

Compulsory Action Hearing Part 3

Written submission from Mrs H L Woolley, affected person subject to Temporary Possession Order plot no. 01-16. Identified as both Category 1 and Category 3 affected party.
Unique Reference nos. Helen Woolley MPSP-AFP156 Geoff Woolley MPSP-AFP155

My husband and I live in the northwest part of the site looking out over the proposed site with the proposed boundary of the DCO order limits running along the tarmac highway adjacent to the grass verge which runs into our front garden.

As I make my submission and without going into any details, these are well documented in by written representations, I wish to state that we remain totally opposed to the scheme in principle and in its totality. But in in this session I want to set out the impact that the scheme as currently proposed will have on my husband and I, the environment in which live and the huge disruption the scheme and in particular the CA application with have on our daily lives.

In particular there are a number of things that would like to seek some clarity on.

Book of Reference

The first is having reviewed the book of reference there appear to be some anomalies regarding the plot number from Plot 01-11 to 01-18. It is not clear from the book of reference why there are the number of plot references between our and our neighbours properties. I also think the allocated plot numbers may not accurately reflect the ownership of our respective properties. In addition plot reference 01-17 does not appear in the book of reference at all.

Foot note: during the hearing the ExA requested the discussion above re Book of reference be taken off-line and discussed directly with the applicant which both parties agreed to do.

I would also like to make clear as it does not appear to be recorded that both we and our neighbour have a right of access to a track adjacent to the south of our properties which is part of plot 01-18. The applicant was made aware of this when we complete the land use interest questionnaire.

Temporary Possession

I would like to fully understand exactly what the applicant's interpretation is of temporary possession. Is this temporary possession just required for construction or is the order required to for the lifetime of the scheme. If the latter, given there is no time limit to the scheme, I would argue that this cannot be termed temporary possession.

However, I think my understanding is that the temporary possession order is to enable the applicant to construct a new gateway a little further north on the B1176 from our property.

But it is what the Temporary Possession order enables the applicant to do which causes us the most significant concerns. By granting the order the applicant will be able to:

- create a new gateway which will enable entry by large vehicles (these must be larger than the existing farm traffic otherwise existing gateways would suffice) and by the permissions sought larger than the road as currently used can cope with.
- create a secondary compound one of three within approximately 500m of each other all adjacent to the B1176. This will be really impactful on the stretch of road between the three compounds.

The consequence of both of the above points will be huge disruption to our daily lives both with regard to the roadworks to facilitate the building of the gateway and also from the proposals in the traffic management plans.

We are an isolated property totally reliant on our vehicles to live our daily lives. We undertake multiple car journeys everyday and we require 24 hr vehicle access to our property and the right of access referred to earlier in the document to be maintained at ALL times. There will be severe disruption to our daily lives, regarding:

- any restrictions to vehicle and pedestrian access to and from our property
- the local road network, 95% of our journeys start with a left turn as we leave home so there will be a direct impact on us from all the compulsory acquisition rights sought across the site result in traffic restrictions during the construction phase but in particular those affecting the B1176 its cross road junction with High St.

I seek an undertaking from the Applicant that our right to have vehicular access to our property and the access at plot 01-18 is not going to be compromised at all during the construction or operation of the scheme.

Alternative routes will inevitably mean long diversions which are inconvenient, increase fuel costs, pollution and carbon emissions – not very eco-friendly!

In addition to the above issues the construction and operation of a secondary compound so close to our home will be disruptive to our everyday life with noise, increased traffic etc all resulting as a direct result of the Temporary Possession order if it is granted.

Land Use Questionnaire

During the submission I also made reference to my frustrations dealing with the applicant during the early consultation phases with regard to the Land Use Questionnaire and its purpose and the challenges we had to be recognised as having both category 3 as well as Category 1 interests. Commenting that I now understand this was all about trying to establish land ownership rights, I believe that the Applicant had a duty of care to be open and actually explain that there could be a compulsory acquisition request and that it was in my interests to complete the information.