



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
<b>Hearing:</b>	Recording of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) - Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	30 July 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## **Gatwick\_30th July\_CAH2\_PT2**

Created on: 2024-07-30 10:27:45

Project Length: 00:34:56

File Name: Gatwick\_30th July\_CAH2\_PT2

File Length: 00:34:56

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:25 - 00:00:36:00

It's now 1115. So we resume the second compulsory acquisition hearing. And we'll start with agenda item number five, which is regarding section 135 of the Planning Act. These questions are primarily aimed at the applicant. But of course if you do have comments I'll come to you at the end. So I'm going to go through all the agenda items first, then ask if anybody else has comments. Um, can you give me an update please, in respect of obtaining Crown consent.

00:00:37:07 - 00:01:14:02

Scotland for the applicant? Uh. Yes, ma'am. Um, as far as the ONS is concerned, uh, memorandum of understanding has been agreed. We're now finalising the section 135. No issues there. The Secretary of State for transport and And then a number of meetings. Exchange of information. And the DFT legal team is finalising the section one, three, five as we speak. Um, as far as the Home Office is concerned, um, a draft MoU memorandum of understanding is being shared, and the Home Office has confirmed that it's as expected, the reviewing that in detail.

00:01:14:08 - 00:01:39:26

And we understand we've explained our hope that the MoU, um, should be signed by the end of the week. Um, the home officers currently confirming their execution process with us. So we're confident that, uh, the correct contacts within the organization are now progressing. The matter under section one three, five consent will be forthcoming. So we don't foresee any issues as far as section one, three, five is concerned.

00:01:40:09 - 00:01:46:26

Thank you. The memorandums of understanding. Can you explain to me basically what they are and how they work?

00:01:53:04 - 00:02:03:11

Yes. Scott Linos for the applicant. In essence, they give assurances about how their interests will be protected through interactions with the construction process.

00:02:04:20 - 00:02:11:06

Thank you. It states that the Crown authority's interests would be reasonably protected.

00:02:12:29 - 00:02:15:03

Can you define reasonably protected?

00:02:16:19 - 00:02:47:15

Natasha Hyde for the applicant. Um, just to give a bit of context. So quite a number of the Crown interests, by the very nature of the operation of the airport, have, um, occupational rights. And so when we say protected that will the reasonable protection will look like re provision of particular rights. So for example, if they're currently operating out of one room, if that room needs to be closed we'll move them to another room. So that's the type of mitigations which are being secured through the MoUs.

00:02:49:09 - 00:03:05:15

Thank you. Obviously I've noted what you've said, but as Crown consent has not yet been received. Could you set out for me how the proposed development could go ahead if consent. Such consent wasn't forthcoming

00:03:07:10 - 00:03:08:27

in Scotland?

00:03:09:00 - 00:03:11:20

The applicant? Yes, ma'am. We'll take that away as an action point.

00:03:13:12 - 00:03:22:24

Thank you. But just to confirm, you are confident that such consent will be granted before the end of the examination. Yes.

00:03:22:26 - 00:03:25:00

We don't foresee any issues, ma'am. The applicant.

00:03:25:02 - 00:03:25:17

Thank you.

00:03:25:28 - 00:03:32:03

Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to comment on any matters in relation to section 135?

00:03:33:25 - 00:04:03:00

Nope. We'll move on to agenda item number six, which is replacement of open space. I know from the deadline. This is to the applicant deadline. Seven submissions and in particular response to EC two CA 2.9, which is rep 780. There's been a change in respect of what was replacement open land. Can you give me a high level summary of this change in any CA implications please?

00:04:03:19 - 00:04:33:25

Scotland. Applicant ma'am Ma'am.. Yes. I've indicated we've set out an explanation of the change in response to CA 2.9. Rep 7080 and as well as updated section 10.1 of the statement of reasons, which has wrapped 7-009. We're aware, too, that you already have a note on acquisition of special category land and provision of replacement land, but that was provided back at wrap up deadline for 4041.

