

- ① HAND OUT PROOF + PLANS
- ② NAME
CHARTERED SURVEYOR
BASED IN MANCHESTER.
- ③ ACT FOR HARRISON DEVELOPMENTS HOLDINGS
- ④ THEY OWN A SITE ON OCCUPIERS LANE
HAZEL GROVE.
→ (SEE PLANS)
- ⑤ HAS PLANNING PERMISSION FOR 2 DETACHED
HOUSES WITH ACCESS OFF OCCUPIERS LANE
- ⑥ CURRENTLY A DISPUTE WITH REGARD TO THE
ACCESS OFF OCCUPIERS LANE WITH THE
OWNERS:

SANCTIONED PROPERTY SECURITIES LTD + BRIAN
TAYLOR.
- ⑦ HAD HOPED TO RESOLVE THIS DISPUTE PRIOR TO
THIS INQUIRY - WITH EITHER THE OWNERS OF
OCCUPIERS LANE ACCEPTING A RIGHT OF
ACCESS EXISTS, OR MY CLIENT ACQUIRING
AN ACCESS,
UNFORTUNATELY WITHOUT PREJUDICE DISCUSSIONS
ON-GOING.

8) ~~MY CLIENT'S CONCERN IS THAT, DUE TO THE~~
 MY CLIENT'S OBJECTION IS NOT TO GAIN
 A RIGHT OF WAY BECAUSE OF THE SCHEME,
 BUT SIMPLY TO PRESERVE HIS PRESENT
 POSITION AND ^{PREVENT} ~~NOT EXAGGERATE~~ HIS DIFFICULTIES
 BEING EXAGGERATED BY THERE BEING OTHER THIRD PARTIES
 ^
 CONTESTING HIS RIGHT OF WAY AND SEEKING
 RANSOM FOR IT.

9) MY CLIENT HAS HAD PLANS PRODUCED BY
 A HIGHWAY ENGINEER AND THESE ARE
 ATTACHED TO MY PROOF.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

10) THERE IS SOME UNCERTAINTY WITH RESPECT
 TO WHAT IS BEING ACQUIRED AND
 WHO OWNS WHAT AS REGARDS OCCUPIERS
 LANE AFTER THE SCHEME IS IMPLEMENTED

11) ~~IN~~ TO RESOLVE ANY UNCERTAINTIES, MY
 CLIENT BELIEVES THE NEW ACCESS ROAD
 SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO HIS BOUNDARY
 WITH GASTER COTTAGE TO THE PART OF
 OCCUPIERS LANE STILL PRESUMABLY RETAINED
 BY SANCTIONED PROPERTY + MR TAYLOR.
 THE NEW ROAD SHOULD BE A PUBLIC
 HIGHWAY

THE PLANS SHOW AN AESTHETICALLY
 PLEASING DESIGN FOR THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY

(12) IF THE NEW ACCESS IS A PUBLIC HIGHWAY TO WHICH THE NEW DWELLING CAN HAVE ACCESS, AND IT MEETS THE PART OF THE LANE RETAINED BY THE PRESENT OWNERS, THEN THERE IS NO OPPORTUNITY FOR ANY THIRD PARTY TO SEEK ~~THE~~ A RANSOM FOR ACCESS FROM MY CLIENT, ONCE HE HAS RESOLVED HIS DISPUTE WITH THE PRESENT OWNER).

(13) IF THE NEW PROPOSED PRIVATE MEANS OF ACCESS IS IN THIRD PARTY OWNERSHIP, THEN THERE IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF A RANSOM BEING SOUGHT, UNLESS MY CLIENT IS GRANTED FULL RIGHTS OF ACCESS OVER THE PMA FOR HIS DEVELOPMENT.

(14) FINALLY, THE A.A. ~~WAS~~ HAVE COMMENTED UPON MY CLIENT'S RIGHT OF ACCESS, SUGGESTING THERE IS NONE AND THERE IS NO ACCESS.

MY CLIENT'S SOLICITORS WOULD DISPUTE THIS. A

ADDITIONALLY, THE LARGE GAP IN THE HEDGE, THE AA WILL REFER TO, IS A FIXED GATE THAT CAN BE LIFTED OUT BUT PREVENTS UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS & TIPPING. PREVIOUS GATES HAVE BEEN STOLEN. PLAINLY THE AA'S PHOTOGRAPHS WILL SHOW A SPLOTTED VERTICAL ACCESS. ALSO MY CLIENT ADVISOR THERE ARE SIGNS OF OLD VEHICLE TRACKS

15

IN SUMMARY

4

MY CLIENT WOULD WISH FOR THE
NEW ACCESS ROAD TO BE EXTENDED TO HIS
BOUNDARY WITH EASTER COTTAGE
AND TO BE A PUBLIC HIGHWAY
WITH ACCESS AVAILABLE TO MY
CLIENT'S DEVELOPMENT TO PREVENT
FURTHER THIRD PARTIES SEEKING
RANSOMS FOR ACCESS.

WHO OWNS ACCESS AFTER
DID NOT WANT TO GIVE AN
ANSWER.