

**ExQ3.3.1** Response from Mary Rance: 20031504. Deadline 6

I would like to thank the ExA for bringing this matter to my attention. This relates to plot numbers 2/5, 2/6 and 2/6/1. The Applicant's agents, Gateley Hamer, have sent me 2/6 which incorporates 2/6/1 also. I have not been sent 2/5 at any point.

I am not objecting in principle to the use of CA/TP powers in respect of 2/6 and 2/6/1, with certain modifications. These are being discussed by my agent and Gateley.

Gateley have published that they had requested sight of my development plans on several occasions. I have had one request from them, and following this it was necessary for me to obtain Counsel's advice and my planner's intervention to prepare a statement for the Inspectorate's information.

I am still waiting to receive from the Applicant details of their proposals in relation to plot 2/5. However, based on the limited information that I have, I am objecting to the southern boundary line which impedes part of the entrance to Chantry Lane, covers the current visibility splay of Chantry Lane and any structure within the verge is likely to impact on the visibility splay. It also covers the area where the mains water is connected to the Chantry Lane supply. There are two meters there.

One of the modifications which are being sought for 2/6 is that the easement area should not cover the entire length of the field (from north to south) but should stop several metres short of the southern end, leaving that corner of the field to me. There has been no indication regarding the western hedge line, which contains mature trees – I have asked the Applicant for clarification but, if the proposals do include the trees, I would expect this to be addressed in an arboricultural survey to ensure that there is no adverse impact or adverse long-term harm to the trees and hedgerow and their root protection areas.

One detail that appears on my copy of 2/6 is the indicative trench line, very close to the boundary hedge, and it turns to cross the road (Waltham) well short of the south boundary of the field. If this position is found to be feasible, why would it be necessary for the Order limit to extend to the position shown on 2/5?

I am in direct opposition to granting access to the field on the corner of Chantry Lane. The Applicant is approaching from the northern end of the field and laying a temporary hard surface for vehicles, and I wish any access to be from that end of the field. Any access to the field from the corner of Chantry Lane would cause unacceptable upheaval and mess.

If Chantry Lane is partially impeded, this will hinder traffic, both in the lane and in Waltham Road. The regular users of Chantry Lane include nine tenants (and staff) who have access to offices and storage on the farm; traffic to my house; the owners and staff of Mathcot (another dwelling in the lane with livery and kennel facilities); the emergency and routine maintenance teams who can access the national railway main line at the dead end of Chantry Lane; the agricultural workers (and machinery) who can access the land in other ownership behind Chantry Farm near the end of the lane; and the members of a clay pigeon shoot who use part of that land. The lane is single track.

I am concerned about the plans presented for the works in this area; they are close to existing mature trees and hedgerows and are completely lacking in any detail. This should be

addressed to ensure that there is no adverse impact or adverse long-term harm to the trees and hedgerow and their root protection areas and no materials are stored in the root protection areas.

As mentioned above, this could all be properly addressed by a topographical survey and arboricultural assessment (which we do not believe has been undertaken), detailed proposals and a construction management plan.

I understand that if the Applicant gains a DCO they would have power to take this land and with that possible outcome in view I am prepared to co-operate.