

Representation Form for Local Plans



Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For
official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which
this representation relates:

Rugby Borough Council Proposed
Submission Local Plan

Please return to Rugby Borough Council by 5:00pm Friday 13th March 2026
By email to: localplan@rugby.gov.uk with Proposed Submission Consultation
in the subject line, OR by post to: Development Strategy, Town Hall, Evreux
Way, Rugby, CV21 2RR.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each
representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below (if applicable) but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Ms	
First Name	Terri	
Last Name	Byrne	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)	BRAID	
Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address (where relevant)		

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each policy or site you wish to comment on

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Local Plan Paragraph	S4 Aiii	Local Plan Policy	Sites for gypsies and travellers	Policies Map	Top Road, Barnacle
Site ID	Top Park				

4. Do you consider the Local Plan:

(1) is Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) is Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

On 19/6/2025 three BRAID members had a meeting with Nicola Smith (Chief Planning Officer), Richard Holt (Development Manager), and Neil Holly (Local Plans and Policies) and made the following points:

- 1) We informed them that Top Park 1 had been vacated by most of the travellers in January 2025 who had moved to a site on the A5 and their caravans replaced by old caravans
- 2) These caravans were being advertised on the Rightmove website by local estate agents for anyone to rent by someone called Moira Einstein – we were informed that the RBC enforcement team should have served a Breach of Conditions Notice but this still has yet to be confirmed
- 3) We were advised that site counts would be made in July 2025 and January 2026 to ascertain the numbers but not who actually resides there – therefore RBC are unable to verify that the site is used by any travellers whatsoever
This demonstrates that although RBC are claiming that these are traveller sites there is actually contrary evidence that the site has been degraded and the caravans are rented to anyone

Additionally the following points require emphasising:

- 4) This site, which is in the greenbelt, now dominates the village and has been turned down by the Planning Inspector previously following 22 years of objections by Barnacle residents and there is currently only a temporary permission that expires in 2028
- 5) The proposal for 22 pitches to be sited in Barnacle out of a total of 45 equates to 49% in a village with only 100 houses and no facilities whatsoever and is totally unacceptable
- 6) The NPPF as it relates to gypsies and travellers provides for local authorities to aim to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale, that plan making and decision taking should protect the greenbelt from inappropriate development, for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies, to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan making and decision making, to enable provision for suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure and for local planning to have due regard to the protection of the local amenity and local environment

- 7) Local planning should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally and must significantly avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
- 8) The NPPF provides for 'exceptional circumstances' and 'where a local planning authority is burdened by a large scale unauthorised site that has significantly increased their need, then there is no assumption that the authority is required to meet their traveller site needs in full'
- 9) In 2007/08 there was a shortfall of 30 caravans and 15 pitches within the borough and RBC considered that they could easily site the travellers at Woodside on Ryton. Subsequently planning permission was granted to expand Woodside by adding 12 more pitches. Considering GTAA 2024 it appears the expansion did not take place therefore the question arises as to why the Local plan has not used that site and why previous plans for expansion were not followed
- 10) An empty site was available in Brinklow that RBC could have invested in rather than collaborating to destroy the greenbelt in Barnacle
- 11) A reminder about Policy E: Traveller Sites in Greenbelt: Inappropriate development is harmful to the greenbelt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites whether temporary or permanent, on greenbelt land are inappropriate developments unless exceptions set out in Chapter 13 apply. If RBC were to consider Chapter 13 there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant the Local Plan breaching that policy
- 12) Looking closely at any special circumstances - there are absolutely none that can be applied to the proposal to make permanent the traveller sites in Barnacle - any suggestion by RBC that there are would be disingenuous as they have no evidence to support the plan. The evidence wholly supports that any sites within Barnacle are in clear breach of planning regulations
- 13) RBC have not taken into account that when determining planning applications for travellers sites it should attach weight to effective use of developed brownfield, untidy and derelict land of which there is plenty in Rugby. There is sufficient brownfield land for RBC to develop authorised sites rather than destroying greenbelt in Barnacle and the Local Plan has to be revised accordingly

