

ID/2

**TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER  
IN THE VICINITY OF STONEHENGE****ADDENDUM TO PRE-INQUIRY NOTE (PIN)**

***This note contains important information for those intending to take part in the Traffic Regulation Order Inquiry. It should be read with the original PIN for the Stopping Up Orders and Traffic Regulation Order Inquiries, dated 13 April 2011.***

**The Inquiries**

1. The Stopping Up Orders (SUOs) Inquiry closed on 27 June 2011. No more evidence or submissions relating to the merits of these Orders will be accepted by the Inspector.
2. This note concerns only the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Inquiry, which was adjourned on 27 June 2011 without having heard any substantive submissions or evidence. So far it has heard only submissions relating to the procedure before, and the timing of, the Inquiry.
3. The Inquiry will resume at **10:00am on Tuesday 20 September 2011** at Salisbury Rugby Football Club, Castle Road, Salisbury, SP1 3SA.

**Scope of the Inquiry**

4. The Inquiry is concerned only with the draft TRO. Further evidence or submissions relating to the SUOs will not be accepted.
5. As indicated in the PIN, the Inspector is aware that planning permission has been granted for '*decommissioning of existing visitor facilities and a section of the A344; the erection of a new visitor centre, car park, coach park and ancillary services building; and related highways and landscaping works*' on land at Airmans Corner, land south east of the junction of the A360 and A344<sup>1</sup>.
6. The Inspector advised in the PIN that, while that permission is of relevance to some or all of the Orders with which the Inquiries will be concerned, their outcomes cannot alter that decision. Therefore it is neither necessary nor appropriate for the Inquiries to hear evidence on the cases for or against that development or about the circumstances of its approval.
7. There still seems to be some confusion about this in some quarters. It is not the case, as some have suggested, that there may be no mention of the proposed visitor centre etc. The stated purpose of the TRO is 'to improve the amenity of the area'<sup>2</sup>, and the Inspector will welcome evidence and submissions on the extent to which the TRO would fulfil this purpose, having regard to that proposal. However, matters such as the

<sup>1</sup> Granted to English Heritage by Wiltshire Council on 23 June 2010 (ref. S/2009/1527/FULL)

<sup>2</sup> Statement of Reasons para 1.2

appropriateness of the location, design and other details of the visitor centre, and the processes leading to the granting of planning permission for it, are not matters for this Inquiry.

### Procedure at the Inquiry

8. Again some participants seem unsure about certain points. For the avoidance of doubt, even though these stages may not be separately identified on the Inquiry programme and subject to the need to avoid repetition as indicated in the PIN, every objector appearing will have the opportunity to:
  - Make opening submissions\*;
  - Cross-examine any or all of the witnesses for Wiltshire Council and English Heritage\*;
  - Give their own evidence (on which they may be cross-examined by Wiltshire Council and/or English Heritage); and
  - Make closing submissions\*.

\* *these are optional.*
9. Normally objectors would do all of these in the one session for which they are programmed. However, requests for any departures from this (eg. making closing submissions at the end of the Inquiry) should be made as soon as possible through the Programme Officer and will be accommodated if reasonably possible.

### Evidence

10. The deadline for the submission of proofs of evidence and summaries has passed. All evidence submitted by 25 May will be taken into account, but normally no additional evidence will be accepted. The adjournment of the Inquiry should not be regarded as 'extra time' in this respect. The only circumstances in which new evidence will be accepted are:
  - Where the Inspector is satisfied that the evidence in question could not reasonably have been submitted within the deadline (for example because it had not been published at the time); or
  - Where an objector who was not previously notified of the Inquiry wishes to be heard.
11. In these instances the evidence and any summary thereof must be submitted to reach the Programme Officer no later than **Tuesday 23 August** in accordance with the arrangements set out in paragraphs 21-23 of the PIN.
12. Parties may also submit rebuttal evidence, if they wish (it is not obligatory). This is evidence that seeks to counter evidence submitted by opposing parties, and must be clearly referenced to the specific evidence it addresses. This is not an opportunity to 'slip in' new evidence simply to supplement that already submitted.
13. Any rebuttal evidence by each party (including Wiltshire Council and English Heritage) will be given at the time of presentation of its main

evidence. The texts of rebuttal evidence will be provided in advance to all parties appearing at the Inquiry.

14. Rebuttal evidence and any summary thereof must be submitted to reach the Programme Officer no later than **Tuesday 6 September**, again in accordance with the PIN.

### **Legal arguments**

15. I share the view of English Heritage that any legal arguments (including any relating to alleged procedural defects) to be advanced should be submitted prior to the resumption of the Inquiry. In order that any necessary responses can also be submitted before the resumption, the same dates as for evidence will apply. That is, arguments should be submitted no later than **Tuesday 23 August** with responses no later than **Tuesday 6 September**.

### **Programme**

16. All parties should supply the Programme Officer as soon as possible with updated estimates of how long they expect to take in each relevant stage in presentation of their cases (including cross-examination of opposing witnesses). They should also notify her of any problems or constraints affecting the revised draft programme.
17. In the interests of the smooth running of the Inquiry and to avoid inconveniencing subsequent parties, parties significantly over-running their programmed time may be required to return at a later date to suit the Inquiry.

*Alan Boyland*

Inspector

8 July 2011