

have a large bund around the perimeter to shield the noise not effect peoples views, however they have not changed their mind on this once they calculated the cost. 8) Giovanni Ottaviani has an interest in a haulage company so has a vested interest in seeing this development succeed.

Sample 46:

East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange – Application for a Development Consent Order Application Reference Number TR050002 Registration of Interested Parties I Nigel Kirk of Mellors & Kirk Ltd, Galileo Street, Nottingham, MK23 3FC represent the beneficial owners of the minerals in 76.24 acres of land at Church Lane and Diesworth Lane Hemington. The land forms part of the proposed development. The beneficial owners derive their title from the late Gregg Rooney who died in 1999, as heirs of her residuary estate. When the freehold estate was sold the minerals were specifically reserved in the conveyance of 28 June 1983. Also so reserved was the power to win, work and get the same. I wish to register as an interested party on behalf of the beneficial owners. For the avoidance of doubt I personally have no vested interest in the matter but have authority to act on behalf of the beneficial owners.

Sample 47:

Construction Compound The compound at Playford, the size of a football pitch, will exist for at least two years and affect the routing of construction and employee traffic. The developers must provide detailed traffic levels, types, and routes. We have been told by Suffolk Coastal District Council that only 5 locations will suffer increases of more than 10% in traffic volume. No evidence has been produced to substantiate this claim. In fact the figures used openly by EAOW in their presentation confirm that the increase in HGV movements will be much greater. This impact will be felt over a considerable area. Some roads will be adapted to accommodate HGVs. We wish to see these measures removed after the work since speed on these roads is a major issue and should not be encouraged. Recommendation Traffic plans should reflect the real increase in HGV movements and road ‘improvements’ should be removed after the work. • Compensation EAOW is compensating landowners for the disruption and loss of cropping, including the cost of agents’ fees. This is grossly inequitable. At the presentation given by EAOW they recognized that the use of the road network and associated infrastructure is the direct concern of ‘your’ village. It is we who will suffer the disruption and permanent loss of hedges and trees with no redress. The route of the cable runs through some of South Suffolk’s most attractive landscape, much vaunted by SCDC in its strategic review but already under pressure. Current planning objectives suggest that these pressures will only increase. Recommendation EAOW should offer compensation to the villages by way