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The sites allocated to Barnacle are totally unreasonable and have to be removed from the Local Plan as RBC have continually failed to provide traveller sites, as they are obliged to, at the large housing developments they have undertaken (eg. Coton and Houlton). This failure has resulted in this attempt by RBC to foist these unwanted sites on Barnacle residents even though RBC have been provided with evidence that very few if any travellers now or will ever reside there

In respect of point (6) above the Local Plan fails, which is particularly relevant at this juncture, as the NPPF as it relates to gypsies and travellers provides for the local authority to use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of the Local Plan and make planning decisions. It has been brought to the attention of RBC on numerous occasions by numerous residents in Barnacle that the sites are housing very few travellers and are being rented to private individuals along with the evidence on the Rightmove website. In these circumstances the gypsy and traveller needs at the sites and null and void and the sites in Barnacle must be removed from the Local Plan

In respect of point (7) above the Local Plan fails as the once a weekday bus service to the nearest towns, villages and shops only stops at the village hall which is over one mile away from the Top Park site. Traveller children tend to require extra support in schools, thus putting pressure on schools to provide specialised and additional support to the children. Allowances are made with respect to school uniforms and homework again adding pressure to the education system leaving the LEA having to find extra cash to ensure the children are inclusive. Returning to the current usage of the sites, as there are only about two traveller families left the Local Plan can ignore this requirement, revise the plan and remove Barnacle from it

In respect of points (1) (2) and (3) with the current usage of the sites there is no cogent reason for the Local Plan to consider family ties for the population on the sites as they are now being used to house private individuals rather than travellers therefore the consideration of family ties falls away. With RBC assessing the sites in July 2025 and January 2026 and the evidence they should have gathered would support that any Article 8 rights are no longer a consideration for the Local Plan

With regard to the GTAA 2024 page 31 paragraph 6.06 relating to the development of new pitches as those pitches remain empty how can the Local Plan justify allocation of these sites to Barnacle citing needs, family ties etc. when there are already pitches that are available and not being used. The Local Plan fails to recognise this and should, and in doing so should revise the plan and remove Barnacle from it

In respect of point (8) this is very important in relation to the Hamlet of Barnacle. Barnacle is not a suitable site and nor is it sustainable. The policy is clear, the suitability of sites in rural areas must not dominate the nearest settled community. As 85% of RBC's gypsy and traveller community were shoe-horned into the settled community of Barnacle they most definitely dominate and the encouragement of permanency by RBC is a clear and compelling breach of the NPPF and is totally unacceptable

When you consider the Rugby GTAA 2024 it clearly demonstrates that the Hamlet of Barnacle and the immediate surrounding area have the highest density of travellers in the whole of the Rugby borough. Why has the site CV3 3GW showing 13 pitches but no traveller households, site CV8 3JY has 10 vacant pitches? Why are they not being allocated? The Local Plan fails on these points and also in regard to considering density

The Local Plan is nothing more than a lazy, short sighted document that ignores the NPPF and will merge two boroughs into each other as RBC are well aware that there are sites on Coventry Road, Mile Tree Lane and Parrots Grove which fall under Nuneaton and Bedworth BC. If this flawed Local Plan goes ahead neighbouring towns will merge causing urban sprawl which is neither permitted or acceptable

The only sensible and compliant modification to the Local Plan is to remove Barnacle completely as being suitable for gypsy and traveller site allocation which is supported by the majority of the settled residents of Barnacle and that of a previous Planning Inspector after visiting the area

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note: In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The voice of Barnacle residents needs to be heard – BRAID is representing the views of at least 107 residents

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

9. If you have used AI to produce or substantially alter your representation, please declare which tool you have used, how it was used, and what checks you have undertaken to ensure the AI-produced material is accurate.

Not applicable

All representations received will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan and published on the council's website. Personal addresses and email addresses (as distinct from businesses addresses), but not names, will be redacted before representations are published.

