore, it would appear that the context or metric within which the favourable conservation status question is to be judged under Art 16. is either Europe-wide – “*the European territory of the Member States*” - or UK-wide – the particular Member State in question.⁴

The third element of the favourable conservation status question asks whether “*there is and will PROBABLY continue to be a sufficiently large habitat to maintain its populations on a long-term basis*” (emphasis added).

(k) The third element (emboldened) above is, clearly, highly pertinent to the issue of whether or not the Waddenzee standard of proof employed for the Art. 6(3) questions also applies to Art. 16; the fact that the Art. 16 question about favourable conservation status includes within it a limb framed in terms of **probability** makes it clear that

⁴ Allowing for fn.1 re Brexit – ie. one continues to apply provisions on the basis of UK’s being a MS

the test is to be applied on the conventional ‘civil’ standard of proof of balance of probabilities, rather than the higher Waddenzee standard of exclusion of reasonable scientific doubt.

- (l) The fact that the reporting duty in Art. 16(3) envisages that scientific data will not inevitably or always be required (only “*if appropriate*”) is consistent with the application of a lesser standard of proof than in the case of Art 6(3).

- (m) The Precautionary Principle applies as a general principle of European environmental law and was relied upon by the Court in Waddenzee as part of its justification for ruling that the very high standard of proof applied to Art. 6; but that is not to say that this same standard of proof applies to every single question or test which falls to be determined under the Habitats Directive and the Court did not so decide.

The Commission’s guidance explicitly states that the severity of the “tests” or “conditions” varies depending on the severity of the impact on the population; this is only guidance, but such a “sliding scale” approach is inconsistent with a uniformly very high standard of proof.⁵ This approach is also much closer to what Professor Altringham said in his oral evidence about the standard of proof he regards as appropriate than the “no reasonable scientific doubt” set out in Charles Streeten’s opening preliminary legal submissions, though not repeated in GWT’s closing.

- (n) Art 12(1)(b) - deliberate disturbance – is to be contrasted with (d) – deterioration or destruction of

⁵ Chapter III.1.2 para.11

breeding sites or resting places; in domestic law terms, the difference is between the absolute requirement or strict liability with regard to (d) as opposed to the qualified requirement or liability with regard to (b). This distinction is replicated in the transposing Regulations.⁶

“Deliberate” is not defined but the Commission suggests that it means: “actions by a person who knows, in the light of the relevant legislation that applies to the species involved and the general information delivered to the public, that his action will most likely lead to an offence against a species but intends this offence of, if not, consciously accepts the foreseeable results of his action.”⁷

(o) *“Disturbance”* is not defined. The guidance deals with it as follows:⁸

(37) Disturbance (e.g. by noise, source of light) does not necessarily directly affect the physical integrity of a species but can nevertheless have an indirect negative effect on the species (e.g. by forcing them to use lots of energy to flee; bats, for example, when disturbed during hibernation, heat up as a consequence and take flight, so are less likely to survive the winter due to high loss of energy resources). The intensity, duration and frequency of repetition of disturbances are important parameters when assessing their impact on a species. Different species will have different sensitivities or reactions to the same type of disturbance, which has to be taken into account in any meaningful protection system. Factors causing disturbance for one species might not create disturbance for another. Also, the sensitivity of a single species might be different depending on the season or on certain periods in its life cycle (e.g. breeding period). Article 12(1)(b) takes into

⁶ Now the 2017 Regulations

⁷ Chapter II.3.1 para. 33

⁸ Chapter II.3.2a paras. 37-39

account this possibility by stressing that disturbances should be prohibited particularly during the sensitive periods of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration. Again, a species-by-species approach is needed to determine in detail the meaning of “disturbance”.

(38) The disturbance under Article 12(1)(b) must be deliberate (see chapter II.3.1) and not accidental. On the other hand, while “disturbance” under Article 6(2) must be significant, this is not the case in Article 12(1), where the legislator did not explicitly add this qualification. This does not exclude, however, some room for manoeuvre in determining what can be described as disturbance. It would also seem logical that for disturbance of a protected species to occur a certain negative impact likely to be detrimental must be involved.

(39) In order to assess a disturbance, consideration must be given to its effect on the conservation status of the species at population level and biogeographic level in a Member State (see also chapter III.2.3.a on “Scale of assessment”). For instance, any disturbing activity that affects the survival chances, the breeding success or the reproductive ability of a protected species or leads to a reduction in the occupied area should be regarded as a “disturbance” in terms of Article 12. On the other hand, sporadic disturbances without any likely negative impact on the species, such as for example scaring away a wolf from entering a sheep enclosure in order to prevent damage, should not be considered as disturbance under Article 12. Once again, it has to be stressed that the case-by-case approach means that the competent authorities will have to reflect carefully on the level of disturbance to be considered harmful, taking into account the specific characteristics of the species concerned and the situation, as explained above.

It is not entirely clear from the guidance, or from the Directive, what constitutes disturbance for these purposes. The guidance was examined and discussed in *Morge (FC) v Hampshire County Council* [2011] UKSC 2 but no clear

conclusion was reached - the Supreme Court saying that it was a matter of fact and degree in each case.

(p) “*Disturbance*” is not defined.⁹ The guidance deals with it as follows:

Art. 12(4) deals with the “*incidental capture or killing*” of Annex IV species. Member States are under monitoring duties with a view to considering further measures to ensure that such activities do not have a significant adverse effect on Annex 4a species. The guidance gives as an example of incidental killing bat road and wind turbine deaths.¹⁰ Whilst this is only guidance, the conclusion seems entirely logical and, if right, would mean that deaths of individual bats or other Annex IV species from the operation of the new road would not count as “*disturbance*”.

2. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

2.1 These are the current transposing instrument for Wales and England. They consolidate earlier Regulations dating originally from 1994, but substantially amended in 2007 as a result of a decision of the European Court to the effect that they had not properly transposed the Directive because a former system in place under the old Regulations to protect dwellings from the rigours of the requirements for bats based on the concept of incidental harm was incompatible with the provisions of Arts. 12 and 16

2.2 By Reg 9(1), the Welsh Ministers and Natural Resources Wales are required to exercise their functions under the enactments relating to nature conservation so as to secure compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Directive and by Reg 9(3), the Welsh Ministers and any

⁹ Chapter II.3.2a paras. 37-39

¹⁰ Chapter II.3.6 para. 83

person holding a public office must, as competent authority, have regard to the requirements of the Directive in the exercise of any of their functions, so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions.¹¹ The Regulation contains a non-exhaustive list of relevant enactments including s.28G Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, NERC Act 2006 and these Regulations. The Regulations do not expressly list the recent Welsh environmental statutes but these would be included.

2.3 Protection of species is dealt with in Part 3.

2.4 Reg 43 creates criminal offences reflecting the provisions of Art. 12 of the Directive. The offence of disturbance under Reg 43(1)(b) imposes qualified liability because such disturbance must be caused “*deliberately*”, whereas the offence under para (1)(d) of damaging or destroying a breeding site or resting place is an offence of strict liability.

2.5 Para (2) provides:

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(b), disturbance of animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely—
(a) to impair their ability—
(i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young,
or
(ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
(b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

This provision is not an exclusive definition of disturbance.

2.6 No criminal offence is committed if relevant activities have been authorised by derogation licence under Reg 55. This Regulation mirrors Art. 16.

2.7 In Morge, the Supreme Court considered:

¹¹ As defined in Reg.7

(a) the meaning of “*disturbance*” in the Directive and the 1994 Regulations (which were the same as the current ones so far as relevant), and;

(b) the extent of the duty upon Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the provisions of the Directive and Regulations.

2.8 Lord Brown gave the leading judgment and dealt with disturbance at paras. 2-25 (attached). As noted above, the Court declined to attempt a definition of the term and held that it was to be interpreted and applied on a case by case basis. The Court recognised that there was a spectrum, declining to adopt either a de minimis approach or to hold that disturbance could only occur when there would be harm to the conservation status of the species. The matter is one of judgment for the decision maker – ultimately the enforcing or licensing body which, in Wales, is NRW.

2.9 The second point in Morge concerned the role of the LPA when granting planning permission, in the light of the obligation to have regard to the Habitats Directive. It had previously been held in Woolley v Cheshire East Borough Council that the Local Planning Authority could only grant planning permission if it was certain that a derogation licence would definitely be granted. The Supreme Court rejected that approach. They held that there was no reason why planning permission should be withheld unless the LPA was satisfied:

(a) that the proposed development would be likely to offend Art. 12; and

(b) that it was unlikely to be licensed as a derogation.

2.10 Although there is no specific duty in the Highways Act 1980 akin to the duty in the Town and Country Planning legislation, Regs 9(1) and 9(3) have the same effect. Therefore the Inspectors and the Welsh Ministers, in deciding about the Orders, should apply the principles laid down in Morge.

2.11 With regard to highly mobile species such as bats, it is clearly a rather complicated question whether or not a road scheme would constitute disturbance. Interestingly, the development in question in Morge was a guided busway, the route of which ran through regenerated vegetation on an old railway line, which included a known flight path for pipistrelles. There were no roosts on the site, but it contained foraging areas. Some form of mitigation was proposed, but it is not clear from the judgment what it was. English Nature initially objected, but, followed a further report, withdrew their objection and apparently accepted that no disturbance would be caused, notwithstanding that it appears to have been accepted in the Court of Appeal that some bats would be killed by colliding with buses from time to time.

2.12 Reg 53 sets up a system for monitoring the incidental capture or killing of relevant species, as required by the Directive.

3. The M4 CaN and Objections from GWT

3.1 In this case, Professor Altringham's real concern appears to be with the construction and operational phases, rather than landtake.

3.2 Landtake will involve the destruction of a number of tree and building roosts and Mr Green has given very clear evidence to the effect that there will be effective mitigation/compensation by provision of artificial roosts at ratios of 2/3:1. He has also explained that this is a tried and tested approach, approved by NRW and NE. In this regard, there is no reason to suppose that derogation licences would not be forthcoming under Reg 55(2)(e) in the event of a favourable determination on the Orders, as the Ministers will have satisfied themselves as to need, public interest and absence of satisfactory alternatives. For reasons set out above, GWT's submission that there must be certainty such that there is no room for reasonable scientific doubt that 90% of bats which would otherwise have used the removed roosts would use the new roosts is misconceived. In addition to all the reasons set out in Section 1 of this Note which demonstrate that GWT's submission is wrong, such a position is

inconsistent with the Morge approach of professional judgment applied on a spectrum and the advice to the Court from DEFRA that the judgment as to whether or not activities constitute disturbance will vary depending on the conservation status of the particular species under consideration.¹² NRW do not suggest that a licence would be unlikely to be granted.¹³

¹² Lord Brown's judgment, para.22

¹³ ID/104 SoCG on Bats, paras 2.1.11 and 2.1.24