

## **Application by Highways England**

### **M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway**

#### **The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information**

**Issued on 11 December 2015**

#### **Section 9 Compulsory acquisition and other land matters**

**CA9.1 Question to - Applicant. Can the applicant confirm that the arrangements for limiting the extent to which the Sipson Road subway is closed can be incorporated into the CEMP as requested by LBHill at Deadline IV REP4-033?**

**Where there is a reduction in powers of temporary possession at Vine Close/Sipson Road subway can this be shown in updated Land Plans?**

1. Highways England can confirm that the CEMP has been updated to include arrangements for limiting the extent to which Sipson Road subway is closed.
2. It is not intended to reduce the extent of temporary compulsory acquisition in the vicinity of Vine Close and Sipson Road as the land is required for working space around the subway. As such, no updated Land Plans are required. However, access will be maintained from Vine Close to Sipson Road at all times, as set out at paragraph 5.3.4 of the CEMP.

**CA9.2 Question to - South Bucks District Council (SBDC)**

SBDC Local Impact Report (LIR) <sup>REP2-050</sup> expresses outstanding concern in relation to temporary possession of lands in SBDC interest. The LIR contradicts the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) agreed with the Council <sup>REP2-057</sup> in respect of its satisfaction with retained access arrangements at Dorney Village Hall.

**For the avoidance of doubt, can SBDC confirm which document represents the current position of the Council?**

1. This question is addressed to South Bucks District Council. As such, no response by Highways England is required.

### **CA9.3 Question to - Applicant**

At the compulsory acquisition hearing (CAH), the applicant stated that a SoCG would be available with Slough BC (SBC) for Deadline IV. No SoCG was received. **Can the applicant update the examination in respect of negotiations with SBC?**

1. Negotiations are still continuing with Slough Borough Council. Highways England is currently preparing a further draft of the SoCG for submission to the Council and hopes to be in a position to submit a signed SoCG by Deadline VI.

**CA9.4 Question to - Applicant, Affinity Water, South East Water, Thames Water, British Pipeline Agency and Network Rail Infrastructure**

**Can the applicant provide an update on the position in respect of negotiations with Affinity Water, South East Water, British Pipeline Agency and Network Rail Infrastructure with regard to protective provisions? Can confirmation of any agreements please be provided by all parties?**

*Affinity Water*

1. Highways England provided plans to Affinity Water on 18 December 2015 showing the interaction between Affinity Water's assets and the works proposed as part of the Scheme and requested a meeting with Affinity Water. That meeting is scheduled to take place on 7 January 2016, after which it is understood that Affinity Water will be in a position to provide its comments on the protective provisions that are proposed for the benefit of Affinity Water at Part 1 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

*South East Water*

2. South East Water provided its comments on the protective provisions that are proposed for the benefit of South East Water at Part 1 of Schedule 9 to the DCO on 11 December 2015. Highways England responded on 2 January 2016 confirming that all of the amendments proposed by South East Water were accepted by Highways England. Those amendments are to be reflected in an agreement between the parties. As such, no amendment to the DCO is required. Highways England hopes to be able to confirm shortly that that agreement has been entered into and that South East Water's representation can be withdrawn.

*British Pipelines Agency*

3. On 30 December 2015 Highways England provided the British Pipelines Agency ("BPA") with a copy of the protective provisions that are proposed for the benefit of the BPA at Part 1 of Schedule 9 to the DCO, which reflected the amendments requested by the BPA. The BPA subsequently wrote to Highways England on 7 January 2015 requesting further amendments. Highways England is currently considering the amendments requested by the BPA and hopes to be able to come to an agreed position shortly.

*Network Rail*

4. Highways England has still not received Network Rail's comments on the protective provisions that are proposed for the benefit of Network Rail at Part 3 of Schedule 9 to the DCO. Highways England chased Network Rail for its comments on 30 December 2015 and 6 January 2016. Those acting for Network Rail responded to Highways England on 7 January 2016, stating that they had not had an opportunity to review the protective provisions, but hoped to be in a position to provide their comments in the week commencing 11 January 2016. Highways England looks forward to receiving those comments and hopes to be in a position to update the Examining Authority in due course.