The Rugby Borough Council Privacy Notice for Development Strategy is available here:

<https://www.rugby.gov.uk/w/privacy#development-strategy>

The Planning Inspectorate's privacy notice can be accessed here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

RBC Representation Form – These are the 107 residents supporting the response against the local plan

████████████████████

██████████ – J Heywood

██████████ – J Lewis

██████████ – A Harrison & R & J Whitehorn

██████████ – M Alcock & K Pay

█ – G Lewis & T Byrne & A & H Harman

█ – A & D Boddington

█ – S & K Rudge

█ – E Mowinski

█ – M Ruddy

█ – P Folwell

█ – A & J Kennedy

█ – J & R Spence

█ – C & S Differ

█ – L Hill

█ – R Downie & D Fletcher

█ – Dewis I & C

█ – M Haywood

█ – T Hewitt

█ – Barton J & R

█ – Burton J & L

█ – C & C & C Atkinson

█ – J & G & W & N Ramsey

█ – J & D & L Martin

█ – B & J Martin

█ – J Edkins

█ – James I & D

█ – R Nelmes & A Madden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - E & V Eardley

[REDACTED] - C & R Nolan

[REDACTED] - Bryant M & M

[REDACTED] - Burdekin D & A

[REDACTED] - Erskine M & E

[REDACTED] - A & D Brown

[REDACTED] - T Billing

[REDACTED] - L Andriuskeviciute

[REDACTED] - D Spencer

[REDACTED] - Stanier D & M

[REDACTED] - Jones C

[REDACTED] - C Lines & E Marriott

[REDACTED] - C & S Duncan

[REDACTED] - H & M Smith

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - Ellis M & T

[REDACTED] - J Dowley

[REDACTED] - S & S Kinsella

[REDACTED] - P & H & P Brindley

[REDACTED] - R & J & J Wilson

[REDACTED] - J Wiggins

[REDACTED] - Y Nollett & A Slater

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] T Pilling & S Watson

[REDACTED] - P & C Walker

[REDACTED] - D Rafferty & E Little

[REDACTED] - S Graham

█ - T Skelhon & S & J Bond

█ - D & J Essex

█ - P & C Case

████████████████████

█ - R & N & J Harrow

Representation Form for Local Plans



Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For
official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Rugby Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan

Please return to Rugby Borough Council by 5:00pm Friday 13th March 2026
By email to: localplan@rugby.gov.uk with **Proposed Submission Consultation**
in the subject line, OR by post to: Development Strategy, Town Hall, Evreux Way, Rugby, CV21 2RR.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below (if applicable) but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Ms	
First Name	Terri	
Last Name	Byrne	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)	BRAID	
Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address (where relevant)		

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each policy or site you wish to comment on

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Local Plan Paragraph	S4 Aiv	Local Plan Policy	Sites for gypsies and travellers	Policies Map	Shilton Lane, Shilton
Site ID	Wilsher Ranch/Nethergreen				

4. Do you consider the Local Plan:

(1) is Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) is Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

On 19/6/2025 three BRAID members had a meeting with Nicola Smith (Chief Planning Officer), Richard Holt (Development Manager), and Neil Holly (Local Plans and Policies) and made the following points:

- 1) We informed them that Wilsher Ranch/Nethergreen was owned by a traveller and that the four proposed pitches would be used as a springboard for expansion to a far greater size as evidenced by the case of Top Park in Barnacle
- 2) Concerns were raised as to the potential activities to which the site would actually be used for and rather than being used as a traveller site we had been made aware that there is every possibility it will become a bail hostel
- 3) Despite Wilsher Ranch being unoccupied there is a major problem of lights being directed at all the bungalows in Lower Road, Barnacle and the further development of this site would exacerbate this light pollution issue even further
This demonstrates that although RBC are claiming that these are for traveller sites there is actually contrary evidence that the site will not be used for this purpose

Additionally the following points require emphasising:

