

Anne Noble Deadline 8 response

In rep7-056 p58 the applicant makes the statement that:

The Baird Soil ALC assessment makes an allowance for additional soil material for the drought assessment of shallow soils. Inspection pits at shallow soils over chalk found minimal root penetration of the chalk. Therefore the calculation of drought limitation to ALC Grade is conservative, reducing the severity of this limitation to grade across the Sites.

This seems to imply that without this allowance (which is not explained and does not arise in the 1988 guidelines) the entire site – other than the piece surveyed by MAFF would classify as either Grade 4 or Grade 5 land

Grade 5 land is defined as land with severe limitations which restricts use to permanent pasture or rough grazing, except for occasional pioneer forage crops. This is patently not the case with the land in this area and yet again casts doubt on the applicant's survey and interpretation of data.

The applicant has failed to explain how DBSC can present in the PEIR evidence that an area of land North of La Hogue is Grade 3b and 4 when the earlier MAFF survey found the majority was Grade 3a without the benefit of irrigation.

The applicant states the downgrade was due to the removal of the irrigation uplift but it was clearly stated by MAFF that this area was not irrigated.

SNTS experts have been criticised by the applicant for a lack of objectivity because they were being paid and acting on behalf of SNTS. The flaws in the DBSC assessment, and the fact that an area previously surveyed was deliberately downgraded, show a similar lack of objectivity.

Trenches dug across all the sites by Oxford Archaeology show that the pictures included by DBSC are not typical. On Lee Farm it is very noticeable that the depths reached often have "runs" of the same number, e.g., 38,39,40a d 41 are all identical depths (40cm) all stopped for hard stone Trench 1197 was 49cm deep to chalk, the nearest auger borings by DBSC were 30-40cm deep with hard stone or flint. There are examples throughout comparing auger borings done by an independent operator and those done by DBSC which do not give the same conclusion.

The response of the Applicant to reasonable requests to do a joint assessment would seem to show a complete lack of confidence in their own assessment. A joint visit would have settled the matter in the space of a single day and removed one of the objections from SNTS and the Councils.