**CA9.5 Question to - Applicant.** The Category 1 interest in plot 26-12 is still listed in the Deadline III BoR REP3-021 as Grundon Waste Management Ltd. **For the avoidance of doubt, can the applicant and Thames Water (TW) please clarify whether TW or Grundon should appear as the freehold interest in this plot?**

1. According to the Official Copies held on record at HM Land Registry, plot 26-12 falls under freehold title number BK427677 and leasehold title BK400799. The freeholder of BK427677 is Grundon Sand and Gravel Limited with Grundon Waste Management Limited being the leaseholder.
2. The Book of Reference reflects this, and therefore lists the ownership of plot 26-12 correctly. Thames Water is listed in the Book of Reference as having an interest in plot 26-12 for rights of access. Thames Water has provided no evidence to Highways England to counter the position shown on the Official Copies received from HM Land Registry, which are to be taken to be definitive in this regard.

**CA9.6 Question to - Applicant.** At the CAH, the applicant asserted that a reduced extent in temporary possession (TP) powers at plot 23-35 had been reflected in the Deadline III Land Plans REP3-008. This does not appear to be the case. **With reference to the detailed drawing attached to the applicant's response to Slough Allotment Federations' (SAF) written representation (WR) REP3-023, can the applicant please provide updated Land Plans showing the reduction of TP powers as agreed with SAF to Deadline V?**

1. Highways England awaits confirmation from Thames Water on the proposed reduction of the extent of plot 23-35. The Land Plans will be updated and submitted to the Examining Authority to reflect the reduced extent of plot 23-35 once that confirmation is received.

**CA9.7 Question to - Louise Maxwell-Watters and John Watters.** Ms Maxwell-Watters/John Watters are interested in plots 19-53 and 19-54. Their objection to the scheme is sustained in their WRS REP2-026.

**Have Ms Maxwell-Watters/John Watters read the applicant's response to their relevant representations (RRs) REP1-003? To what extent are the interested parties satisfied by the assurances provided by the applicant in the response to their RRs, particularly in respect of the measures included in the Outline CEMP (in its current form) REP3-10? (Repeated from first round questions).**

1. This question is addressed to Louise Maxwell Watters and John Watters. As such, no response by Highways England is required.

**CA9.8 Question to - Applicant.** The applicant is reminded of the intention to update Works Plans to show Shinfield Eastern Relief Road. **Can this update please be provided to Deadline V?**

1. Highways England confirms that the proposed Shinfield Eastern Relief Road has been added to Sheet 7 of the updated Works Plans, which have been submitted at Deadline V.



**CA9.9 Question to - Applicant, Bloor Homes Southern and Anita Thomas. Can the parties please update the examination on the progress of discussions in respect of plot 18-02?**