- 4) This site, which is in the greenbelt, has been deliberately degraded and the property is in a deliberately dangerous derelict state which has allowed this proposal to be put forward
- 5) The proposal for these four pitches in Shilton along with the 22 pitches proposed for Barnacle (within a mile of each other) out of a total of 45 equates to 58% of the allocation in these two villages with no facilities whatsoever. This is totally unacceptable especially considering the overwhelming number of traveller sites already in Shilton Lane
- 6) The NPPF as it relates to gypsies and travellers provides for local authorities to aim to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale, that plan making and decision taking should protect the greenbelt from inappropriate development, for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies, to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan making and decision making, to enable provision for suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure and for local planning to have due regard to the protection of the local amenity and local environment

- 7) Local planning should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally and must significantly avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
- 8) The NPPF provides for 'exceptional circumstances' and 'where a local planning authority is burdened by a large scale unauthorised site that has significantly increased their need, then there is no assumption that the authority is required to meet their traveller site needs in full'
- 9) In 2007/08 there was a shortfall of 30 caravans and 15 pitches within the borough and RBC considered that they could easily site the travellers at Woodside on Ryton. Subsequently planning permission was granted to expand Woodside by adding 12 more pitches. Considering GTAA 2024 it appears the expansion did not take place therefore the question arises as to why the Local plan has not used that site and why previous plans for expansion were not followed
- 10) An empty site was available in Brinklow that RBC could have invested in rather than calling for sites which has resulted in this site being put forward by travellers
- 11) A reminder about Policy E: Traveller Sites in Greenbelt: Inappropriate development is harmful to the greenbelt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites whether temporary or permanent, on greenbelt land are inappropriate developments unless exceptions set out in Chapter 13 apply. If RBC were to consider Chapter 13 there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant the Local Plan breaching that policy
- 12) Looking closely at any special circumstances - there are absolutely none that can be applied to the proposal to allow this site in Shilton - any suggestion by RBC that there are would be disingenuous as they have no evidence to support the plan
- 13) RBC have not taken into account that when determining planning applications for travellers sites it should attach weight to effective use of developed brownfield, untidy and derelict land of which there is plenty in Rugby. There is sufficient brownfield land for RBC to develop authorised sites and the Local Plan has to be revised accordingly

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The sites allocated are totally unreasonable and have to be removed from the Local Plan as RBC have continually failed to provide traveller sites, as they are obliged to, at the large housing developments they have undertaken (eg. Coton and Houlton). This failure has resulted in this attempt by RBC to flood this area with sites that residents never wanted but time after time residents views are dismissed and the sites keep coming

In respect of point (6) above the Local Plan fails which is particularly relevant at this juncture as the NPPF as it relates to gypsies and travellers provides for the local authority to use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of the Local Plan and make planning decisions. It has been brought to the attention by BRAID that there is a high probability that this will not be a traveller site but a bail hostel therefore must be removed from the Local Plan

In respect of point (7) above the Local Plan fails as the once a weekday bus service to the nearest towns, villages and shops only stops at Wood Lane which is over one mile away from Wilsher Ranch. Traveller children tend to require extra support in schools, thus putting pressure on schools to provide specialised and additional support to the children. Allowances are made with respect to school uniforms and homework again adding pressure to the education system leaving the LEA having to find extra cash to ensure the children are inclusive. Returning to the current usage of the sites, as there are only about two traveller families left the Local Plan can ignore this requirement, revise the plan and remove this site from it

In respect of points (1) (2) and (3) with the options being the inevitable expansion of the site from four to probably 20 sites or as expected a conversion to a bail hostel aided and abetted by the usual ineffectual RBC enforcement and the ramping up of light pollution there is no cogent reason for this site to be in the Local Plan

With regard to the GTAA 2024 page 31 paragraph 6.06 relating to the development of new pitches as those pitches remain empty how can the Local Plan justify allocation of this site citing needs etc. when there are already pitches that are available and not being used. The Local Plan fails to recognise this and should, and in doing so should revise the plan and remove this site from it

In respect of point (8) this is very important in relation to this area. This is not a suitable site and nor is it sustainable. The policy is clear, the suitability of sites in rural areas must not dominate the nearest settled community. As 85% of RBC's gypsy and traveller community have been deliberately steered into the settled

communities of Shilton and Barnacle they most definitely dominate and the encouragement of permanency by RBC is a clear and compelling breach of the NPPF and is totally unacceptable

