

**From:** [Gregory O'Broin](#)  
**To:** [Joanna Vincent](#)  
**Subject:** HIF1 Orders and CPO  
**Date:** 22 April 2024 21:06:28

---

Joanna

Below is an email NPC-JC wish to place before the Inspector.

I am not aware of the protocol as we are a non-statutory objector and are not participating as a Rule 6 Party for the Orders and CPO. Thus unsure about circulating to Rule 6 Parties.

Please advise if I should circulate to R6 parties which I can do later or in the morning or do you put it before the Inspector.

Regards

Greg O'Broin

-----  
22 April 2024

Dear Madam Inspector

I am writing on behalf of Appleford Parish Council and the Neighbouring Parish Council Joint Committee (NPC-JC) as non-statutory objectors. This position of NPC-JC discussed and clarified with you during the March hearings, is that it wishes to maintain its objection. Representatives of each of the five parishes have agreed I should write to make you aware of information that has come to our attention.

The Parish Councils do not have land holdings which are the subject of CPO, however, the essence of our objection is that the applicant has failed to demonstrate a compelling case that the HIF1 scheme is in the public interest in relation to the matters laid out in the letter of objection dated 21 March 2023 (J.25) and the matters raised by Appleford Parish Council in the letter dated 20 March 2023 (J.11). Of particular concern is the damage to the climate and the impact on the local environment with 114 hectares (283 acres) of land removed from the natural environment.

The Joint Committee does not intend to actively participate in the Orders & CPO Inquiry. However, we have recently been advised by knowledgeable sources that negotiations for substantial additional funding for HIF1 (not merely ongoing liaison) have commenced. Therefore, we respectfully request that the Inspector seeks clarification from the Applicant by asking the questions below: -

Has the Council or its officials engaged in negotiations for additional funding with Homes England during the course of the Inquiry and sought an extended delivery deadline to construct the scheme?

**What additional funding has been requested and what time period extension is sought?**

If the full quantum of additional funding sought for HIF1 is not provided by Homes England or another source what impact will that have on delivery of the scheme?

If it transpires that in parallel to Inquiry hearings, the Council is seeking to negotiate additional funding, that we believe is a matter the Inquiry should be made aware of. It raises questions of integrity and confidence in evidence provided and claims by the Applicant that the budget of £296M (or £332.5M in Mr Mann's proof 04 - see note1 ) is adequate and that the Council has sufficient funding to deliver the scheme. Such negotiations suggest otherwise.

We understand that inadequate funding or uncertainty on funding adequacy is a material consideration and trust the Inspector can clarify these important matters during the remaining stages of the Inquiry and assess the implications accordingly.

Sincerely

Greg O'Broin (Chair)  
Appleford-on-Thames Parish Council, and  
Neighbouring Parish Council Joint Committee

Note 1.

The estimate of £332.5M in Mr Mann's proof (Table 1 page 12) alone will give rise to a funding deficit over and above the £296.2M funding arrangements approved by the Council.