1. Highways England has been negotiating with Bloor Homes Southern and the landowners (and their agents) ("**Bloor Homes**") in relation to the issues around the proposed Construction Compound 5 on plot 18-02 and continue to do so (the last substantive event being a conference call with all parties represented on 6 January 2016).
2. Progress has been made towards an agreement between the parties and it is hoped that a contractual arrangement can be entered into that will ultimately result in Bloor Homes' objection to the Scheme being removed prior to the end of the Examination.
3. Any agreement entered into between the parties will be confidential, and therefore will not be provided to the Examination. However, by means of explanation, it involves an application to the Local Planning Authority ("**LPA**") for planning permission for a construction compound of the same dimensions, but in a slightly different configuration, on land owned by Bloor Homes, outside of the current Order limits of the Scheme.
4. Such private contractual arrangements are outside of the DCO process and the timing and grant of a satisfactory planning permission cannot be guaranteed. The land sought under the DCO for the provision of construction compound 5 is required for delivery of the Scheme, as the principal construction compound for the Scheme. As such, it is vital to ensure the delivery of the Scheme that the current proposals for powers of compulsory acquisition for Construction Compound 5 are provided for in the DCO, whether or not a private agreement is entered into with Bloor Homes.
5. Whilst Highways England is seeking to come to a private agreement with Bloor Homes out of a desire to be mindful and understanding of local stakeholders' redevelopment desires and long term plans, Highways England maintains that the tests for the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition are met in relation to the land sought for Construction Compound 5. In particular, Highways England submits that the temporary powers sought over this land amount to a proportionate interference with Bloor Homes' property rights.
6. Highways England acknowledges that Bloor Homes currently has an option to build 360 residential homes on a site, part of which is required for Construction Compound 5. However, this proposal needs to be understood in context. Currently, this option represents a private arrangement between the landowners and a potential developer. In reality, at this stage, this residential project has a long process to go through with no guarantee that planning permission for the proposed development will be granted. The site is in the Green Belt and Bloor Homes has been trying to promote a development proposal on it with the LPA for over ten years. The proposal remains unallocated in the local plan and the next iteration of the local plan is not due to be published until late 2017 (at the earliest).
7. Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan Regulation 19 publication is currently scheduled for September 2016. The Local Plan Examination in Public may take place in March 2017. However, it is well known that such timetables can slip. On current scheduling, the report on the Examination in Public into the Local Plan may be released in September 2017 and the Proposed Local Plan Modifications, in a best case scenario, will be ready in December 2017. As such, even were the site to be allocated in the Local Plan, that allocation would not occur, at the earliest, until December 2017, at which point the Scheme would already be under construction.

8. It is understood that Bloor Homes hopes to submit a planning application in October 2017. On this basis, an approval could be expected in April 2018, based on no major problems arising, including appeals, high court challenges or other delays.
9. There are myriad reasons why the residential project might never come to fruition including the need to traverse the entire planning process at this time. Local opposition to development in the Green Belt in this region is well documented and there are no firm indications that the LPA intend to allow such an erosion of the protected Green Belt. The planning history of plot 18-02 is that it has been used recently as a temporary motorway construction compound and Highways England are seeking exactly the same *temporary* use of plot 18-02 now, which will not prejudice the development of the site in the future.
10. The Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project which will allow much greater capacity on the overcrowded transport routes into and out of London and the West in this area. It represents the modernisation and improvement of a very important part of the Strategic Road Network. Construction Compound 5 is the main compound for the DCO application, centrally located and key for the delivery of the entire Scheme. Highways England therefore maintains that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the grant of temporary powers of compulsory acquisition over this land, which is required for the development of the Scheme.

**CA9.10 Question to - Applicant, Railway Pension Nominees Ltd. Can the parties please update the examination on the progress of any discussions in respect of plots 18-07 and 18-08?**

1. Railway Pension Nominees Limited is the freeholders of plots 18-07 and 18-08, which form part of Priors Way Industrial Estate. Leaseholders and occupiers of the Units in Priors Way Industrial Estate have also received various documentation from Highways England in relation to the Scheme in relation to their rights of access over plot 18-07, as per the table of correspondence below.
2. Unit 6 is the premises that is directly affected by plot 18-08. It is currently vacant.
3. Highways England has received correspondence from Savills, which has been instructed by Railway Pension Nominees Limited to act as its agent for the negotiations, and are in the process of arranging a meeting to discuss plots 18-07 and 18-08.
4. The table below list all communications held with Railway Pension Nominees in relation to the land in which it has an interest:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of Contact</b>	<b>Summary</b>
08 June 2015	Letter from Highways England (District Valuer) to Railway Pension Nominees referencing plots 18-07, 18-08	Property negotiation request letter to freeholders to negotiate land by agreement
26 July 2015	Letter from Highways England (District Valuer) to Railway Pension Nominees referencing plots 18-07, 18-08	Chaser to freeholders that have not responded to request to negotiate land by agreement
23 November 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Railway Pension Nominees referencing plots 18-07, 18-08	Further chaser to freeholders that have not responded to request to negotiate land by agreement
23 November 2015	Email from Railway Pension Nominees responding to 23 November email	Automated email response confirming receipt of correspondence
3 December 2015	Email from Railway Pension Nominees agent (Savills)	Confirming Savills had been appointed to act on behalf of Railway Pension Nominees
3 December 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Savills	Requesting fee proposal and meeting date
3 December 2015	Email from Savills responding to 3 December email	Provision of fee proposal
4 December 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Savills responding to 3 December email	Provided comments on fee proposal
7 December 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Savills	Provided further comments on fee proposal and an offer of a meeting on 17 December 2015
15 December 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Savills	Chasing email regarding the suitability of the proposed meeting date