When you consider the Rugby GTAA 2024 it clearly demonstrates that Shilton and the immediate surrounding area have the highest density of travellers in the whole of the Rugby borough. Why has the site at CV3 3GW showing 13 pitches but no traveller households, site CV8 3JY has 10 vacant pitches? Why are they not being allocated? The Local Plan fails on these points and also in regard to considering density

The Local Plan is nothing more than a lazy, short sighted document that ignores the NPPF and will merge two boroughs into each other as RBC are well aware that there are sites on Coventry Road, Mile Tree Lane and Parrots Grove which fall under Nuneaton and Bedworth BC as well as those in Top Road, Barnacle and Shilton Lane, Shilton. If this flawed Local Plan goes ahead neighbouring towns will merge causing urban sprawl which is neither permitted or acceptable

The only sensible and compliant modification to the Local Plan is to remove Shilton and Barnacle completely as being suitable for gypsy and traveller site allocation

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note: In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The voice of residents needs to be heard – BRAID is representing the views of at least 107 residents

***Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.*

9. If you have used AI to produce or substantially alter your representation, please declare which tool you have used, how it was used, and what checks you have undertaken to ensure the AI-produced material is accurate.

Not applicable

All representations received will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan and published on the council's website. Personal addresses and email addresses (as distinct from businesses addresses), but not names, will be redacted before representations are published.

The Rugby Borough Council Privacy Notice for Development Strategy is available here:

<https://www.rugby.gov.uk/w/privacy#development-strategy>

The Planning Inspectorate's privacy notice can be accessed here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

RBC Representation Form – These are the 107 residents supporting the response against the local plan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] – J Heywood

[REDACTED] – J Lewis

[REDACTED] – A Harrison & R & J Whitehorn

[REDACTED] – M Alcock & K Pay

[REDACTED] – G Lewis & T Byrne & A & H Harman

[REDACTED] – A & D Boddington

[REDACTED] – S & K Rudge

[REDACTED] – E Mowinski

[REDACTED] – M Ruddy

[REDACTED] – P Folwell

[REDACTED] – A & J Kennedy

[REDACTED] – J & R Spence

[REDACTED] – C & S Differ

[REDACTED] – L Hill

[REDACTED] – R Downie & D Fletcher

[REDACTED] – Dewis I & C

[REDACTED] – M Haywood

[REDACTED] – T Hewitt

[REDACTED] – Barton J & R

[REDACTED] – Burton J & L

[REDACTED] – C & C & C Atkinson

[REDACTED] – J & G & W & N Ramsey

[REDACTED] – J & D & L Martin

[REDACTED] – B & J Martin

[REDACTED] – J Edkins

[REDACTED] – James I & D

[REDACTED] – R Nelmes & A Madden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] – E & V Eardley

[REDACTED] – C & R Nolan

[REDACTED] – Bryant M & M

[REDACTED] – Burdekin D & A

[REDACTED] – Erskine M & E

[REDACTED] – A & D Brown

[REDACTED] – T Billing

[REDACTED] – L Andriuskeviciute

[REDACTED] – D Spencer

[REDACTED] – Stanier D & M

[REDACTED] – Jones C

[REDACTED] – C Lines & E Marriott

[REDACTED] – C & S Duncan

[REDACTED] – H & M Smith

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] – Ellis M & T

[REDACTED] – J Dowley

[REDACTED] – S & S Kinsella

[REDACTED] – P & H & P Brindley

[REDACTED] – R & J & J Wilson

[REDACTED] – J Wiggins

[REDACTED] – Y Nollett & A Slater

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] – T Pilling & S Watson

[REDACTED] – P & C Walker

[REDACTED] – D Rafferty & E Little

[REDACTED] – S Graham

9
[REDACTED] - T Skelhon & S & J Bond

[REDACTED] - D & J Essex

[REDACTED] - P & C Case

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - R & N & J Harrow