

Land at former Hatfield Aerodrome, Hatfield

Ref: APP/M1900/W/24/3346607

PUBLIC INQUIRY

**Final Statement Observations pertinent to Popefield Farm
and the residential and commercial Occupiers of Popefield Farmhouse and barns**

29th November 2024

Dear Sir

Our views on the gravel site and its massive impact on the local environment, local population and ultimately Popefield farm have not changed. We remain 100% objectors.

This is not through intransigence because we agree with your view that thrashing it out over the table might be possible if both parties even had the same documentation. Brett, HCC in particular has not engaged with us because they have not fully appreciated our willingness to compromise on some points.

Regarding the plan HQ 3/16 R which is listed in condition 4. This is still an issue. You see we were posted by Brett our October 2024 version of this document and told this was agreed by you. This we were told was the one with the new red boundary line for the Popefield land included incorrectly in the appellants application which was rejected previously. Still, it appears the barrister for the appellant is operating off the 2022 version of this plan. There are two main issues with this 'have your cake and eat it' business of HQ 3/16R. The cross-section should read 100 meters from buildings (E-EE) to the working phase boundary (not 92 meters) if you are allowing them to change their red line mistake which included 8 metres of Popefield land. The reason for this is that 75 meters were an established minimum from our boundary to the workings in the gravel extraction approved in 2016 (the major condition being the Ellenbrook trust being set up or the gravel extraction proposal would not go forward). If as the Brett Barrister seem to indicate yesterday we are using the Nov 2022 plan HQ3/16R it means Popefield land is part of their application still. We don't agree with this.

If your red line change is being allowed we have pointed out reasonably in our presentation of evidence that there are many parts of this October 2024 HQ 3/16R we find fault with. We don't agree on this plan.

So even discussions on planting, permissive paths and the security of Popefield farm are not from the same documentation.

This misinformation is not just frustrating, annoying, and inefficient but also is something consistent in its inconsistency as appreciated by the previous inspector.

Their view of bunds being 'non-permanent' round Popefield masks the idea that it appears they will be in place for 32 years and then removed in the final planting scheme. We like the idea of 32-year bunds...YES, WE AGREE but not the idea of moving them after 32 years because now they will be part of the landscape.

Another aspect of the confusion over HQ 3/16R is where the permissive path is. If the path is the other side of the bund boundary and there is a fence it appears the security of Popefield is good...WE AGREE. The point we might raise is that this may need a gate because Ellenbrook Park as it currently stands has Popefield farm residents and office (20 people) using it.

One of the aspects of this inquiry is how your voice can be suppressed if you don't fight your corner. Ellenbrook Field was the land of Popefield Farm in part in the past. Popefield has listed buildings in good order and is exposed at all phases of the appellant's plan. The owner of Popefield has many other calls on his time, it is only necessity which makes me feel I should be included in the liaison mentioned in the conditions.

The structural integrity of the buildings of Popefield comes from their age and construction (ring beam oak/timber with some brick). It is obvious to me that terraforming the area around will create a change in the hydrology (surface and sub-surface). This will be itself change dynamically as the phases progress. So a monitoring (yearly say) of the condition of the buildings in relation to borehole data might show any problems. If the clay layer strategy is not working for example. The owner of Popefield suggests we have a datum for the condition of Popefield paid by the appellant simply so we both know the faults already with the building. Again the owner of Popefield does not look for the appellants scheme not working. But if the scheme is causing flooding or sub-surface dehydration because they got the modelling wrong, we need to know if the appellant's insurance will underpin or put in place something to ameliorate the causes.

Regarding 'noise' we simply need to have a complaint scheme we agree linked to monitoring in the right places on Popefield land.

Many of the underlying issues with the whole application are exacerbated by the Ellenbrook Trust not being in place. It appeared that the HCC barrister was saying that the Trust might come about in the first phase or the next 32 years. It is obvious to us that 'corporate misdeeds' should not be rewarded with Arlington getting a dividend from Brett. So if the previous inspector's rejection is overturned it always should be with the caveat that the trust be set up before gravel extraction is approved. You have heard even in the last week that deeds of variation keep being pushed out, with no resolution.

The 150 metres from our boundary to the workings or some greater distance over 75 metres we believe will negate noise and dust and to a degree light pollution. It puts

people at the forefront while valuing the listed status and the need for gravel/inert infill, it is compromise.

We depend on the inspector's impartial fair appraisal and above all respect his conclusions. Having opposed the gravel for 8 years and been in the van of the opposition, we believe this gives us some reason for being allowed to be consulted.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'David Jackson', written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

David Jackson

Owner of Popefield farm representing the residents.