

Landowner Position Statement – Field

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 National Highways have prepared a series of Position Statements with landowners) directly impacted by the A417 Missing Link project. These have been prepared in collaboration with the District Valuer Services (DVS), National Highways Property and Compensation Team and National Highways Project Management Team to inform ongoing discussions about land interests.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of the Position Statement is to provide a ‘live’ document that captures the key engagement activities held with a landowner and record important matters raised, and with a National Highways response to such matters.
- 1.1.3 The detail recorded within this Position Statement relates to the communication and engagement with Mr and Mrs Lisa Field as a landowners impacted by the scheme.
- 1.1.4 Further detail relating to any consultation responses submitted by Mr and Mrs Field during targeted landowner and statutory consultation periods can be found in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1, APP-027) and Consultation Report Appendices (Document Reference 5.2, APP-028, APP-029) submitted in support of the DCO application. Where appropriate, matters pertinent to their land raised in those submissions are captured in this document, whereas wider matters (for example any opinions expressed about the principle of development) are not captured in this document to avoid duplication.
- 1.1.5 This Position Statement has been updated in December 2021 in order to ensure that matters raised through Relevant Representation and Written Representation submissions have been considered and responded to.

Table 1 Record of Key Landowner Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
27/09/19	Land Interest Consultation Invitation - Letter	Meeting arranged with Mr Field for the 10/10/2019.
10/10/2019	Meeting	<p>Meeting with Mr & Mrs Field to discuss the scheme and potential land take. The meeting included a discussion about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design request for existing trees established for landscaping for the 1993 A417 scheme to be reduced in height. • Concern about noise levels. • Request to remove a drainage basin from the Field's land. • Explanation about the compounds required during construction.
06/2/2020	<p>Meeting</p> <p>Not to redesign the layby, but to relocate to where needed, if needed at all.</p>	<p>A meeting took place with the Field's at the National Star College. Discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access concerns • Height of existing landscape planting from previous road scheme • Drainage design (it was established that the suggested route for drainage conflicts with existing soak away and septic tank).. • Impacts of construction. • Noise mitigation. • Request to redesignate and redesign lay-by.
13/10/2020	Statutory Consultation Notification	Correspondence issued to the Field's notifying them of the beginning of the public consultation.
02/11/2020	Meeting	<p>A meeting took place on site to discuss existing drainage and landscaping issues for the scheme. The drainage and landscaping proposed was explained to the Field's.</p> <p>The Field's provided comments which will be considered and used to inform a review of the design proposed.</p>
26/01/2021	Email Correspondence	Draft accommodation works plans issued to Mr & Mrs Field for comment.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
08/02/2021	Targeted Landowner Consultation	Correspondence issued to Mr & Mrs Field notifying them of the beginning of the targeted landowner consultation.
16/02/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	<p>Meeting as part of the targeted landowner consultation to discuss the lay-by, drainage and landscape.</p> <p>National Highways to review the proposed drainage design across the Field's land. Review to consider existing drainage infrastructure in place.</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Field object to the proposed lay-by on the southern boundary of their land interest. National Highways to review the justification and design of the lay-by as requested.</p> <p>Landscape discussions are ongoing with Mr & Mrs Field.</p>
05/05/2021	Meeting (Virtual)	Meeting to discuss the lay-by, drainage and landscape.
1/11/2021	Meeting in person	<p>Meeting to update and discuss the scheme. Main points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land take • Lay-by • Drainage route • Land boundary west • Land to the east • Field access

Table 2 Support / Matters Agreed

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Attenuation Basin	The Field's raised concerns about the proposed location of the attenuation basin proposed south of dog lane. The Field's were concerned that the attenuation basin would impact their own drainage infrastructure serving their property.	The impact that the attenuation basin would have on the Field's was assessed and the basin was moved south of the A417 off their land holding. This was the decided course of action after reviewing whether the existing pipes could be moved. The proposed relocation of the pipework is still being considered.
2	Access	The Field's request that the scheme is designed to allow for unimpeded access to their field for the land plot 845/1.	The Field's will be able to access their field during the construction and operation of the scheme. A permanent right is to be created to confirm this position. .
3	Drainage	The Field's raised concerns about the drainage pipe going through their land for the purposes of the scheme. The Field's questioned why the pipeline could not run along the whole of the south side of their property on National Highways land and only enter their property after the last manhole on National Highways side of the boundary.	The route of the drainage pipe has been revised to take the minimum amount of land and also lie as far to the west of the Field's land holding as possible. The last pipework plan I have is dated 29.01.21. Has pipework been revised since and if so please could you supply me with a copy of the updated plans
4	West Boundary Land	The Field's raised concerns about their western boundary land that they state was wrongly taken by National Highways for the scheme back in the early 90's. The Field's request that this matter is resolved before the end of the scheme's construction. The Field's stated that the trees should be cut down and left at the property and all roots removed by National Highways.	The previous scheme created an incorrect land ownership boundary. As such during the preliminary works for the A417 missing link scheme, the fence line will be moved and appropriate vegetation clearance undertaken to provide the land back to the Field's and show the correct land ownership boundary. I seek clarification that your wording 'appropriate' means full clearance back to a grazing field as prior to the wrongful take.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
5	Small additional Land Area U00275d	The Field's state that the land parcel U000275d; which has been assigned to them, should not result in any management burdens being placed upon them.	This area of land is a small area of road verge, consisting of some 12 square metres of woodland planting. There are no management requirements for the land in question.

Will be have full ownership over this area of land to do with as we wish?