15 December 2015	Email discussion between Highways England (District Valuer) and Savills	Discussion related to agent fee levels and the proposed meeting date.
15 December 2015	Email from Highways England (District Valuer) to Savills	District Valuer offered to hold a meeting in the New Year without agreement on fees, provided Savills confirm that Railway Pension Nominees understands Highways England's position on fees and that Railway Pension Nominees may be liable for any element of Savills' fees eventually agreed or determined to be in excess of a 'reasonable' fee level. (No response yet received from Savills).

**CA9.11 Question to - Applicant. With reference to the applicant's summary of oral representations put at the CAH REP4-006, can the applicant please provide updated Land Plans showing the removal of plots 05-11, 05-12 and 05-13 from the scheme?**

1. An updated version of Sheet 5 of the Land Plans has been provided with the Deadline V submission to show the removal of plots 05-11, 05-12 and 05-13.

**CA9.12 Question to - Applicant. Can the applicant confirm the transfer of BK461004 to Highways England (HE)?**

1. Title number BK461004 is still listed as a cautionary title in respect of first registration relating to rights in the name of the Secretary of State for Transport.
2. Highways England's lands team is continuing to investigate this transfer. In the meantime, on-going contact is being made with the Department for Transport to gain consent under s.135 in the event that the transfer is not achieved by the end of the examination.

**CA9.13 Question to - Applicant.** The applicant's Deadline III submission states that, in addition to BK461004, Land Registry documentation is not available to evidence the transfer to HE for 68 other plots. **Can the applicant confirm the registry or transfer of ownership of these 68 plots to HE?**

**What would be the implications for the draft Order if registry/transfer to HE cannot be achieved before the end of the examination?**

1. When the M4 was constructed, all the land within the highway boundary was vested in the authority that owns and maintains the M4 (now being Highways England). The 68 plots listed in the Position Paper on Updated Land Information submitted at Deadline III relate to land within the motorway boundary that is reputed to be owned by the highway authority (in this case now Highways England) but where the Land Registry information either shows that the land is unregistered or is registered inaccurately in the name of a third party.
2. Where land is unregistered within the motorway boundary, land has been included within the Order limits in order to regularise the position that already exists (i.e. that Highways England owns the land, it being part of the M4 motorway). Where land is inaccurately registered in the name of a third party, the land has been included within the Order limits in order to clean the title and regularise the position that was established at the time of the Compulsory Purchase for the construction of the original M4 motorway. As this land has been included within the Order land over which powers of compulsory acquisition is sought, there is no implication for the draft Order.
3. The registration of the currently unregistered land and the transfer of land currently registered in the name of third parties is not expected to be completed before the end of the examination. However, as this land has been included within the Order land over which powers of compulsory acquisition is sought, there is no implication for the draft Order in this regard.

