

The reference numbers used are from the document ExQ2

4.1 the applicant recites the Holford rule 3 - where possible choose inconspicuous locations for angle towers, terminal towers and sealing end compounds. Options 1 and 2 put forward both do this but option 2 is more compliant than option 1. It is agreed that option 2 has 2 more angle towers than the NG proposal however one of them is in the sealing end compound and the other one is only a very slight angle. Both of which are in inconspicuous locations and only really seen by the landowner. The decision to proceed with their proposal is as already stated an economic one which NG as pointed out at the hearing are bound to take but the economic effect on the landowner must have some effect on the decision making process.

Table 2.1 REP04-027

We do not agree with the final comments. The issue is the area proposed to be purchased is located at the heart of the farm not on the periphery. Despite the amendments made the proposed area will have a significant financial impact on the future of the farm. It is not correct to say that the amendment made allows the farm to develop in the linear fashion.

4.3.3

the proposal to reduce the Limit of Deviation of the sealing end compound is a good idea and much appreciated by the landowners.

4.3.5

discussions are on going between the parties in the light of the proposed change to the permanent access route to the sealing end compounds. However the proposed location of the 2 passing places on Newlands Lane was received from NG last week - this propose to remove in total 100m of strong mature thorn hedge which is circa 7-8 feet tall, there has been no proposal put forward as to how the construction traffic will be managed. On boundary between the 2 compounds there is a dead oak tree and with some crown pruning an gap can be made in this location to allow construction traffic to pass unhindered and safely through to the sealing end compounds. This is a matter for further discussion with NG.