

A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Examination

Thursday 3rd September 2015, Third Compulsory Acquisition Hearing.

Re: Mr R. A. & Mrs P. W. Everdell

Preliminary Statement

by

M. P. Alexander FRICS FAAV,

Brown & Co Alexanders, Chartered Surveyors.

1. On behalf of Mr R A and Mrs P W Everdell Representations were made in advance of the March and June deadlines and the Highways England Response is at para 61 of HE/A14/EX/53.
2. A SOCG has been signed which identifies significant items as not agreed and as matters still under discussion.
3. In the course of recent discussions progress has been made and in particular at HE/A14/EX/99 a significant change has been proposed at DR 1.70 which meets our clients' objection. The replacement flood plain at DR 1.70 is also on land owned by our clients.
4. At document 99 a further proposal has been made at DR 1.20b which affects our clients namely an additional acquisition area being plot 15/11d. Our clients object to this additional area and have noted that changes at 1.20a, 1.20d, and 1.20e which in common with 1.20b all refer to gas pipeline "diversion works" are all coloured green indicating temporary use and not compulsory acquisition.
5. Our clients' principal objection relates to the acquisition of 24.9721 ha for the purposes of a Borrow Pit and you will have heard the presentation of Mr Barry Denyer-Green. Our clients' concerns regarding the provision of Borrow Pit 3 does raise matters of practical concern quite apart from the legal points; At para 5.3.1 of the Deadline 2 Representations we recorded our concerns regarding the working of the Borrow Pit and in particular the process of de-watering which is the usual method of working river gravels. In relation to our clients' retained land the potential adverse impacts are twofold:-
 - (i) The private borehole supply which serves West End Farmhouse and associated premises is vulnerable.
 - (ii) The effect on water levels on 31.50 ha of adjoining fishing lakes (also a County Wildlife Site) where potentially fish stocks and associated wildlife are vulnerable.
6. Document HE/A14/EX/104 re Borrow Pits refers at 2.2.11 to criteria adopted in selection of Borrow Pit sites includes "proximity to water courses and low lying land which could increase drainage and de-watering issues during excavation".
7. Table 2.2 in doc 104 envisages an after use of bio diversity with a restoration objective of an aim "to enhance habitats of otters and water voles", this objective has not been the

subject of any consultation and is quite inconsistent with the existing adjoining fishery owned by our clients.

8. At Appendix 2, 1.4 in doc 104 a number of points arise:
 - (i) 1.4.3 the 2 cells which make up Borrow Pit 3 are constrained by utilities which have to be protected which impacts on the usable site area (26.25 ha out of overall site of approx. 40.67 ha)
 - (ii) 1.4.4 refers to uses of material excavated which includes "restoration fill for Borrow Pits or other landscaping areas". The implication being that borrow pits are being created to fill other borrow pits.
 - (iii) The groundwater section makes clear that the method of working will be complicated and expensive 1.4.7 – 1.4.9. There are also nature constraints in particular GCN at 1.4.16.
 - (iv) Within Appendix 2 each Borrow Pit is considered in turn and under each of the 6 locations the use of the material excavated is dealt with under earthworks. Each Borrow Pit identifies as a possible use "fill for borrow pits or other landscaping areas".
9. At para 61.3 in Document 53 HE refer to constraints linked to Borrow Pit 3 and suggest that the viability of Borrow Pit 3 may not be established until the detailed design stage (61.3.4). At para 61.3.5 the response suggests that minerals may be worked without de-watering i.e. dredging which would be a very inefficient method of working.
10. Clients remain concerned that their concerns regarding the Borrow Pit methodology are deferred to detailed design and contend that notwithstanding the legal issues the case for the northern section of Borrow Pit 3 is not made and it should be excluded from the DCO.