

**From:** Debbie Hodge [REDACTED]@jbradburneprice.com>

**Sent:** 06 June 2023 15:31

**To:** Hynet CO2 Pipeline <hynetco2pipeline@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Peter [REDACTED]@jbradburneprice.com>

**Subject:** FW: LIVERPOOL BAY CCS LTD HYNET CARBON DIOXIDE PIPELINE HEARING WEDNESDAY 7TH JUNE 2023

Submission on behalf of:

	Client
[REDACTED]	Mr Andrew Mullock
[REDACTED]	JG & MA Brown & Son
[REDACTED]	Mr J.C. Peers
[REDACTED]	Execs of Mrs G. Evans
[REDACTED]	Mr D.L. Cunnah
[REDACTED]	Mr A. & Mrs K. Hirst
[REDACTED]	Mr E & Mrs J. Williams
[REDACTED]	Mr P. Hardern
[REDACTED]	Stephanie Roberts
[REDACTED]	Ian Bentley
[REDACTED]	Hewitt Family
[REDACTED]	Mr B., Mrs S. & Mr M. Jones (Mollington)
[REDACTED]	Mr R, Mrs N., Mr I & Mr G. Jones (Picton)
[REDACTED]	Mr & Mrs K.N. Garner
[REDACTED]	Michelle Elford
[REDACTED]	
[REDACTED]	

I refer to the above hearing and to your email of the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June regarding instructions for attending/joining the hearing. I write to confirm that is my intention to attend the hearing on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> June (and if appropriate Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> of June) and would welcome a brief opportunity to emphasise a number of general representations/objections to the scheme.

There are a number of specific issues relevant to individual clients which I will address separately.

**General Representations/Objections Applicable To All Clients.**

1. Notwithstanding the number and extent of intrusive and non intrusive surveys undertaken on the subject land, there remains no clear indication as to the exact line of the pipeline and the associated easement. This uncertainty causes concern to the landowners/occupiers, and it is not acceptable that they have been requested to enter into Agreements with such uncertainty as to the rights that will be taken through the property which limits their ability to plan and make long term decisions for the subject properties.
2. The requirement for an easement width of 24m is excessive and has not been justified, this potentially sterilises a large area through the subject properties and where relevant will prevent appropriate development and restrict other operations including some agricultural operations.

3. The extent of land included within the Option Agreement is excessive and has not been justified and is beyond what is reasonably required for the construction of the pipeline. Whilst possibly not within the remit of this hearing, this consequently sterilises for the period of the option which is potentially up to 8 years.
4. There is no indication within the proposal that the Heads of Terms are requesting the grant of such rights as to the number, size and location of manholes, vents, marker posts and other such structures, which may be constructed along the line of the pipe. There is no provision for agreement with the affected landowners/occupiers as to the location of these structures.
5. Uncertainty as to the exact location of the pipeline and the associated easements together with the excessive extent of the option area potentially places a blight upon the subject property in relation to valuation and possible near future sales. Assurances are sought that any diminution in value of the property ahead of construction of the scheme will be compensated for.
6. Of particular concern is the suggestion that permanent rights of access to the pipeline are to be taken over all of the landowners adjoining land, i.e. not over an allocated route. Such rights totally sterilise all of the remaining land as if granted these rights can be exercised over any area, thus preventing any buildings or structures which may obstruct them. This is unreasonable, excessive and not required as linear access can be taken along the pipeline easement and in event many parcels of land have road frontage which is crossed by the pipeline. Assurances are sought that any permanent access rights to reach the easement are along allocated and agreed routes (if any).
7. There has been a lack of positive engagement by Hynet and their agents to landowners concerns with no amendments or discussions on many of the objections raised, and little movement on land valuations despite open market evidence being provided to indicate that the broad brush valuations adopted are not reasonable or reflective of Open Market Values for many parcels of affected land.
8. Agents acting on behalf of Hynet have indicated that in the event that the pipeline lease cannot be entered into consensually and Hynet subsequently utilised the compulsory powers (if granted) they will be seeking to acquire the pipeline strip on a freehold basis. This is totally unacceptable. Inspection of most affected properties will show that the majority of land parcels will be severed resulting in loss of access, irregularly shaped fields, severing of services, issues in relation to management of purchase strip etc. Any rights taken should be on the basis of a permanent underground pipeline easement.

It is accepted that some of the foregoing may be outside of the remit of this inquiry and I am happy to be led by the Inspector on these points/procedure.

P.D. LEWIS BSc (Hons) MRICS  
RICS Registered Valuer

T: +44 (0) 1352 753873
A: 14/16 Chester Street, Mold, CH7 1EG
W: [REDACTED]



**J. Bradburne Price & CO**  
- EST. 1902 -  
- CHARTERED SURVEYORS - AUCTIONEERS -  
- VALUERS & ESTATE AGENTS -