**CA9.14 Question to - Applicant. Can the applicant provide an update on its enquiries with the Government Clearing House in respect of the five plots listed as owned by Defra?**

1. As yet the enquiries with the Government Clearing House regarding the ownership of the rights to maintain and construct The Cut have been non-conclusive. The results from the Government Clearing House, which are provided in a chain of emails provided at Appendix A to this submission, note that Defra deny having an interest in these plots.
2. The response from Defra, included in the emails at Appendix A, states that “the holding will now vest in Highways England or the Department of Transport as the body responsible for roads (and land associated with it).”
3. On-going efforts are being made by Highways England to establish who is the appropriate authority to give consent under s.135, including discussions with the Department for Transport and the Treasury in relation to a direction being given under s.227(6) of the Planning Act 2008.



**CA9.15 Question to - Applicant and Goodman Colnbrook (Jersey) Ltd (GCL). Can an update be provided to the examination by the applicant and GCL with regard to the compatibility of the M4 scheme with the proposed strategic rail freight interchange on which an appeal decision is due in April 2016?**

1. As detailed in paragraph 8.25 of the Written Summary of Issue Specific Hearing Dealing with Compulsory Acquisition (APP 4-003), discussions are continuing between Highways England and GCL regarding the interface between the Scheme and Slough International Freight Exchange. Following a meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015, design information for the two schemes has been exchanged to allow composite details to be prepared prior to a follow-up meeting arranged for 13<sup>th</sup> January 2016. Highways England will provide a further update on the progress of the on-going discussions with GCL at Deadline VI on that meeting has taken place.

**CA9.16 Question to - Applicant. Can the applicant demonstrate by means of a plan the relationship between the planning permission O/2006/8687 (Persimmon Homes and Bovis Homes) and the scheme proposals in the vicinity of the residential development site?**

1. A plan showing the relationship between the planning permission O/2006/8687 (Persimmon Homes and Bovis Homes) and the Scheme proposals in the vicinity of the residential development site is provided at Appendix B to this submission.
2. As stated in Highways England's response to David Hutchison's Relevant Representation on behalf of Persimmon Homes Ltd and Bovis Homes Ltd (RR-283), Bovis Homes Limited has an interest in land to the north of plots 09-01 and 09-06 shown on sheet 9 of the land plans (Application Document Reference Number 2.2, APP-010). Bovis Homes Limited has been listed in the Book of Reference in plot 09-07 in respect of a potential subsoil interest in the unregistered road (King Street Lane). This plot is listed in Table 2 of the Statement of Reasons (Application Document Reference Number 4.1, APP-030) as "land within existing motorway boundaries retained for construction and operation of the Scheme".
3. King Street Lane is not one of the bridges that requires development as part of the Scheme and, as acknowledged in the relevant representation on behalf of Persimmon Homes Ltd and Bovis Homes Ltd, the Scheme is not anticipated to impact the implementation of the planning permission. The land is included in the Order limits for the Scheme because of changes to the M4 carriageway above the structure and no work is required to King Street under the structure. Bovis Homes Limited has a potential subsoil interest over part of King Street Lane as the road is unregistered. King Street Lane is maintained by Wokingham Borough Council as public highway.
4. The District Valuer, appointed by Highways England, contacted Bovis Homes by letters dated 8th June 2015 and 29th July 2015 to commence negotiations for the required land interests. No response has been received to either of these letters.
5. Based on a review of The Revised Masterplan for the Hatch Farm Dairies development (drawing MP-02 submitted with the planning application), there are potentially two areas where the consented development proposals for Hatch Farm Dairies (O/2006/8687) and the Scheme interface, as outlined below.
  - 5.1 Construction of the foundations for gantry G8-05; read sheet 17 of the general arrangement drawings (Application Document Reference 7-4, APP-116) in conjunction with sheet 9 of the works plans (Application Document Reference 2-3, APP-015). The area required for access during construction of the gantry may constrain the works required to create the new Link Road and its junction with Kings Street Lane for the Hatch Farm Dairies development. However, the final gantry will not prevent construction or operation of the Link Road. Highways England will liaise with Persimmon Homes and Bovis Homes to ensure that the construction works are programmed to negate any conflict.
  - 5.2 The Revised Masterplan for the Hatch Farm Dairies development shows new planting along the northern edge of the motorway (outside the highway boundary), presumably to screen the Hatch Farm Dairies development from the motorway. During detailed design of the Scheme, the planting proposals will need to be reviewed to ensure that there remains adequate space for construction, maintenance and operation of Emergency Refuge Area E8-B1 and gantry G8-07 (read sheet 17 of the general arrangement drawings in conjunction with sheet 9 of the works plans) including provision of adequate sight-lines. Highways England will liaise with Persimmon