00:04:33:27 - 00:04:37:00

So if we could assist you, we can update that to bring it into line with.

00:04:37:06 - 00:04:38:23

That was one of my questions. So yes.

00:04:38:27 - 00:05:18:18

Thank you very much, ma'am. Um, as far as, um, the current position is concerned, um, the latest change has resulted from our understanding that none of the JLR wish to own the replacement and open space, or have any associated management or monitoring obligations. As I say, we started this process with a strong preference to give the replacement open space, um, to the JLS. Um, as is normal and having regard to the community benefit and the existing provisions that are made for, um, open space through the JLA.

00:05:18:21 - 00:06:01:12

Control and maintenance. Uh, but what we've done, um, is to alter the approach. Um. Uh, that's been taken. And the statement of reasons, um, the case for the open space to date. Has been based on a combination, uh, of in respect of the existing open space. Owned by Reigate and Banstead. Relying upon section one three, one, subsection four of the 2008 act um as a effectively exception to special parliamentary procedure, and that requires repairs and open space to vest in the party from whom the open space is being acquired, and secondly, in respect of the existing open space owned by other entities.

00:06:01:14 - 00:06:36:19

We are relying upon section 1315, which applies to land for the widening of existing highways or the giving of other land is unnecessary. Now, those twin justifications were used originally because we had understood that Reigate and Banstead want to be vested with replacement open space, but that's not the case. And the position now is, we think it'd be simpler for all of the existing open space required for the scheme to be acquired on the basis of section 1315, such that none of the space has to be vested in Reigate and Banstead.

00:06:37:00 - 00:07:15:15

So, as the statement of reasons explains, special parliamentary procedure is not required in respect of the permanent acquisition of those plots that are set out in part one of schedule ten. Because the lands are required in connection with the widening or drainage of an existing highway and the giving in exchange of other land is not necessary for for the following reasons. Um, first, it's been communicated to the applicant and its discussions with the local authorities that no authority wants to be vested with the replacement land, and they'd be satisfied if the land is divested and the applicant, provided we lay out and maintain suitable replacement open space for the benefit of the public.

00:07:16:00 - 00:07:50:28

And secondly, article 40 of the draft DCO continues to secure the laying out of replacement open space by the applicant. And although this is not replacement land under section 1314, because it's not to be vested in the entities from which we're acquiring it. So this minor change, it's important to note in the legal justification, does not affect the applicant's commitment to deliver the full extent of replacement open space as described in the application, and that would be continued to be secured under article 40 and through the approval of lamps.

00:07:51:10 - 00:08:13:21

Um, uh, under DCU requirement. Um, uh, it um, so the management required for the replacement open space would be set out in the relevant lamps, which would be approved under DW requirement yet. So that's the way we see matters now operating, essentially prompted by the local authorities telling us that they don't want to take the land.

00:08:15:05 - 00:08:48:19

Thank you. I'm going to turn to you, Mr. Bedford, in a moment. I do have one related question for the applicant, I think. Well, Mole Valley District Council, in their response to EC2 Ceia 2.9, which is Rep seven 111. Noted that all mention of replacement open space had been removed from the latest version of the draft, section 106, which is 663 with no details on where the maintenance commitment from the applicant will appear. Is that still required and will that wording be put into the next draft?

00:08:51:27 - 00:09:04:03

For Scotland, for the applicant? Yes. There's nothing in the section 106 because the, uh, provisions for maintenance would be included in the lamps approved under DCU requirement. It.

00:09:06:12 - 00:09:16:16

Yeah. So it was in the 106 when we had anticipated that local authorities, we would be taking on responsibility. Now that's shifted. We've we've relied upon the issue requirement instead.

00:09:16:18 - 00:09:21:22

So that's in the Lem. Okay. Is there anything anybody.