Table 3 Issues / Matters Outstanding

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
1	Accommodation works	The Field's request that a permanent and secure structure is provided for security purposes next to the lay-by. The Field's suggest a Gabion fence is installed and the lay-by is used for 'emergency use' only.	Accommodation works are to be developed and agreed as the scheme progresses. To be clear we DO NOT want the lay-by at all and still have not received any complete justification for it to be placed at the edge of our land and our land take for the scheme.
2	Land acquisition	No land acquisition discussions are to commence until the exact nature of the lay-by is known.	Land acquisition discussions cannot progress until the final nature of the lay-by is known. Land to be acquired by GVD. Who is GVD?
3	Landscaping	<p>The Field's raised concerns about the landscape planting completed for the scheme in 1993 that has not been properly managed or maintained.</p> <p>The Field's state that it was promised that the tree planting would be kept at a certain height, but this has not happened.</p> <p>The Field's request that further trees are not planted on their land as part of the landscape mitigation works and is properly managed going forward.</p>	<p>The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the environment in the local area and consider landowner concerns. National Highways have considered the comments received from the Field's in relation to planting. Are any of them from the local area?</p> <p>National Highways intend to maintain the height of the trees located on the north side of the east bound carriageway.</p> <p>An agreement between National Highways and the Fields' will need to be created for the management of the proposed planting. Will this be guaranteed and in writing?</p> <p>Full details of planting management and specifications and tree species proposed will be detailed within ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex D LEMP (Document Reference 6.4). Tree species selected will be appropriate for the local character of the area.</p>

We are NOT opposed to planting, we just request that the planting be no higher at its maximum growth than the fence/wall height. Regarding trees, over the last 30 years hundreds of trees have been planted in the surrounding areas and therefore the legislation for trees is definitely covered. Prior to that this whole area was fields with no trees so wildlife has definitely had a massive increase without having to encase our home in a wall of trees again. There are plenty of shrubs, bushes, low lying shrubbery that can be planted in keeping with the area, without large trees.

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
			National Highways are currently reviewing ways to reduce visual impact and to allow for more appropriate species mix on their land. Details of which will be provided as part of the detailed design phase.
4	Lay-by	<p>The Field's object to the lay-by proposed on the southern boundary of their land. The Field's believe that the lay-by will be used for anti-social purposes and will have a negative security impact on their land interest.</p> <p>There is also the point that vehicles do not break down at the base of the hill, they break down half way up it, so there is no point in putting something where it is not needed, but to place it in a position where the safety and practicality take priority.</p>	National Highways is aware of the concerns the Field's have about the lay-by proposed. The lay-by has been positioned in consideration of DMRB guidance. The final design of the lay-by is likely to be an emergency lay-by that is reduced in size and can only be used for emergencies. The lay-by will have a Traffic Regulation Order that allows the police to move people on. This prevents for instance the lay-by being used by refrigerator lorries overnight.
5	Security	<p>The Field's requested security in the form of a Cotswold stone wall or caged stone gabions on the south side of their property. Also that the southern should be secure during construction.</p> <p>As this will be a permanent structure, we would like clarification on this asap as discussion on Dry Stone Walling & Gabion Bunds have been discussed as options.</p>	<p>National Highways will review the request for Cotswold Dry Stone walls to be used for the purposes of the scheme boundary works. Cotswold stone walling could be proposed on the landowner's side of the boundary to a height of 1.2m, in combination with the highways boundary fencing along the lay-by. The boundary design will be progressed during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>During construction the work area will be fenced off and appropriate security measures will be put in place by the contractor. What do you class as appropriate measures?</p>
6	National Highways land to the east	The Field's request that if the triangle of land on the east side of their property (that currently belongs to National Highways is sold, they get first refusal.	The land is currently identified as being required by the scheme on a temporary basis. This is because then exact nature of the utilities and drainage in this area are unknown. As the land is not required on a permanent basis by the scheme it will have to be

Issue No.	Sub-section/ Discipline	Landowner/Occupier Matter	National Highways Position
		<p>We politely request that we are kept updated on the developments of this land.</p>	<p>declared surplus prior to any sale agreement. The land formerly belonged to Crickleigh Hill Farm, therefore it would have to be offered to any living descendants of the former owner before being sold.</p>
7	Communication	<p>The Field's raised concerns about the quality and quantity of the engagement completed for the scheme. The Field's requested minutes from meetings that took place as part of the landowner engagement.</p> <p>At every meeting that has been held either in person, on site or via on line services, minutes have been taken and and for months and on numerous occasions we have requested copies of said minutes, but as to date we still have not received any communication regarding these missing minutes. You must have copies of these to be able to keep updated records and for the purposes of these communications.</p>	<p>National Highways has continued to consult and engage with affected landowners throughout the design of the scheme. This is set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1), which evidences how National Highways has met the statutory consultation requirements for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008. Ongoing engagement has occurred with landowners throughout the development of the scheme. National Highways will have a landowner liaison in place during the construction of the scheme. This person will be a point of contact to discuss issues relating to the scheme the landowner may have. National Highways continues to work through the matters outstanding in relation to the landowner. Detail of the matters outstanding and agreed and a record of key engagement is recorded in the Position Statement developed for the landowner.</p>

We would just like to clarify, we are in support of this project and know it is a great step forward for the area and transport in general, but our concerns remain the same, that it will come at a detrimental cost to our home and surrounding property and that of the future generations of our family that will live at Holly Brae. We wish to proceed with communications on the same friendly footing that we feel we have with HE & Oliver Kirkham and the rest of the team, but we also request that you be fair and reasonable as we feel we have been during these ongoing talks and compromises.

I am still awaiting copies of all missing meeting notes. Please advise if you do not intend to supply these after months of waiting and numerous requests. What is the next course of action available to us to obtain these or who to we contact to escalate this matter?.