Submission ID: 37630

Further to the publication of the examining authorities additional questions it has come to light that information given to Mr H and Mrs J Kirkham with respect to an access proposed across their land has been incorrect.

Documentation forwarded to Mr H and Mrs J Kirkham together with discussions held indicated that the proposed access was a shared operational access however having noted question 2.5.1.19, the comments within and following through on to the tracker it is apparent that whilst both Projects are seeking an operational access the Morecambe Project is seeking a construction access across Mr H and Mrs J Kirkham's land. We have only just become aware of this. We attach a plan which was forwarded to Mr H and Mrs J Kirkham in the spring with respect to the access required over their land and you will note that it clearly states that this is an operational access only. There is no mention by either project of the requirement for a construction access at this point.

We are extremely concerned that the information given by the Projects has been inaccurate/misleading and even more concerned that one of the Projects is seeking a construction access across Mr H and Mrs J Kirkham's land (this being the access point to the highway within the curtilage of their dwelling house) when they are already applying for two further construction accesses within approx. 100m to gain access to the same easement area.

We have already submitted representations in respect of the duplication of construction accesses on land owned by other members of the Kirkham family which is immediately adjacent to this property under reference 20052880. We do not believe that there is any justification for the requirement for two accesses let alone three. We attach a second plan which shows the location of access points A26 which is direct off the highway onto the easement working area and A28 which is an additional construction access direct off the highway along a route to be constructed and which we estimate from the plans supplied by the Project to be approximately 80m to 90m long. The further access which is also indicated on the plan is a further 20m to 30m away from the easement and working area.

Questions we would ask are why a third access is now required for construction and why do the Morecambe Project require this when the Morgan Project do not. The applicants' agents tell us that the 2 projects have to have separate accesses for CDM/H&S reasons but we note that accesses are shared elsewhere on the easement route. Why then are extra separate accesses required here? We will continue to raise our queries as to why two accesses are required let alone three but that will be on behalf of the relevant landowners.

E&OE We reserve the right to amend or add to this submission.