00:09:23:09 - 00:09:55:18

Nigel Turner, resident. Can I urge that that is rejected? The outlined response gives no representation to the public that something vested in the applicant, who has already demonstrated in early answers this morning, they're their disinterest in anything but their own interests. And I reference their comments about the traffic management outside the hotel, and they're only focused on their own interests. That is surely not satisfactory.

00:09:56:00 - 00:10:11:07

So we ask Mr. Turner, thank you for that. We're talking about the replacement open space. And there's been a change because an agreement could not be reached with the local authorities they did not want to vest, take take responsibility of the land. Are you talking about that issue or is it?

00:10:11:09 - 00:10:28:19

I'm talking about that issue and I understand what you're saying. So surely the examination examining authority must insist that some other public body that has a genuine interest takes over this land. Otherwise there is nothing protecting it.

00:10:29:26 - 00:11:01:06

The way the examination works, obviously, is as you're more than aware, we come, we examine issues, and then we make a recommendation in writing to the Secretary of State. If myself, my colleagues on any issue think that we need to suggest an alternative course of action, we will do that

in our recommendation report. Thank you. My silence does not mean either I've made a decision. Either way. It's just I am listening. But I take on board your point.

00:11:03:19 - 00:11:14:00

Anybody else? Nope. Mr. Bedford, I'm going to turn to you for a response from the G8 joint local authorities about the change. Yeah.

00:11:17:07 - 00:11:47:24

Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. Madam, I think the the principal is capable of working in terms of the change that the applicant is proposing, but and it is a significant but only if it is understood and secured that the future maintenance of the replacement open space will be assured indefinitely by the applicant,

00:11:49:12 - 00:12:25:22

so that the open space then continues to function and maintain its value as replacement open space at the moment. I think in the discussions that we've had with the applicant, there has been some suggestion on the applicant's part that it would be a time limited commitment, and that I'm afraid at the moment we don't see that as an acceptable, um, arrangement. And that then goes to the question of whether it is necessary to provide replacement open space or not.

00:12:26:14 - 00:13:05:21

Uh, and say without getting into a fixed position at this stage, what we really need to see from the applicant is a clear and non time limited commitment to the, um, maintenance of, uh, the open space that the applicant is providing in lieu of the open space which is being taken in order to benefit the scheme. And I say at the moment that's not there. and that needs to be there. Um, and I'm hoping that, um, the applicant will therefore revise its current position to provide that reassurance.

00:13:06:01 - 00:13:11:07

How long was the time limited commitment that was suggested if if, you know.

00:13:11:09 - 00:13:17:09

I think the discussion, uh, from the applicant was a 30 year period.

00:13:19:12 - 00:13:38:04

Yeah. Which is, I think what the current lamp, uh, suggests. Um, uh, whereas uh, we are looking for a non time limited commitment because otherwise there's no assurance that the open space is going to be maintained into the longer term.

00:13:39:18 - 00:13:51:05

Thank you. I do have a further question. Um, at deadline seven, an updated version of the draft DCO was submitted. Um, there was amended article 40 wording. Do you have any comments on that wording?

00:13:58:06 - 00:14:01:26

I think it just it just updates the position.

00:14:15:09 - 00:14:34:01

I think that wording in itself is not problematic. What is important is what's the content of the open space delivery plan, which is secured. And obviously the provisions within that plan for long term maintenance of the open space.

00:14:35:14 - 00:14:40:20

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Does anybody else have any comments to make on that agenda item?

00:14:42:22 - 00:14:49:28

No, I have oh, I need to go back to you. Sorry. Um, the applicant, do you have any final comments?

00:14:50:14 - 00:15:24:09

Um. Scotland. Applicant. Yes, ma'am. Uh, briefly for now, I think we need to remember the context of this. It was always our strong preference, uh, to effectively give the replacement open land to local authorities. And we're in this position because they've essentially said they don't want to take, uh, the land, uh, back. And that wasn't why we wanted to, uh, to deal with this. Um, the second point is we don't anticipate that the management details would be effectively dealt with through approvals, precedent, DCO requirements yet.