Homes and Bovis Homes to develop a solution that is mutually agreeable for both developments.

6. Highways England considers that there is no conflict that cannot be resolved, and that the Scheme does not have any potential to render planning permission O/2006/8687 unimplementable. Highways England is confident that the two issues above can be resolved through coordination of the respective construction programmes, in accordance with section 4.3 of the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (an amended version of which has been submitted with Deadline V), and Highways England will contact Persimmon Homes and Bovis Homes to initiate discussion in this regard.

**CA9.17 Question to - Applicant. Has the applicant reached any agreement with RBS in relation to the submissions made in the RBS RR dated 2 July 2015 RR-239?**

1. The table below provides a record of the contact Highways England has had with RBS and National Westminster Bank plc, which is part of the RBS group, in relation to the land in which it has an interest. As can be seen from that table, the last contact Highways England had with National Westminster Bank was when the agent actions for RBS contacted the District Valuer acting for Highways England by email in August 2015 requesting technical and plot details to be provided. Those details were sent by return to the agent as requested. There has been no further contact from the agent since that time and no requests for any further information or meetings have been received by Highways England or the District Valuer.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of Contact</b>	<b>Summary</b>
10 March 2014	Invitation to attend a Preview Public Information Exhibition, to be held on 18 March 2014	Preview Public Information Exhibition as part of initial stakeholder engagement and information exercise.
17 October 2014	Letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership questionnaire	Requesting land interest details for identified areas of land which may be affected by the Scheme
10 November 2014	Planning Act 2008 Section 42: Notice of statutory pre-application consultation period	Notification of the formal pre-application consultation between 10 November and 21 December 2014 about the Scheme in accordance with Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
10 November 2014	Planning Act 2008 Section 47 Notification Letter	Details of the pre-application consultation to be held between 10 November and 21 December 2014.
19 February 2015	Letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership confirmation questionnaire	Questionnaire to obtain confirmation that the details previously provided regarding the Scheme are still valid and to offer the opportunity to provide any updates
28 May 2015	Planning Act 2008 Section 56: Notice of acceptance of an application for a development consent order	Notification of acceptance of application together with details of land which National Westminster Bank plc have an interest
08 June 2015	Letters from Highways England to National Westminster Bank plc referencing plots 19-66, 19-69, 23-08, 28-11	Property negotiation request letter to freeholders to negotiate land by agreement
2 July 2015	Email from Bilfinger GVA stated as working on behalf of RBS	More information requested on the impact of the Scheme on the plots 19-66,19-69,23-08 and 28-11
16 July 2015	Email from Highways England to Bilfinger GVA providing information requested on 2 July 2015	Details given regarding the impact of the Scheme on the plots 19-66,19-69,23-08 and 28-11
29 July 2015	Letters from Highways England to National Westminster Bank plc referencing plots 19-66, 19-69,	Chaser to freeholders that have not responded to request to negotiate land by agreement

