

This document is intended to provide a response to the Applicants document referenced 7.17 which was submitted at deadline 4.

Ref : Open Floor hearing 2 – Interested party Mark Hawes

Applicant Response 21.

The response from the Applicant does not correlate to the oral statement given at the meeting which was to highlight that some of the comments from the Applicant were subjective. In order to illustrate I provided the following example:

The loss of a limited number of trees, anticipated to be less than 10, is not anticipated to significantly reduce the enjoyment of the garden space

In the hearing I suggested that despite their expertise the Applicant author was not in a position to make such a strong statement especially as they have never had the opportunity to enjoy the space or understand how we use it.

Applicant Response 21

I welcome the suggestion that the implementation can be “micro-sited” to avoid the trees.

Applicant Response 25

Potential dates for a follow-up meet were offered to the Applicant on 1st April. The meeting will provide an opportunity to walk through the 50 outstanding issues referred to in the open hearing.

Applicant Response 27

In producing Appendix D, I welcome the extra focus that the Applicant is placing on protecting the trees.

Ref : 5 Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 – Section 4 - Site specific representation

Applicant Response xiv

I welcome the suggestion that the implementation can be “micro-sited” to avoid the trees.

Applicant Response xv

The following statement from the applicant should have read “western side” rather “eastern side”
The Applicant confirmed that plot 1-8a is located on the eastern side of Mr Hawes’ property.

Applicant Response 3

Since this comment was made there have been follow-up emails to establish an agenda and dates for a follow-up meeting.

Ref : 6 Issue Specific Hearing 2 : Environmental matters

Applicant Response 3.7

It is disappointing to read that the Applicant still believes that the “concerns expressed are misplaced”. Having lived in the property for over 25 years we are very much aware of why we love the property and what we enjoy most about it. As such, we are equally clear on how each of the proposed changes will negatively impact upon our enjoyment of the property. Unfortunately, unless we are able to make head way in mitigating the worst of the impact then ultimately, we will be forced to move from the property. Trying to avoid this particular outcome has been the main motivation as to why we have been actively involved in the planning process over the last 4 years. Having the Applicant suggest that our concerns are misplaced is not helpful and possibly explains why we have not been able to find solutions in the past.

In assessing the visual effect, the Applicant continues to focus the assessment from only one position which sits behind a group of trees that I planted 25 years ago. This position does not reflect actual usage and enjoyment of the property. There is no recognition from the Applicant of the less than desirable views on offer as you approach the property and how at the point of access there are effectively 8 roads in view. As the Applicant, who reported on the visual effect, has not visited the property, I submitted a number of photographs as part of deadline 4. The photographs try to illustrate how the proposed changes will impact the outlook at key positions within the property. As this submission also includes further details on visual effect, I have resisted repeating the same points here.