

Nigel and Susan Sleeman
18 Trenic Crescent
Headingley
Leeds
LS6 3DL

Telephone: 0113 278 9269
Email: nigel_sleeman@hotmail.com
s_sleeman@hotmail.com

21 July 2014

Dear Mr Whitehead

Re. Supplement to the Environmental Statement (ES) Historic Environment Update

While we realise it would have been too expensive and impractical to send a copy of such a large document as the above to every objector, the Promoters should surely have sent us notification by letter or email to inform us of the document and to let us know where we could have access to a copy. Not everyone reads the Yorkshire Evening Post and, of those who do, it is unlikely that most of them read the Classified section regularly. There are undoubtedly objectors who intend to speak at the Inquiry and who are, as yet, still unaware of the existence of this major new document.

Having been made aware of the proposal to submit this new document on 15 July, when the Inquiry re-opened, we would now like to urge you not to accept this as an Inquiry document for the following reasons:

- **Amended Or New Document**

We believe from comments of others that the amendments made are so extensive that, in effect, the document becomes a new document. The introduction of such a document at such a late stage is against the spirit of the Inquiry and is an indication that the Promoters realise, after the cross-examination of Mr Ward, that their original ES was inadequate. The fact that the Promoters state that the new document does not alter the validity of their case means that there would be no prejudice to them if this new document was not to be allowed.

- **Not Fair To Allow Promoters To Have A Second Chance To Make Their Case**

Mr Ward could have carried out a proper, comprehensive assessment of heritage impacts before he submitted his Proof of Evidence. He has now been examined, cross-examined and re-examined on the basis of his reliance on the original ES. We believe it would be unfair, and so unacceptable, to allow the Promoters to present new evidence in order to correct inadequacies which came to light in Mr Ward's cross-examination.

- **The New Document Has Not Been Properly Publicised Or Consulted Upon**

The deadline for representations on the new 392 page document is 18 August 2014 – 6 weeks after its submission on 7 July 2014. However, most objectors, except for those who cross-examined Mr Ward, were not made aware of the existence of this new document until the Inquiry re-opened on 15 July 2014 for those attending the Inquiry, and possibly not even yet for those who don't attend. Not everyone reads the classified section of a local newspaper – no objector would have expected the sudden introduction of such a large document at this late stage.

The Promoters could, easily and at little cost, have informed all objectors of the new document by e-mail to let them know where they can see it. Had this been done all objectors might have had 6 weeks to respond, as it is most have not.

- **Unfair To Objectors**

Most objectors have limited resources, especially of time, and we believe it would be unfair to expect them to respond to such a comprehensive new document in the expected timescale. In addition, some objectors have paid for professional advice on the heritage aspects of the original ES and it would not be fair, or in some cases feasible, to expect them to pay for further advice.

The Promoters appear to have unlimited funds. Many millions of pounds have already been spent leading up to this Inquiry, all of which have been provided by taxpayers, principally local council tax payers. These funds have allowed the Promoters to employ permanent staff, legal representatives and expert advisors to assist them in making their case and possibly to pay the costs of some objectors. It seems to us that it would be grossly unfair to expect objectors, most of whom are taxpayers, to make further expenditure in order to adequately oppose this scheme.

- **Acceptance Of This New Document Would Disrupt And Prolong The Inquiry**

If this new document is accepted as an Inquiry document, it may be thought necessary to recall any previous witness who has made any reference to the historic environment part of the ES in their Proof of Evidence, examination-in-chief or in cross-examination. This would particularly apply to Mr Ward.

In addition, a precedent would have been set whereby any of the Promoters' documents, on which they rely, could be extensively amended and presented to the Inquiry at any stage. This could undermine the Inquiry as it would be difficult to disallow such a

document if a precedent had already been established. Also, to be fair to all participants, third parties would also have to be allowed to amend any of their evidence and have it accepted by the Inquiry at any stage.

We can see that, if this were to be allowed, the Inquiry could easily be disrupted and become almost never-ending.

For the above reasons we urge you not to accept this new document.

Yours sincerely

Nigel and Susan Sleeman
OBJ/1166 and OBJ/997