00:15:24:11 - 00:16:00:24

So this was a matter that could essentially be resolved through the approvals, through the approvals process, insofar as they may refer to 30 years that was designed to, um, align with, uh, BNG related um, uh, requirements, which is why it has been put. Um, uh, in there. I think all we can do at this stage is, um, reflect on what we have heard, but I think we have we have an issue in the sense that we were put in this position by the local authorities not wanting to take on land which they normally take on themselves.

00:16:01:03 - 00:16:34:18

And, um, our approach so far has been to say we don't think that the given exchange of land is, uh, is necessary because this is a matter that can be resolved through the process. That was the intention of, um, uh, the process that we'd set out to try and address the problem with the local authorities not taking it. Of course, the other option is to avoid this, that rather than the obligation being put on us to work out how to resolve this, it's actually to local authorities to take the land in the first place. And that that's one other way of resolving the problem as would normally expect to happen.

00:16:36:10 - 00:16:52:01

We'll take that. We'll take that away. But our position at the moment is that this is a matter which could be resolved through approvals of lamps pursuant to requirement eight, and management can be dealt with by that process in any event.

00:16:54:00 - 00:17:28:20

Thank you. As ever, I'd encourage those negotiations to continue. Um, I don't have any further items to ask on that agenda point, so we'll move on to agenda item number seven, which is funding. Um, again, these items are primarily aimed at the applicant. I'll go through the agenda items first and ask if any of the parties have anything, um, they wish to add so to the applicant. Have there been any significant changes to the content of the funding statement since the last hearing?

00:17:29:13 - 00:17:30:28

Scotland. Applicant. No, ma'am.

00:17:31:08 - 00:17:53:28

Thank you. Um, in response to EXC 1CA1 22, which is rep 387, it stated that the property cost estimates for the land acquisition was around \$121 million. Is this still correct? And what evidence do you have to confirm that this figure remains reasonable?

00:17:56:29 - 00:18:02:13

Uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. That figure, I'm instructed, is still is still correct.

00:18:09:21 - 00:18:24:15

Um, Scott, for the applicant, as we've said previously, ma'am, this matter is kept under review. We don't see any reasons for that figure to change at the moment. Um, again, should there be any changes between now and the close of the examination, we would inform you of that.

00:18:25:21 - 00:18:46:27

Thank you. Um, I'd like to move on to ask about category three persons and possible relevant claims. How much funding has been put aside to deal with any compensation payments, and is that level of funding included in that £121 million figure? And if not, where is that budgeted for in.

00:18:51:16 - 00:19:03:19

Scotland? For the applicant I've instructed that the estimate for relevant claims stand at 4.4 million, and it is included within the larger figure. You mentioned well.

00:19:05:26 - 00:19:09:22

How how is that compensation figure calculated?

00:19:23:03 - 00:19:45:06

Scott Linus for the applicant. Uh, man, we can confirm this in the note of the hearing, but essentially, it's been based on an assumption that, uh, of a 1 to 200 properties code. In the worst case experience, more than three DB cumulative LEC day and night increase. Uh, And that's been the working assumption which the figure has been best.

00:19:45:10 - 00:19:56:26

Thank you. Given that the book of reference does, um, change quite regularly? Could ask that for the final deadline. That figure is revisited. And if there is a change that you just inform me, please.

00:19:56:28 - 00:19:57:16

We'll do that, ma'am.

00:19:57:18 - 00:20:28:19

Thank you. Um, I'm going to move on to agenda item 7.3. So I've noted the update to the Noise Insulation and Compensation Scheme, Schools Insulation Scheme and the Home Relocation



Relocation Assistance Scheme at deadline for which is rep 417. I do have a few questions. Um, these are more technical questions rather than CA related, but it kind of makes sense to ask them here.

00:20:28:21 - 00:20:53:03

But I think you were alerted to the fact that I would be asking more technical questions. And I see you've got your, um, the correct person here. Thanks. Um, so if we look at the noise scheme first, do you have a rough estimate of the number of residential properties who could be eligible, who live in either a conservation area or will require listed building consent or both?

