



# The Planning Inspectorate

## THE NETWORK RAIL STALYBRIDGE AND DIGGLE (SADDLEWORTH) TRANSPORT WORKS ORDER ACT (REF DPI/G4240/25/18)

Pre-inquiry meeting held at 10:00 on 17 April 2026 (meeting held virtually)

Requested action points are underlined

### Introductions

1. The pre-inquiry meeting (PIM) was led by myself, Matthew Woodward, as the appointed inspector.
2. **Joanna Vincent** was introduced as the Programme Officer. She will be dealing with the administrative arrangements for the inquiry. She should be the point of contact in case of any questions or other procedural matters or enquiries you have before the inquiry commences.
3. PIM participants are set out later in this note under 'participation in the inquiry'. Other individuals and parties were in attendance but did not participate at the PIM.
4. The purpose of the PIM was to discuss the arrangements for the inquiry. The merits of the scheme were not discussed.

### Scope of the proposals

5. The Transport and Works Act Order application<sup>1</sup>, application for a direction for deemed planning permission, the 10 no. listed building consents (LBC) applications<sup>2</sup> and application for certificate in relation to the acquisition of open space land<sup>3</sup> will all be dealt with at the same inquiry event. They are hereafter referred to collectively as 'the scheme'.

### Main Issues

6. The Secretary of State issued a Statement of Matters (SoM) on 1 April 2026. The applicant subsequently wrote to the Secretary of State regarding inconsistencies with the SoM relative to the particulars of the scheme applied for.
7. ***New point*** – A revised SoM was issued on 27 April 2026. This replaces the SoM dated 1 April 2026. This will be available to view on the [inquiry website](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the Transport and Works Act 1992

<sup>2</sup> Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

<sup>3</sup> Under the Acquisition of Land Act 1981

8. The revised SoM is not substantially different when compared with the main issues set out in the superseded SoM. Consequently, I advise all parties to continue to prepare their cases accordingly. The main issues to be considered by the inquiry are to be substantially based on those set out in the revised SoM.
9. At my request, the applicant agreed to produce a consolidated description of development document which contained:
  - A short summary description of development.
  - A detailed description of development aligned with the constituent elements of the scheme, including links to documents.
10. For example, under the proposed Order relating to the TWA, the applicant is requested to set out what is proposed under this element, including where details of the works can be found and/or links to relevant works plans/documents. A similar approach should be applied to the request for deemed planning permission, LBC applications and open space certificate application.
11. ***New point*** – Applicant to confirm how the evidence to be heard during the inquiry addresses the SoM.

**Action** - Applicant to provide description of development document and SoM summary by 12 May.

### **Inquiry participation**

12. It was agreed that the inquiry will principally be a face-to-face event. Having regard to the contributions made by interested parties during the PIM, the applicant agreed to explore live streaming of the event, in consultation with the programme officer. The applicant should consider publicity requirements (that is to say, publicising the inquiry event) in the event that live streaming is facilitated.
13. I appreciate that live-streaming would allow the inquiry to be observed by interested parties which, in comparison with physical attendance, may be more compatible with the work/life commitments of attendees. Therefore, I support live-streaming where it is practicable.
14. However, I note that none of the parties in attendance expressed a desire to present evidence virtually. As such, I see no reason why virtual presentation of evidence would be necessary in this case, particularly as it is intended that a robust timetable be produced which will contain time allocations for all witnesses and contributors, thus providing a degree of certainty with regards necessary inquiry attendance.

