

ExQ3.3.1 Further response from Mary Rance (20031504) relating to works plan 2/5

I have still not had a sight of this plan from Longfield. My agent made an urgent request for it but it was refused.

Longfield have responded to my submission at deadline 6 (REP6-074) and given references to their Arboricultural Report on the hedging between my field (2/6) and Waltham Road (Works Plan No 4). Following an enquiry by my agent to Gateley Hamer as to what the Applicant's intention is regarding this hedge, their written answer is *'As detailed within the vegetation plan submitted in the DCO the project has no right to remove existing vegetation within your client's land.'*

This is one of several inaccuracies, or misleading statements, which I have received over the course of the past year. A further example is the depth at which the cables will be laid. Firstly I was informed it would be between 2m and 3m, and now it is 800mm. After discussion with my agent, Gateley have said it is possible this can be increased to 1000mm but that 2000mm is 'not possible'. This is confusing.

The Arboricultural Report shows a substantial portion of trees and hedging to be removed. I object to this significant loss and the ecological and visual impact it will have. My understanding is that the proposal is to run the cables through my land and across the road; this will involve turning the cables and there will be an associated permanent inspection chamber. There is also to be a temporary road surface in the field for associated vehicle movements. Given these specific works, the level of vegetation removal seems excessive.

In spite of the absence of plan 2/5, by searching the Application I have found the Traffic Management Plan and believe that what Longfield are aiming for is a temporary road that will not only facilitate the trenching programme, but also serve as a through road from Toppinghoehall Wood to Bulls Lodge. This would be alongside the trenching and accounts for the large amount of vegetation they want to demolish. It also explains why they want a temporary compound on my land for traffic to wait in until traffic lights allow them to cross.

Heavy construction traffic would be using this crossing and because there would necessarily be parking and turning in field 2/6 I feel strongly that it puts an unfair load on my land. It would require a much longer period of time for activity to continue here than is necessary – in fact, for the duration of the long trenching that continues to Bulls Lodge. I believe that my field would scarcely survive such use. This traffic would also be crossing and re-crossing the mains water supply that runs along the eastern verge of Waltham Road.

There is already a vehicle track on Lord Rayleigh's land from the woodland to Waltham Road at a point that is only a short distance from this proposed temporary vehicle crossing. Is there any reason why this cannot be utilised? And, surely, it should be preferred to third party land. If this plan could be used, it would not be necessary to remove quite as much vegetation as is envisaged on my boundary, in an area where there is going to be significant clearance of it on both sides of the road.

As I have already indicated, I am prepared to co-operate with Longfield with regard to their wish to pipe the cables through my land; but I strongly feel that the further requirement to facilitate a virtual highway through this field is neither necessary nor acceptable.