00:20:53:26 - 00:21:02:20

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Good morning. Yes we do. We've looked at the number of listed buildings and it's approximately 5% of the total.

00:21:06:07 - 00:21:31:06

Thank you. Um, what happens if the relevant consent required for the works is refused by the local planning authority? Obviously, I know the answer that it would go to appeal. If that appeal was then dismissed. What happens then and who is eligible for the costs involved in making such an appeal?

00:21:32:15 - 00:21:38:12

Steve Mitchell For the applicant, you are talking specifically about listed building consent for noise insulation work.

00:21:38:14 - 00:21:40:17

Sorry. Yes. Yes if required.

00:21:40:26 - 00:22:13:19

Yes. Required. required. Well, what we have said is the applicant will centralize those listed building applications. So the cost is at the applicant's cost not at the resident. The homeowner has to instigate the request for listed building consent, but the applicant will then do it centrally. It's more efficient and effective to do it that way working with the relevant planning authorities. Uh, in terms of whether that could be refused. I think, um, it's worth remembering what the works are that we're talking about.

00:22:14:02 - 00:22:41:01

Um, and the noise insulation scheme does describe it for listed building, um, situations where we won't change the windows because that's generally not allowed. Um, we would go for secondary glazing option internally, which is consented in my experience, on numerous listed buildings because it doesn't change the external appearance of the property. So therefore we don't believe that consent would be refused.

00:22:43:23 - 00:22:46:21

Thank you. But but what happens if it is?

00:22:47:07 - 00:22:49:27

Then any appeal would be at the cost of the applicant.

00:22:50:15 - 00:22:52:24

And if that appeal was dismissed.

00:22:53:09 - 00:23:35:17

I think we would work to, uh, whatever solution was needed, particularly in the inner zone where we have a requirement to offer that noise insulation because it's above the significant observable adverse effect level. We have a policy requirement to avoid that noise level in the context of the government's sustainable development policy. And what that policy means is it won't always be possible necessarily to do that. So in other words, any noise mitigation scheme which is required to avoid a significant effect in policy still has the test of in the government context of sustainable development.

00:23:35:19 - 00:23:51:06

So there will be exceptions which are allowed if it should occur, where it's just actually not practicable to do that and still comply with the policy requirement. Having said that, um, I think there will be a solution, um, to listed building consent.

00:23:51:29 - 00:24:11:26

Okay. I mean, the reason the reasons for my question is, are to make sure that your mitigation, the mitigation is proposed, is feasible and that it is workable, which I know you understand. That is the reason for my question. It's just the document as it stands makes reference to planning applications. It does not, unless I've missed something go further than that and

00:24:13:12 - 00:24:14:26

could ask you to revisit that.

00:24:15:23 - 00:24:37:18

Scotland if the applicant will take that away. Mom, I think to some extent, um, I have to bear in mind what sort of likely to happen in reality if there were an issue. The airport, for the reasons that Mr. Mitchell is given, is going to go and work with the conservation officer to resolve any concern that may be outstanding. But in that context, we'll take your request.

00:24:37:20 - 00:25:21:23

I think it would just thank you. I think it would just close the circle because you the document has to be a reassurance for the people. They have to understand what would happen at each stage. And another question I've noted that the noise insulation solution available to residents is. The maximum amount is £26,000. What what mitigation from the list that you've provided would you get for £26,000? I just want to I you know, it is a very simplistic question, but I would like to understand you've given a figure of £26,000, what would, albeit a hypothetical resident, get for that for that figure?

00:25:22:04 - 00:25:22:19

Sure.

00:25:22:21 - 00:26:01:12

So Steve Mitchell for the applicant. First of all, it's worth saying that is a figure that we've put in the document because we want to we need to budget that. And we believe the number of cases that could need more than that will be very, very small. But this is a concern that the local authorities have

expressed to us. And we met them on the 18th of July to further these discussions. And we have agreed a terminology where, um, if a particular case, more than that was required, we would need a second surveyor to verify that those works were needed and that could be exceeded if absolutely necessary.