**Action** – Applicant to provide clarity on live-streaming arrangements by 22 May.

## Participation in the inquiry

15. Note – this list is based on that provided in writing by respective parties, or verbally during the PIM. Titles of address and names may be incorrect. The participation list is subject to change and will be revisited when the inquiry opens.
16. The Applicant will be represented at the inquiry by:
  - Richard Turney (KC) – Counsel (assisted by Harley Ronan)
  - Mark Ashton - Need Case & Project Benefits
  - Emma Clarke - Engineering & Design
  - Keith Gardner - Construction
  - Jim Pearson - Environment Management
  - Chris Cary - Traffic & Transport, suitability of alternative route (Moorgate Halt level crossing), suitability of diversionary route (Stockport Road level crossing)
  - Mike Gradwell - Planning
  - Sandra Honeywell - Heritage & Listed Building Consents
  - Adam Lawrence - Noise & Vibration
  - Will Horlock - Ecology
  - Nigel Billingsley - Property
  - Jerry Greenwood – Level crossings policy and strategy
  - James Doodson – Level crossing safety
  - Lee Barraclough – Engineering and design of alternative route (Moorgate Halt level crossing)
  - Sean Wotherspoon – Highway safety (Moorgate Halt level crossing)
  - Laurie Barbour – Engineering and design of diversionary route (Stockport Road level crossing)
17. The following parties expressed a desire to make representations/give evidence at the inquiry, in some cases subject to any prior agreement being reached with the applicant. Interested party reference numbers are provided in italicised brackets e.g. (*OBJ-705*) and relate to the suffix assigned on the website.<sup>4</sup>
  - Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council (Clare Richardson) (*REP-05*) – reserve the opportunity to give oral evidence at the inquiry. May appoint counsel.
  - Oldham Borough Council (Mr Dickinson) (*OBJ-185*).
  - Councillor Helen Bishop (*OBJ-205*) – Saddleworth South ward councillor, Saddleworth Parish councillor.

---

<sup>4</sup> Those contained in: <https://gateleyhamer-pi.com/en-gb/stalybridge-diggle/inquiry-documents/initial-responses/>  
And  
<https://gateleyhamer-pi.com/en-gb/stalybridge-diggle/inquiry-documents/statements-case/>

- Councillor Tafheen Shariff (*REP11.1 and REP11.2*) – Mossley ward councillor.
  - Dave Jones (*OBJ-213*) – Mossley Town Council.
  - Sam Al-Hamdani (*OBJ-101*) – Friends of Saddleworth Group.
  - Canal & River Trust (Tim Bettany-Simmons) (*OBJ-211*) – May present up to five witnesses depending on further discussions with the applicant.
  - Claire Matthew of Roger Hannah – representing S Fleming (*REP-08*).
  - Catherine Wright (*OBJ-110*).
  - June McDickens (*OBJ-57*).
  - Janet Lowe (*OBJ-145*).
  - Parochial Church Council of Christ Church Friezland (Guy Betts) (*OBJ-191*).
  - Andrew Taylor (*OBJ-19*).
  - Barbara Beeley (*OBJ-103*).
  - Kevin Lawton on behalf of three walking groups (Wednesday Walkers (Oldham)(*OBJ-117*), Peak & Northern Footpaths Society (*OBJ-259*) and Saddleworth Pedestrians Walking Club (*OBJ-193*)).<sup>5</sup>
  - Saddleworth & Oldham Whit Friday Band Contest (Peter Norbury)(*OBJ-129*).
  - Nichola Corcoran (*OBJ-49*).
18. The list above is indicative and does not commit any party to giving evidence, nor does it prevent other parties from registering to make representations at the inquiry. As I stated at the PIM, if you intend to make representations on matters which are shared with others then it would benefit the inquiry if a spokesperson was nominated to present on behalf of multiple organisations or individuals. This will ensure that evidence is given to the inquiry in the most time effective manner.

### **Timetable**

19. The inquiry is scheduled to open on Tuesday 9th June at 10am and sit until Friday 10th July 2026. Week 1 will run between Tuesday 9th June – Friday 12th June. Week 2 - Tuesday 16th June – Friday 19th June. The following week commencing 22 June will be a non-

---

<sup>5</sup> Other representations have also been received on behalf of the respective walking groups

sitting week. Week 3 will run Tuesday 30 June – Friday 3 July.  
Week 4 - Tuesday 7 July – Friday 10 July.

