

DEADLINE 2 SUBMISSION - INTERESTED PARTY REFERENCE: RAM-476 - SIMON KILHAM  
TABLE 2-25 PAGES 147-148 RESPONSE DATED 25th MARCH 2024

The response from Rampion has only further exposed the inadequate consultation they have carried out. I make the following comments:-

2.1.1.

Having only met once on my farm they show no level of understanding of any part of my business. They claim I am a tenant over pastureland, this is incorrect. I run a mixed farm which includes arable wheat, barley and maize in a rotation with grass for grazing and mowing. The cable route severs the arable fields and pastureland and would ruin my cropping rotation/stocking densities.

It is correct we do run other farms across the Wiston Estate. There have been no consultations on these areas at all. No site visits or meetings. How could they understand the disruption Rampion would cause me.

Define temporary – 1 day, 1 week, 1 month. Up to 3 years is not temporary in a farming business. Anything over a month needs to be planned to make sure financial impact is minimised. This has not been done.

This will cause huge disruption both to the arable and livestock enterprises. Although the applicant says they are keen to discuss, no “ongoing discussion” has taken place. The applicant is misleading the Examination Authority by stating this in its response. No plans have been given or disclosed. No discussions have ever taken place on “farm management operations” or how to manage the disruption.

2.1.2.

The applicant writes words about engaging further with land interested parties but no engagement at all has happened, past, present or in the future (no meetings planned).

There may well be provision within the Freehold Landowners “Heads of Terms” but to date I have not seen these.

Furthermore, my Landlord informs me the draft Heads of Terms are still to be agreed. Again, they are misleading the Examination Authority by including this in their response.

For complete transparency they should have given the compensation rates to us, without these we are being placed at a disadvantage and in an up hill struggle to recoup any losses.

I appointed a Land Agent but since Rampion will not pay his fees I have had to stop using him. I can ill afford to run up a bill with an Agent to be told further down the line Rampion will not compensate me for this expense. This again places us at a disadvantage and I get the impression this is part of their plan to minimise opposition.

They have never fully engaged with me. If they had then none of the above would have been necessary.

As I have expressed before the willingness to negotiate has been minimal. I refer to the old adage, don't tell me show me.

At this point all Rampion have shown me is in fact they wish to ride rough shod over me and have no regard for the effect on my business.

How can a decision be made on this application with such a poor consultation leading to so many inaccuracies and anomalies.