00:26:02:06 - 00:26:40:18

So that's the first point. But to answer your question, what physically would be, you know, what you get for £26,000? Um, we're looking at a fairly large home, um, requiring, um, replacement acoustic glazing to all living rooms, bedrooms and dining rooms. So maybe several rooms that need that treatment. They would also have taken up, um, their offer for acoustic ventilators in each of those rooms, um, so that the fresh air can come in without the noise coming in to help reduce the overheating, um, load on the building.

00:26:41:00 - 00:27:13:00

They may also have taken thermal insulation to the roof spaces above bedrooms to help the heat gain through the ceiling. Keep down. And we've also accounted for the fact that in the bedrooms. And I think I said it might be a five bedroom property, say, um, there could be a poor roof design such that the noise from above aircraft above is coming through the ceiling, and that becomes a weak point. So we've also budgeted for upgrading the ceiling space, or rather the loft space, um, where that's practicable.

00:27:13:02 - 00:27:16:04

And we've costed to do that for all of those bedrooms.

00:27:17:08 - 00:27:20:27

And all of that comes in at under 26?

00:27:21:02 - 00:27:21:24

Yes.

00:27:23:06 - 00:27:43:13

But as I say, if there's a very large house, particularly if it's listed, I should say that also comes in. We've uplifted the costs for listed building because the glazing may be a more expensive bespoke solution. Um, then, then that's also included. And as I said earlier, in an exceptional case, we would exceed that if it was absolutely needed.

00:27:44:06 - 00:28:06:04

That that was my next question. So I don't need to ask you about what what happens if the required compensation exceeds that. But you you have answered that. Thank you. I'd like to move on to the schools scheme. Um, can you let me know how much funding is available? And do you have a rough estimate of how many schools are likely to apply for for that scheme?

00:28:06:25 - 00:28:15:05

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. How much funding has been allowed for? I can answer that's budgeted at £400,000.

00:28:17:10 - 00:28:50:23

There are 25 schools, um, which include nurseries and um, we have had to have an estimate as to which of those may come forward. Many of them are in the quieter noise zones, and about a quarter of them actually have less noise as a result of the project. 15 have either no noise change or an increase of noise for the project. And we have assumed for budgeting purposes that about five of them come forward for a noise insulation survey and treatment.

00:28:52:20 - 00:29:04:29

Thank you. If we turn to the home relocation scheme. Can you confirm how the figure of 40,000 was calculated? So that has doubled since the original submission?

00:29:06:15 - 00:29:54:29

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, I can confirm in principle if that's okay, rather than numerical values. First of all, it's been increased in the latest update to the noise insulation scheme. And forgive me, I'm not sure if that's the version that you have at deadline for 4017 or the version that we are about to submit deadline eight, which will be an update to reflect the changes that we've agreed with the local authorities. More recently, um, it's been updated to £46,000 to allow for inflation in the meantime, in essence, um, it's calculated as the cost of moving, um, the cost of associated moving, including the stamp duty payable on the new property.

00:29:58:27 - 00:30:13:01

Thank you. In terms of funding for all of these schemes, I'm assuming, and it's always dangerous to assume that that is not contained in the land acquisition figure. Or is it?

00:30:16:22 - 00:30:21:27

Scotland is. The applicant is not included in the land acquisition figure, but it is included in the wider 2.2.

00:30:21:29 - 00:30:36:06

So that's a separate budget item. Thank you very much. Um, Mr. Bedford, I'm aware that, um, the local authorities are proposing a detailed response at deadline H regarding this matter. Are there any comments you want to make today?

00:30:37:22 - 00:30:43:20

Madam Michael Bedford, joint local authorities in short, no, not at this stage. And we are intending to provide those written comments.

00:30:45:04 - 00:30:51:00

Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to comment on this agenda item?