20. I will be running the inquiry in order to be as fair as I can be to all parties. However, it is important to recognise that all parties have a duty to the inquiry, by contributing to its efficient and effective running. Therefore, I would ask all parties to be as flexible as possible with regards availability.
21. The inquiry will generally take the form of:
  - a) the formal presentation of evidence, in the first instance led by the applicant's advocates through Evidence in Chief. That evidence may either be subject to cross-examination, or questions from me (inspector) or from other parties. The same applies to other parties formally presenting evidence.
  - b) round-table sessions led by me (inspector).
22. The final form of the inquiry will largely depend on the details set out in the proofs of evidence and the position of parties at the start of the inquiry.
23. The applicant prepared a skeleton timetable which I attached to my [PIM advanced note](#) (appendix C). This formed the basis of the discussion during the PIM. In response to this timetable, I make the following points and suggestions:
  - Splitting the scheme into scheme wide matters and representations and scheme specific matters and representations would be an effective way of managing the event. Refining these into 'blocks' based on broad topics would help arrange evidence and inquiry time management.
  - Day one should be dedicated to 'opening submission/statements' from the applicant and may include statutory objectors or those presenting substantial evidence to the inquiry, usually on behalf of organisations.
  - Time should be set aside near the start of the inquiry for a round-table session on the draft Order.
  - I would prefer to hear from all scheme-wide objectors during the first week of the inquiry.
  - With the above in mind, it seems unlikely to me that all the applicant's scheme-wide witnesses could be heard during week one. I agree with the applicant that prioritising those witnesses who would be presenting evidence relating to what is proposed and the 'need' case would be beneficial.
  - Any other scheme-wide topics and witnesses could present their evidence during week 3 and/or 4.

- During week 2 the applicant indicates that this block should be dedicated to witness evidence relating to scheme specific matters including proposed level crossing closures and related effects (such as footpath closures etc.), within which time objectors to these specific matters could also be heard. I agree with this approach. However, it appears to me that this block should include the scheme specific matters relating to the station proposals (particularly Mossley station relocation).
  - ***New point*** – I would ask that in addition to the suitability of alternative routes, evidence is also presented concerning other alternatives considered and any costs/financial considerations that are relevant to the determination of the alternatives considered.
  - I wish to hear from the applicant on the open space certificates application. This could be timetabled during week 3 of week 4.
  - I suggest that heritage matters are dealt with through round-table sessions, led by me, in week 3 or week 4. **Action - Applicant, Oldham Borough Council and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council to comment on this approach by 22 May.**
  - I wish to hear from the planning witness after all other planning and heritage evidence has been heard.
  - Planning conditions, LBC conditions and a further session on the draft Order should be scheduled for week 4, before the inquiry closes.
  - A separate block/allocation of time will need to be dedicated to statutory objections and related proposed compulsory acquisition of land/rights (Land Matters).
  - Flexibility should be retained to allow closing submissions to take place virtually, should it be necessary. However, closing submissions should be timetabled.
  - ***New point*** – I would expect the ecology witness to address HRA<sup>6</sup> matters.
24. The applicant indicated that they would provide an estimate of witness timings as soon as possible, prior to 22 May. ***New point – indicative time estimates from the applicant have now been received but have not been factored in when drafting the indicative timetable in Appendix A.***

**Action - All parties should confirm whether they intend to make representations by 22 May including, where relevant, approximate time estimates.**

---

<sup>6</sup> Habitats Regulation Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

25. A draft inquiry programme is included in [Appendix A](#). This is an indicative programme which reflects the nature of the discussions held during the PIM. It should be considered as a starting point.

**Action** - Comments on the draft inquiry timetable/programme by 22 May (particularly applicant).

### **Plans and documents (inquiry)**

26. All submitted plans to be separated into individual plans. All submitted control documents included in the Environmental Report Appendices (NR14), and any other control documents which are secured as part of scheme mitigation, to be separated and submitted.
27. The above should be accompanied by a plans and documents schedule which includes a list of all the submitted plans, the version number, a simple title explaining what the plan is for, and a link to the plan/document. The applicant may need to liaise with the programme officer to ensure links can be successfully assimilated into the schedule.

