

Inquiry into the Manchester Airport Relief Road Scheme Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads OrderOpening Statement of Michael Kingsley as Personal Representative of the Estate of Marques Kingsley Dec'd,
Director of Glenhazl Ltd and In Person

We are major landowners in the area having been affected by road proposals in this area for a very long time.

Over the years we have had to contend with proposals to close Clay Lane in the original inquiry, blight affecting our land at Hill Green Farm, Woodford Road Poynton and blight affecting our land at Lostock Hall Farm.

It has also been necessary to sell The Cottage at Lostock Hall Farm to the Highways Agency since it was blighted by their Poynton Bypass scheme, even though it was my own private residence.

There have been many and various road proposals in the area over the years and even though our lands are adversely affected, we have always made it clear that we are supporters, not objectors of road schemes, but only if our interests are properly taken into account and adverse impacts are adequately mitigated.

We have always done our best to co-operate in trying to bring all road proposals forward, since in the absence of resolution of these matters, we suffer major blight and are unable to further our legitimate business interests.

Nevertheless, by failing to cater for our legitimate requirements and expectations in the design of this particular road scheme, the Acquiring Authority has inexplicably contrived to turn us into major objectors.

Be that as it may, we do not come to this inquiry to pose problems, but to try to offer or find solutions.

Accordingly we have reviewed the objections which we made by our letter of the 30th January 2014 and have concluded that it is not strictly necessary to pursue certain of those objections.

We can therefore confirm that we wish to withdraw the following objections:-

- i) Paragraphs ~~8~~^{2,3}, ~~10~~⁴ and ~~11~~⁴ in full,
- ii) The first part of paragraph ~~12~~⁵, up to the word "recommended",
- iii) Paragraphs ~~13~~^{6,7,8}, ~~14~~⁸, ~~15~~⁸ in full,
- iv) The first part of paragraph ~~16~~⁹, up to the words "flow of traffic" on the second line and
- v) Paragraphs ~~17~~¹⁰ and ~~18~~¹¹ in full.

Those objections are withdrawn, but without prejudice to our remaining objections.

With regard to our remaining objections, we are conscious of the fact that by maintaining these objections, the current scheme could potentially be delayed or even withdrawn.

We have no wish to see that happen.

We would therefore be prepared to agree to the Orders being granted in part, in respect of those parts of the scheme which are not directly affected by our objections. The scheme could then proceed while sufficient time is taken to achieve a satisfactory resolution of our remaining objections.

We believe that the inquiry has the ability to recommend that the Secretary of State confirms the Orders in part as suggested and we accordingly formally request that the inquiry will in fact make that recommendation.

Should confirmation in part be of attraction to the Acquiring Authority at this stage as a solution, then we would be happy to identify which parts of the Orders could be confirmed at present and to conclude an agreement.

In the absence of agreement to confirm in part, we would regrettably maintain our objections.

Michael Kingsley
Personal Representative

9th October 2014