00:30:52:23 - 00:30:53:08

Mr. Turner?

00:30:53:12 - 00:31:14:01

Nigel Turner, resident I need to observe that there's some 41,000 for requiring someone to move their home. Doesn't take into account the loss of the value of the house noise and all the other costs. And I would suggest a figure of 250,000 would be more appropriate.

00:31:15:02 - 00:31:24:16

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. When you I'm assuming you were going to put some written submissions in following this. If you want to provide that figure and how you got to it, it would be very helpful for me.

00:31:24:18 - 00:31:27:03

Isn't it sufficient for me to say it here?

00:31:27:20 - 00:31:36:24

I have to ask. Well, if it's entirely up to you. If you wish to follow up with the written submission, that's fine. But if you want to tell me today how you got to that figure that equally.

00:31:39:05 - 00:31:41:01

You can do that now if you wish.

00:31:41:03 - 00:31:41:20

Well, it's.

00:31:41:22 - 00:32:06:27

Quite easy, isn't it? There's a lot of value because the house presumably would. Would, I mean, would reduce in value because the current occupant doesn't want to be there. They've got the stamp duty. They've got the cost of moving. I would have thought 250,000 was a much 41,000. Is clearly ludicrous. That would hardly start to cover the costs that any resident would occur incur.

00:32:08:02 - 00:32:11:21

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. Um, Miss Scott, you've got your hand up.

00:32:22:06 - 00:32:25:08

Miss Scott, do you want to make representation or.

00:32:25:20 - 00:32:55:28

Apologies. I was double muted. Um, I confirm the point from the previous, um, um, member of the public, um, Lisa Scott, Charnwood Parish Council, I think 41 or £46,000 wouldn't go anywhere near the financial losses that somebody would suffer, um, for the, um, reduction in property value plus a house moving costs. And, um, Charles Parish Council can provide an outline of, uh, um, a ballpark figure of costs where we fill.

00:32:56:00 - 00:32:57:03

That should be.

00:32:58:08 - 00:33:00:18

That would be very useful. Miss Scott, thank you.

00:33:00:29 - 00:33:01:14

Okay.

00:33:01:22 - 00:33:03:23

Anybody else wish to make any comments?

00:33:05:20 - 00:33:10:06

No. I'll hand over to Mr. Hockley to deal with agenda item eight.

00:33:11:14 - 00:33:12:13

Thank you. Um.

00:33:12:21 - 00:33:28:18

Action points there. A number of action points. Uh, mainly for the applicant. Uh, there's one for details and one for statutory undertakers as well. Um, these are quite detailed, quite technical nature. So we will double check them and we'll publish them on the project web page as soon as possible.

00:33:30:22 - 00:33:44:08

Uh, Scotland applicant. Uh, thank you very much, sir. It would be very helpful if we could just have confirmation of the ones for deadline. It in particular, we have a note. We'll work off that, but it will be helpful so we can get that information too, as quickly as we can.

00:33:44:10 - 00:33:44:25

Of course.

00:33:44:27 - 00:33:45:21

Thank you very much, sir.

00:33:45:23 - 00:33:49:15

No problem. Thank you. Okay. Just hand back to Mr. Cassidy.

00:33:50:04 - 00:33:58:06

Thank you sir. Agenda item nine. Is any of the business. Can I ask if there are any other matters in relation to compulsory acquisition or temporary possession, please?

00:34:01:02 - 00:34:07:28

No. So there are no other matters. I'll now pass back to Doctor Brewer to close a compulsory acquisition hearing too.

00:34:09:18 - 00:34:46:02

Thank you, Mr. Cassini. Uh, may I remind you, you just mentioned it. Um, timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any posting submissions on or before deadline eight, which is next Wednesday. Um, the 7th of August, 2024. Um, may I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspector's website as soon as practicable after this meeting. Thank you

very much. There's nothing to say and thank you for your participation, which we have found very helpful. Uh, the time is now approximately 1149, and the compulsory acquisition hearing to is is now closed.