**Action** – Applicant to provide plans/documents and schedule by 12 May in liaison with programme officer.

### **Inquiry Venue**

28. The venue for the inquiry will be Uppermill Civic Hall, Lee Street, Oldham OL3 6AE.
29. The applicant confirmed that retiring rooms will be available. The applicant should liaise with the programme officer to confirm availability of microphones/roving microphones, accessibility arrangements for mobility impaired and hearing-impaired persons, availability of printing facilities, car parking availability. The applicant should confirm arrangements for document storage overnight and over the weekend.
30. The applicant should confirm whether a screen/monitor will be provided and whether it can be used to display documents. The applicant also suggested that *Google maps* or similar be displayed as necessary throughout the inquiry. Whilst I am not averse to that suggestion, if that option is pursued during the inquiry, I will seek the views of the parties at the inquiry before determining whether it is suitable.

**Action** – Applicant to confirm venue details by 22 May.

### **Proofs of evidence**

31. Proofs of evidence (proofs) should be submitted to the programme officer ([joanna.vincent@gateleyhamer.com](mailto:joanna.vincent@gateleyhamer.com)). They should be in PDF format and clearly labelled. Any appendices should be submitted in

PDF format (weblinks are not accepted) and clearly labelled with an accompanying index.

32. More information on proofs is included in the [PIM advanced note](#) and the [Transport and Works Act order: a brief guide](#).

**Action** – For those submitting proofs, they must be submitted by 12 May.

33. Rebuttal proofs will be accepted but they should be focused and only submitted where necessary.

**Action** – For those submitting rebuttal proofs, they must be submitted by 29 May.

34. In addition to the above, parties may serve their proofs on the applicant (Network Rail) using the following e-mail address:

[w2btru.stakeholder@atkinsrealis.com](mailto:w2btru.stakeholder@atkinsrealis.com)

### **Statements of Common Ground**

35. The applicant stated that progress had been made with stakeholders concerning the preparation of statements of common ground (SoCG). I appreciate that it is not feasible for the applicant to agree SoCGs with every party. However, I would ask that the applicant engage with statutory objectors and other main stakeholders, with a view to agreeing SoCGs, including the following parties:

- Oldham Borough Council
- Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
- Historic England
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Canal and Rivers Trust
- Relevant Parish or Town Councils
- Relevant local walking groups and other campaign or interest groups
- Other statutory objectors (although matters relating to land/rights acquisition may also, or alternatively, be covered in a land and rights tracker or similar document)

36. The above list is not exhaustive, and the applicant should review their case and the representations received promptly.

37. SoCGs are useful as they allow areas of disagreement to be crystallised, allowing me to understand the real points of contention, and ensuring the best use of inquiry time. I encourage all relevant parties to collaborate with the applicant in the preparation of SoCGs.

38. In relation to Oldham Borough Council and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, SoCGs should include an appraisal of relevant

development plan policies, confirming where there is agreement concerning compliance/non-compliance with relevant policies. I would expect these SoCGs to also address heritage matters, the proposed Order, planning conditions and LBC conditions as appropriate, and any relevant matters relating to Green Belt land.

39. ***New point*** - I would expect the applicant to engage with Oldham Borough Council, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and Natural England on the HRA Assessment<sup>7</sup> (Environment Report – Volume 3 – Appendix 6B).

**Action** – Applicant to submit SoCGs by 29 May.

### **Inquiry documents and amended plans/documents**

40. I will require hard copies of plans, proofs, SoCGs and core documents which are easy to navigate and set out in folders. They can be provided for me at the inquiry venue.
41. A second copy of the entire scheme documents, including those listed above, should be provided and be available for inspection by other parties at the inquiry venue.

