

GENERAL Summary

Introduction.

I submit that our clients are reasonable practical people who recognize the need for the scheme generally. They understand that the authority has to mitigate impact on nearby residential settlements.

but - we say there also needs to be a balance between all relevant interests, including existing businesses and land occupiers.

It is appreciated that the authority has to look for cost efficiencies.

but - we say that most of our clients proposals mitigate compensation and low construction costs.

Consultation with existing land interests has been too little, too late. Suggesting that consultation to local forums once the design has been captured represent proper consultation fail to convince. Discussion about a design that is immovable is not consultation.

If I am wrong in saying a consultation, then put them in the result of failing to consult the right ^{order} that our proposals to modify the scheme ~~to~~ ⁱⁿ ~~not~~ have been rejected.

people at the right time is that some elements of the scheme have not been properly thought through.

The proposal for the authority to employ specialist land drainage consultants and contractors is made firstly on the basis of experience, and secondly with a view to saving the authority as much as the claimant cost and time. Its ^{apparent} rejection by the authority is symptomatic of ~~the~~ an attitude that doesn't want to engage.

Summary

It is accepted that it is not the purpose of the Scheme to facilitate development. However the trustees have a duty to follow up the development potential already identified and we submit that the authority has made only ~~very minor~~ minimal changes to design to protect land take.

It has made changes elsewhere so the approach is not consistent. The situation cannot be remedied by compensation.

The bridge design (sort of the A6) is overly cumbersome and does not provide access to the trustees woodland.

1 submit
not possible need for full extent of cycleways.

Sketch etc - if it is the case that the objections have been consulted, then the points made by objects have been repeated.

← Jan Shift

→ The authority has not worked with the landlord to reduce land take.

In terms of land management.

It is of course up to the landlord, not the authority, to determine whether and when to terminate the HQT. There is therefore a compensable interest.

A permanent occupation as suggested in the
? ~~But~~ rebuttal proof is not a realistic proposition and the landlord will be able to deal with possession for any development as and when it arises.

→ The authority accepts that the impact on this HQT is adverse. It has not however been able to address that situation with any practical measures.

Hazel Mart and family

The family has put forward a practical alternative bridge location which the authority agrees is neutral in terms of construction cost, and which will reduce compensation costs.

Despite initial indications from the Project Director that the bridge location was not cast in stone, this has proved to be the case despite our detailed case for the alternative location.

Consultation ^{with our client} was never undertaken at the most critical point in the design process - ie prior to initial design.

If there has been full consultation ^{when we do not accept} ^{our clients concerns} ^{have not been accepted} the main bullet in 21/12/06 of the rebuttal ^{proof} ~~is~~ is incorrect, in that there is no access from Mill Hill Farm that provides a direct access to the proposed bridge. A simple inspection would reveal that. The access from Mill Hill Farm involves a significant length of highway with bends and poor lines of sight, and is accordingly unsafe.

This objection is fully supported by David Hall, ^{who is} one of the major family enterprises affected by the Scheme.

Lawson.

The authority accept that the equestrian holding is currently intensively used, and accordingly support our contention that even a modest amount of land take will have a significant effect.

Freedman

As it currently stands the authority cannot demonstrate that our clients will be able to access their driveway following erection of the cycle safety fence. They will have to park their cars where the cycle traffic is intended.

The plans / drawings produced by the authority don't answer the problem and confirm that the proposed access route is blocked by existing landscaping.

The se proposals seem to have been designed somewhat late in the day.

Our Mr Freedman will wish to erect a fence against the cycle fence to preserve privacy which will negate part of the purpose of the cycle fence.

We have put forward a practical and cost effective option which is to use an existing gateway to the proposed road, just to the east of the proposed access point.

We didn't cover this point earlier.

Also The land take in the CPO includes a section of ~~new~~ land to the west of the shared / footway cycleway. which further compromises manoeuvrability. It is not ^{now} clear why that land is being taken in addition to the route of the cycle way / footpath.

JONES / ROWLAND FOLDING.

The authority appear not have considered the implications of introducing new equestrian cycle and pedestrian traffic on to the existing track (which was provided to mitigate severance caused by the construction of the A55) until we raised objections.

We submit that the response has seen to try and fit ^{together} two competing types of user at minimal cost and by ignoring best practice for the proposed new users. It only seems to have considered guidance as to preferred and minimum widths as a result of our representations.

The widths available from the existing track, as shown on the authority's drawing showing cross sections of the track are not agreed.

- Examples.

Can provide copy of authority's drawing with measurements from our drawing.

