

## Hearing Statement

26<sup>th</sup> September 2023

I represent the Eldridge Family who are owners a house and grounds to the north-east of the airport and whose property is affected by the proposals. This is Plot **6-04**.

Discussions have occurred over the years with my clients where they were advised their property would be compulsorily acquired as part of the proposals, which has understandably left them in a period of uncertainty and difficulty making future plans. Our clients were more recently advised that their property would no longer be acquired, but that rights would instead be taken over the property. On behalf of our clients, we have sought clarification of the plans and detail of these rights.

The responses published at the end of August did provided some further detail, but a number questions also remained. We were able to meet with the Applicant's agents on the 14<sup>th</sup> of this month of September to raise these points and look to progress.

We would highlight discussions are ongoing and not concluded. Some useful clarification has been provided and we would ask that this detail is incorporated.

The **4c (02)** works extend over more than just our client's plot and clarification has been provided on the works and a number of points, including:

1. Pipe size, depth and width of working corridor
2. Presence of working compounds, above ground installations, pumps, monitoring equipment and fencing (including any associated noise and lighting)
3. Finished site levels
4. Inspection requirements and frequency
5. Access track, parking and loading area locations.
6. Construction periods
7. Commitment to re-provide extinguished private water supply rights

The provisions of the rights and restrictions as documented are broad and we would ask that this sufficient detail is incorporated to give our clients more certainty.

The responses clarified that our clients land was "Woodland 4" in the **Outline Landscape & Biodiversity Management Plan (Doc AS-029)**. This had not been clear previously as the plan had been removed from the document for confidentiality reasons. Proposals therefore included a 10 year felling and replanting programme to enhance it as a native broadleaved woodland.

Our clients do question the requirement given extensive other land in control of the applicant. However, putting that question to one side, the details of what is intended at this point are not fully understood.

What is not known is the extent of rights & restrictive covenants to construct, operate, access, protect & maintain a habitat mitigation area are to be imposed and how our clients, or a future owner, would be able to use their woodland. This is a question we have put to the Applicant's agent our meeting and we await that response.

Our clients also have planning approval to construct two dwellings on their property and Plot **6-04** incorporates the gardens for those dwellings. Depending on the exact rights and restrictions

sought on the use of the gardens for those dwellings, this could have a particular impact. This area within Plot **6-04** does not actually contain any trees and in principle it has been discussed with the Applicant's agent that Plot **6-04** could be reduced to exclude the gardens. We would welcome that confirmation.

In term of "protection" provisions for the pipe we have now been provided with a document setting out industry standard pipeline terms which we will fully review and respond.

In relation to the pipe route on the Works plan in **General Arrangement Drawings (pt 2 of 3) Doc. AS-019** –This is indicative and the route may in practice be positioned anywhere in Plot **6-04**, which is an extensive area. We have asked if more detail can be provided and whether, if the pipe route is indeed required to pass through our client's property, whether it can be located further east, away from the dwelling and building plots.

Whilst we have engaged and continue to progress dialogue with the Applicant, we still do raise the fundamental question as to why our client's property is required for this pipeline route and woodland enhancement area.

We have raised the question why the pipeline route cannot be routed around our client's property which would be a relatively insignificant re-routing and why woodland enhancement cannot be undertaken elsewhere in the extensive land in the control of the Applicant.

We understand the response has been that the land is required for the pipeline route and woodland enhancement, however these are questions that require a technical evidence based response.