

Compulsory Action Hearing 2 26 September 2023 Part 2

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 primary concerns raised at the last Compulsory Action Hearing remain though I am reassured on some points where I have had clarification from the Applicant particularly regarding access to and from our property during the construction phase of the project.

The following summarise the points I made during the hearing:

Book of Reference

There has been correspondence between myself and the Applicant to try and resolve what I still believe are discrepancies in the allocation of plot numbers in the Book of Reference between the residents of Barbers Hill House and Barbers Hill Farm. I agreed to take an action and review the Land Registry documents in further detail. I will liaise with the Applicant to try and resolve and will submit further information to the Examiner when this is completed.

Response to ExA Question post hearing: Since the hearing I have checked the Land registry documents which I believe are correct and are the documents published when the house was purchased. However, I believe that the interpretation by the applicant of the property boundaries is incorrect and not consistent with land registry documents. Therefore the plans showing the plot numbers is inaccurately reflecting our north boundary and hence the allocation of plot numbers. I will take this matter up again with the Applicant directly to try and resolve the issue.

Plot 18 - I raised again the matter of the right of access being maintained to the track accessed from the B1176 listed as plot no.18. I gave a recent example of the need to use this access to construct scaffolding and relay roof tiles on the annex to one of the properties on the Barbers Hill site and sought reassurance that access to the track would be maintained throughout the construction and operational periods should this scheme be approved. The applicant was made aware of this right of access when we complete the land use interest questionnaire.

Access to and from Property

During the hearing I offered to provide the applicant with details of our vehicles so the necessary vehicle swept paths can be determined to ensure that any road working will not comprise our vehicle access to and from our property. The Applicant has assured us vehicle access will be maintained at all times.

The impact of the proposed road closures shown on the Traffic Control Measures Maps will be significant. The maps show road closures on the B1176 between Barbers Hill and the junction with The Drift and at the cross-roads with the junction of High St, Holywell Rd and the B1176. For anyone using these routes the options for diversions are limited and long making it incredibly inconvenient for all road users and residents.

As I have said in various responses to the consultation 95% + of our journeys turn left from our drive. To give an example, if we are unable to turn left for our daily run to Ryhall to collect the paper the alternative route will require a 9 /10 mile detour each way for a journey which is currently just 2 miles each way. Trips to the local supermarket & other retail outlets will be extended by a similar distance as will accessing the A1 south and many other routes. I do

not believe that this length of detour is acceptable to local road users, in addition all royal mail and other delivery services, including on-line shopping, oil deliveries the list goes on both to our property and delivering more generally in the area will be hugely disrupted and cause massive inconvenience.

Broadband - I seek reassurance that our Broadband services will not be interrupted at any time during construction. We have a direct fibre to property connection with a manhole just opposite the house. The applicant confirmed verbally that there would be no disruption to supply and I would seek to have this along with all other verbal reassurances confirmed in writing.

Secondary Construction Compounds

I asked for more information and clarification to justify the need for 3 secondary construction compounds all accessed off the B1176 and within less than circa 700m of each other. It is the need to create these secondary compounds particularly the one on Barbers Hill which is creating much of the need for temporary possession powers and resulting in the huge disruption to residents and road users. Is this proportionate and justified?

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.

In-combination effects

It is the in-combination effects that we fear and which will make the proposed scheme intolerable for us, as an affected person, the many other residents similarly affected and the wider local communities as we see the area we choose to live dominated by an industrial scale development.

The Applicant does not appear to have truly considered the in-combination effects of:

- Blighted properties
- Compulsory Acquisition powers
- Proximity (and visibility) of solar arrays to residential properties
- Proximity of sub-station, primary & secondary compounds to residential properties
- Increased noise throughout the life of the scheme but particularly during construction
- Glint & Glare with no mitigation where properties are identified as moderately affected
- Huge disruption due to road closures, traffic measures, impractical diversions routes, significant increases in traffic volume
- Dramatic changes to the landscape from a rural landscape to an industrial landscape
- Loss of recreation and residential amenity

the list goes on....

Each appear to have been assessed separately. Whilst any one of these would be bad enough, for many, us included, it is the in-combination affect of all or some of the issues listed above which creates the truly adverse effects of the scheme on our long-term health and wellbeing. There is circumstantial evidence that suggest the prevailing wind can carry piling noise over many miles not the 400m suggested by the Applicant. Many of the assessments rely on desk based studies with all impacts claimed to be within legal limits

which means they are deemed acceptable. How reliable is this information – what happens if these assessments are found to be inaccurate and the true impacts under-estimated?