**Action** – Applicant to provide copies by the inquiry start date.

42. The applicant agreed, at my request, to provide additional information to support the inquiry as follows:
43. A consolidated table of heritage effects/impacts which lists all the affected designated and non-designated heritage assets, whether they would be affected directly (i.e. through physical changes) or indirectly through effects on setting, extent of harm envisaged without mitigation, and the extent to which ways to maximise enhancement or minimise harm have been explored. Any mitigation relied upon should be detailed, including how such mitigation is to be secured.
44. A register of environmental actions and commitments (REAC). This should, on a topic-by-topic basis, set out the commitments the applicant has made to providing mitigation, as set out in the Environmental Report and other relevant control documents. It should identify whether this would be embedded mitigation or additional mitigation and detail how such mitigation would be secured.
45. A land and rights negotiation tracker/landowner position statement or similar should be provided and updated as necessary throughout the inquiry, depending on whether negotiations in relation to land interests have progressed. This should include the relevant land interest, the plot number, the power or interest sought, which of the proposed works would apply and summary of negotiation

---

<sup>7</sup> This is effectively a 'shadow' HRA which does not replace the Secretary of State's duties in relation to HRA requirements

status. I also want to understand whether agreement has been reached with the landowner and interest in question.

**Action** – Applicant to provide additional documentation by 12 May.

46. The applicant indicated that amended plans and an amended version of the Order may be submitted between now and the start of the inquiry. The applicant should clearly set out any proposed amendments in a covering letter and set out any associated publicity that has taken place. I will decide whether to accept any amended plans/documents.

**Action** – Applicant to provide any amended plans or details as soon as practicable before the inquiry commences.

47. Both 'clean' and 'tracked' version of any amended documents should be provided and the plans and documents schedule updated accordingly.

### **Site visits**

48. I will carry out my own unaccompanied site visits as I deem necessary.
49. I ask that all parties submit suggested site visit location/viewpoints, confirming whether they are accessible from public land. When the inquiry opens, I will ask the applicant, local authorities and any other suitable parties to collaborate and produce a draft site visit itinerary.
50. I will consult as necessary on the draft site visit itinerary during the inquiry before I carry out the visit(s) on either an accompanied or unaccompanied basis.

**Action** - All parties to provide suggested site visit locations/points by 29 May.

### **Costs**

51. Please refer to the [Transport and Works Act order: a brief guide](#) for information on costs.

### **Other matters**

52. The applicant confirmed that they do not intend to respond individually to objections in writing. They principally rely on the evidence submitted, further documents which are timetabled for submission, and the evidence to be given during the inquiry through respective witnesses.

### **Summary of key dates**

53. The key dates for submission of documents are set out below:

- As soon as possible:
  - Any amended plans/documents or revised Order.
- By 12 May 2026:
  - Applicant to provide – consolidated description of development and plans schedule, SoM summary, consolidated table of significance (heritage), REAC, land and rights tracker (or similar).
  - Proofs due (relevant parties)
- By 22 May 2026:
  - Applicant to confirm venue details.
  - Live-streaming confirmation.
  - All parties who wish to participate in the inquiry to confirm with programme officer. Any comments on timetable in Appendix A due.
- By 29 May 2026:
  - Any rebuttal proofs due.
  - SoCGs.
  - Suggested site visit locations/points.
- By 9 June – inquiry start date:
  - Hard copies of documents to be deposited at the inquiry venue.

#### **Programme officer contact details**

54. Programme officer contact details are:  
[joanna.vincent@gateleyhamer.com](mailto:joanna.vincent@gateleyhamer.com)

The inquiry website address is:  
<https://gateleyhamer-pi.com/en-gb/stalybridge-diggle/>

Telephone - 0148 3230164  
Mobile - 07483133975

*Matthew Woodward*

INSPECTOR  
28 April 2026

## **Appendix A – Draft/Indicative Inquiry timetable/programme**

THE NETWORK RAIL STALYBRIDGE AND DIGGLE (SADDLEWORTH) TRANSPORT

WORKS ORDER ACT (REF DPI/G4240/25/18)

PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY

UPPERMILL CIVIC HALL, LEE STREET. UPPERMILL, SADDLEWORTH OL3 6AE

### **Block 1 – Scheme wide issues and objectors**

**Block 2 – Scheme specific issues and objectors – including level crossings and related matters and station proposals and related matters**