Summary
drawing
submitted
yesterday

We have put forward a costed alternative proposal which would allow safe segregation of what would otherwise be competing users. Modern farm machinery is ever increasing in size and the potential impact can only increase. The proposed track could be constructed by the claimants within the agreed costs (much cheaper than the authority's estimated costs).

The rebuttal proof refers to a forth coming
"detailed design stage" which supports our view that
the proposed shared use of the access track has not been thought
funded through compensation. This option will
save the authority compensation costs.

An alternative option may be to widen the
proposed widening of the track area towards
the existing A555 but we submit that a
minimum of 3 meters is required in this respect.

As Charles Jones has put it.

"We have tried to help the authority
make it work, but they have ignored us".

A problem also remains with the access into
Mrs. Howlands land as the drawings provided
seem to indicate the removal of the existing
access arrangement.

C. Section Ton.

As with Messrs Jones Fielding and Rowland, the attempt to force new cycle and pedestrian traffic onto a facility provided as an accommodation work for the construction of the A34 / A555 is fraught with difficulties.

Whilst it is accepted that the current proposal does not include a bridleway, a bridleway formed part of the original proposals and the authority have made it clear that a bridleway is very much on their agenda.

Photos
and
measurements
submitted
yesterday

However there remain insufficient width, particularly on the bridge, the most sensitive section of the track, for farm vehicles and machinery to pass bicycles.

Tractors currently using the track are 10 feet (3050mm) wide but with increase in size over the years. Currently tractors are up to 3.36 metres wide and large harvesters up to 5.06 metres. ~~Most implement drawings~~
~~tractors are no less wide~~

Details have been submitted that question both the authority's measurements of the track width and its ability to service both farm machinery and cyclists. Passing places

will not work as some cyclists will not want to even replace their steps.

The guidance available prescribes a minimum width for cycle routes of 2-3m and a preferred width of 2.6 to 5m. These dimensions are not available from current track dimensions.

The position of ~~existing~~ and diverted footpaths remains a serious concern as does the quality of footpath surface. Kissing gates — installed at the time of the construction of the A34/A555 are not working and allow escapes of sheep, occasionally on to the dual carriageway.

The further diversion of FP 81 as proposed would help to mitigate the impact of the Scheme generally on this land holding. Concern about many paths ^{close} to highways with high speeds are rather lacking in credibility given the fact that there are ~~existing~~ footpaths close ~~to~~ to, and crossing the roundabout, on A34 and A555 and the introduction of cycle routes along the side of the carriageway in this scheme.

Chris Sheraton is unequally qualified to comment on problem associated with road schemes, as the existing drainage of land adjacent to A555 is ~~not~~ dysfunctional due to the highway authorities inability to maintain drains and ditches that are outside the private land boundary. This issue has caused significant production losses for over the 17 years or so since the construction of the existing roads.

This ^{problem} ~~issue~~ will also work against any ~~proposed~~ drainage works required for the new scheme. If the highway authority do not maintain highway drains - none of it will work.

Mr Sheraton's comment about the drainage legacy from the original A24/A555 construction touches on all the relevant issues that affect him and other claimants

"it won't work and it will be us that gets the grief after works".

Nehru Halls

m Inus etc
Sneaton

imply that as traffic either
doesn't exist or will have to
fit in with the standards for
~~extra~~^{shared} highways / cycleways / pedestrian

Design manual for Road bridges.

Any other works.

mw 2.0 m

Refined S.O.

bedienung

ML 2.0

Refred 2.6.

success due

ms 200

unsegmented

Refined 3.00.

Surfaced under.

acceptable $\approx 3m$

pre freed us. Sun.

Country Side Agency.

unsegregated.

absolutni 2000

cycling water.

min 2.00.

derumhle S. 22.

Machinery factor up to. 3.36.

Wage havens upto 5.06.

Canhio also 39.

Flow good printer.

Daten - $\frac{1}{n}$ Spalte mit 1m
 o max 18.

fuel case. min 15.
max 18.

Control proposals NOT BEST PRACTICES

Final summary.

Most of our chief objections are underpinned by practical and cost effective proposals designed only to rectify obvious adverse ~~any~~ impacts of the scheme. ~~offers have been made~~

The authority in response displays a form of design dependency - once a design has been captured they don't give it up.

Reference is made in the rebuttal proofs about the vulnerable road users group.

Sir, I find myself a representative of the vulnerable road users group and ~~by~~ respectfully ask you to examine our objections in the light of the submissions made and in the context of achieving a fair balance between all interests.