

From: Andrew Parsons [<mailto:aparsons888@gmail.com>]

Sent: 15 November 2020 22:39

To: Tudor, Sarah sarah.tudor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk ; Denise Hoggins denise.hoggins@dft.gov.uk

Cc: Nick njmboulter@btinternet.com ; Eric Stobart eric@thestobarts.co.uk ;

malcolmtice14@gmail.com; John South jcbssouth@gmail.com

Subject: Re: URGENT - DPI/G1250/20/9 Bournemouth and Swanage Ferry Fees Inquiry

Dear Sarah,

While I am a Studland resident I am not a member of the Parish Council and cannot see how this misapprehension arose. I note that the crucial Gerald Eve Valuation Report of 2015 upon which much of the Ferry Company's fare justification and accounting practice hangs has been recently included in their documents and has been heavily redacted. I have attached the original (as far as I can tell) that was submitted to the previous inquiry and to which the previous Inspector makes reference in his report. The objectors with whom I am in contact and myself regard this report as a factitious work of fiction bearing little relation to fact and it may be necessary to refer to the complete report in the Inquiry. I have also attached a screenshot of the Land Registry search of the ferry area that is also relevant here and may be referred to in the course of the Inquiry. Also a title from the Land Registry showing that the Ferry Company does own the slipway, this ownership may also come up in the course of the Inquiry. There is also a letter from the Bankes archives dated 1922 showing the position regarding the road. It is important that any assertions made may be backed by evidence - this is the evidence.

Kind regards,

Andrew.

On 13/11/2020 16:25, Tudor, Sarah wrote:

Dear Mr Parsons

Thank you for your email.

You will have seen the Inspector's comments in response to Mr Boulter, also of Studland Parish Council. Presumably, the alternative that he referred to is the same as that to which you allude. The Inspector is not 'inviting' others to put forward alternatives. It is simply that one group of objectors put forward, as part of their evidence, an alternative regime. It was submitted very late in the day which did not, in her view, give sufficient time for anyone with an interest, time to properly assess any implications. She understands now that Studland Council was intending to submit a further alternative to the Inquiry. As stressed to Mr Boulter, the Inquiry itself is not the time spring surprises. It is run in the spirit of The Highways (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994 which anticipate that any evidence on which parties seek to rely is submitted in advance, to allow all participants to the inquiry the opportunity to properly prepare. If the Council is looking to submit something in this regard, it needs to be submitted as a matter some urgency so that if necessary, it can be included in the forthcoming consultation exercise referred to in the previous correspondence.

Kind Regards

Sarah

From: Andrew Parsons <aparsons888@gmail.com>

Sent: 13 November 2020 14:27

To: Tudor, Sarah <sarah.tudor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>; Budd, Graham <graham.budd@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Cc: nj >> Nick <njmmboulter@btinternet.com>; Eric Stobart <eric@thestobarts.co.uk>; Churcher, Tracey <tracey.churcher@nationaltrust.org.uk>; mark.street@nationaltrust.org.uk; John South <jicbsouth@gmail.com>; malcolmtice14@gmail.com

Subject: Re: URGENT - DPI/G1250/20/9 Bournemouth and Swanage Ferry Fees Inquiry

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for your email of 13/11/2020 in which you inform us objectors that the Inspector is invoking the provisions of the Transport Charges &c (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1954 s6(2) to accept, without prejudice or favour, other alternative applications under the aegis of this Inquiry and is proposing to adjourn the Inquiry to allow interested parties and objectors sufficient time to thoroughly examine and assess these and prepare questions and objections.

This is a welcome development, it is expedient, efficient and democratic within the spirit and wording of the 1954 Act and the inquiry provided by Bournemouth-Swanage Motor Road and Ferry Act 1923s81. Otherwise we would only have the deeply flawed application by the Ferry Company and the alternative from the Councils who are working very closely with the Ferry Company. For a fair and proper Inquiry the objectors must have at least an equal platform and the same level of access as the proponents. In Studland we objectors are at this moment preparing our proposed fare structure and financial projections for submission to the Inquiry under s6(2).

Kind regards,

Andrew Parsons

On 13/11/2020 08:31, Tudor, Sarah wrote:

Good Morning

The Inspector dealing with the application made by the Bournemouth-Swanage Motor Road and Ferry Company has asked me to write to you.

She has, very recently, received a suggested alternative toll regime from a consortium of Councils (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, Dorset Council and Swanage Town Council) who are working together in response to the application by the ferry company. The Inspector is content, having regard to the provisions of Section 6(2) of the transport Charges &c. (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1954, that the submitted document can be accepted to the Inquiry. She is mindful though, that should the Secretary of State take that alternative proposal into account, not all those who may have an interest in the outcome of the decision will have had the opportunity to review the alternative regime before it is discussed at the Inquiry. In the interest of natural justice therefore, the Inspector considers that the submission will need to be subject to some form of consultation, with time allowed for the applicant to consider any responses received. In order to allow time for that, the Inquiry will need to adjourn at some point. The Inspector wishes to stress that that is not to be taken as indicating that she has any views one way or the other on the alternative regime. Rather, she will need to hear informed views

on it in order to be able to report to the Secretary of State. The applicant will also need time to properly consider the submission and any implications that arise from it.

The Inspector's current thinking, on a without prejudice basis, is to open the Inquiry as planned at 09.30 on Monday morning. She will take appearances and run through the formalities and then explain the proposed course of action set out above. She will then take any questions on procedural matters and ask for any views on the suggested way forward. On the basis of the information that is before her at the present time however, she then anticipates adjourning the Inquiry, without hearing any evidence, to allow for a period of consultation. The Inquiry would then resume at a later date and would proceed to hear evidence on both schemes. The likely date for resumption of the Inquiry would be Tuesday 5 January, again proceeding as a virtual event.

I would just stress again, that the above arrangements are suggested by the Inspector on a without prejudice basis.

Kind Regards

Sarah

**Sarah Tudor
The Planning Inspectorate
3A Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN**

Tel: 0303 444 5572