### **Block 3 – Land matters**

### **Block 4 – Round table sessions – conditions/LBC conditions**

<b>Week 1</b>	
<b>Tuesday 9 June 26 10am</b>	<p>Inspector's Opening Announcements/ Appearances and Inquiry Programme</p> <p><b>Opening Statements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Network Rail (NR)</li><li>• Other Opening Statements</li></ul> <p><i>Session on Draft Order??</i></p> <p><b>Other Parties – Wider Scheme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supporters</li><li>• Reps</li><li>• Objectors</li></ul> <p><i>Topic 1: Need Case &amp; Project Benefits for the Scheme</i></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Mark Ashton</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence in Chief</li><li>• Cross-examination<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ OBJ-XXX</li></ul></li><li>• Inspector Questions</li><li>• Re-Examination</li></ul>
<b>Wednesday 10 June 26</b>	<p><i>Topic 2: Engineering &amp; Design</i></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Emma Clarke</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence in Chief</li><li>• Cross-examination<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ OBJ-XXX</li></ul></li><li>• Inspector Questions</li><li>• Re-Examination</li></ul> <p><i>Topic 3: Construction</i></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Keith Gardner</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence in Chief</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Topic 4: Environment Management</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Jim Pearson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Thursday</b> <b>11 June 26</b></p>	<p><b>Topic 5: Property</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Nigel Billingsley</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Topic 6: Traffic &amp; Transport</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Chris Cary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Topic 7: Noise &amp; Vibration</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Adam Lawrence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Topic 8: Ecology</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Will Horlock</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul>
<p><b>Friday</b> <b>12 June 26</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>As above – TBC</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Week 2</b></p>	

<p><b>Tuesday 16 June 26</b></p>	<p><b><i>Policy &amp; Strategy (Applicable to Moorgate Halt &amp; Stockport Road Level Crossings)</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Jerry Greenwood</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Safety (Applicable to Moorgate Halt &amp; Stockport Road Level Crossings)</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: James Doodson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul>
<p><b>Wednesday 17 June 26</b></p>	<p><b><i>Moorgate Halt Level Crossing – Engineering &amp; Design of the Alternative Route</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Lee Barraclough</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Moorgate Halt Level Crossing – Suitability of the Alternative Route</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Chris Cary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul>
<p><b>Thursday 18 June 26</b></p>	<p><b><i>Moorgate Halt Level Crossing – Highway Safety</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Sean Wotherspoon</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Stockport Road Level Crossing – Engineering &amp; Design of the Diversionary Route</i></b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Laurie Barbour</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul>

<b>Friday</b> <b>19 June 26</b>	<p><b>Stockport Road Level Crossing – Suitability of the Diversionary Route</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Chris Cary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Open space certificate application round table?</b></p>
<b>22<sup>nd</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> June – non-sitting week</b>	
<b>Week 3</b>	
<b>Tuesday</b> <b>30 June 26</b>	<b>Stations - TBC</b>
<b>Wednesday</b> <b>1 July 26</b>	<b>Stations – TBC</b>
<b>Thursday 2</b> <b>July 26</b>	<p><b>Topic 9: Heritage &amp; Listed Building Consents (Potential round table session – anticipate between ½ a day and full day)</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Sandra Honeywell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul> <p><b>Topic 10: Planning</b></p> <p><b>NR Witness: Mike Gradwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Chief</li> <li>• Cross-examination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OBJ-XXX</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inspector Questions</li> <li>• Re-Examination</li> </ul>
<b>Friday 3</b> <b>July 26</b>	<p><b>As above?</b></p> <p><b>Open space certificate application round-table?</b></p> <p><b>Site visit?</b></p>
<b>Week 4</b>	
<b>Tuesday</b> <b>7 July 26</b>	<b>Land Matters evidence/objectors - TBC</b>
<b>Wednesday</b> <b>8 July</b>	<b>Land Matters evidence/objectors - TBC</b>
<b>Thursday 9</b> <b>July</b>	<b>Session on Draft Order? Listed Building Consent conditions/planning conditions.</b>
<b>Friday 10</b> <b>July</b>	<b>Closing submissions</b>