	23-08, 28-11	
2 August 2015	Email from District Valuer to Bilfinger GVA	Providing District Valuer contact details to GVA and confirming District Valuer acting on behalf of Highways England
10 August 2015	Email from Bilfinger GVA to District Valuer responding to 2 August email	Information requested on the impact of the Scheme on RBS property, particularly plot 28-11
11 August 2015	Email from District Valuer to Bilfinger GVA responding to 10 August 2015 email	Provided copy of Highways England email dated 16 July 2015, which provided details regarding the impact of the Scheme on the plots 19-66, 19-69, 23-08 and 28-11
19 November 2015	Email to Ms S Lees of RBS ref plots 19-66, 19-69 and 23-08)	Response to call to Highways England's Customer Contact Centre on 5 November 2015 regarding the compulsory acquisition of three land plots (19-66, 19-69 and 23-08). Information provided on proposed works and location of the plots on the Scheme drawings

**CA9.18 Question to - Applicant. Has the applicant held any discussions with Ms Rieseberg in relation to the land in which she has an interest?**

1. The table below list all communications held with Lesley Rose Rieseberg in relation to the land in which she has an interest:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of Contact</b>	<b>Summary</b>
10 March 2014	Invitation to attend a Preview Public Information Exhibition, to be held on 18 March 2014	Preview Public Information Exhibition as part of initial stakeholder engagement and information exercise.
25 April 2014	Letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership questionnaire	Requesting land interest details for identified areas of land which may be affected by the Scheme
18 May 2014	Email response from Ms Rieseberg to land ownership questionnaire	Completed questionnaire on request for land ownership details for Lesley Rose Rieseberg
28 October 2014	Letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership confirmation questionnaire	Questionnaire to obtain confirmation that the details previously provided regarding the Scheme are still valid and to offer the opportunity to provide any updates
10 November 2014	Planning Act 2008 Section 42: Notice of statutory pre-application consultation period	Notification of the formal pre-application consultation between 10 November and 21 December 2014 about the Scheme in accordance with Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
28 November 2014	Letter response to land ownership confirmation questionnaire	Completed response to confirmation questionnaire on behalf of Lesley Rose Rieseberg
19 February 2015	Letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership confirmation questionnaire	Questionnaire to obtain confirmation that the details previously provided regarding the Scheme are still valid and to offer the opportunity to provide any updates
23 February 2015	Email with copy letter from Highways Agency requesting completion of land ownership confirmation questionnaire sent to Ms Rieseberg's agent	Questionnaire to obtain confirmation that the details previously provided regarding the Scheme are still valid and to offer the opportunity to provide any updates
05 April 2015	Email response to land ownership confirmation questionnaire	Completed response to confirmation questionnaire
28 May 2015	Planning Act 2008 Section 56: Notice of acceptance of an application for a development consent order	Notification of acceptance of application together with details of land which South Bucks District Council have an interest
08 June 2015	Letter from Highways England (District Valuer) to Lesley Rose Rieseberg	Property negotiation request letter to freeholders to negotiate land by agreement

20 June 2015	Relevant Representation Response submitted to PINS	<p>Objection raised. Relevant representation stated “Land ownership parcel 23314 Field and agricultural land (Riding Court Road).</p> <p>This land was purchased through SJ Capital Group Investment (PTY) Ltd, and is in the process of being re-zoned from agricultural land to residential land.</p> <p>My interest in this land is that I want this land re-zoned to residential land.”</p>
29 July 2015	Letter from Highways England to Lesley Rose Rieseberg	Second chaser to freeholders that have not responded to request to negotiate land by agreement. No response has been received to either letter.
2 October 2015 (Deadline 1)	Highways England Response to Relevant Representation made by Lesley Rose Rieseberg	<p>Response given was “The use of land is an issue for the local planning authority and does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Examination. There is no evidence that the Scheme would have any impact on an application to have a site allocation changed to residential land.</p> <p>The landowner is entitled to discuss any concerns with the District Valuer. Compensation payable (if any) for loss and disturbance to will be assessed in accordance with the Compensation Code.”</p> <p>No further communication has been received from Ms Reiseberg. It appears that the plot which she owns is part of a scheme where small land parcels have been sold to people in South Africa as part of an investment scheme.</p>