

**The Planning Inspectorate
The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN**

Copied to:

7000 Acres

2nd October 2023

Dear Mr Stone

Re: Land at High Street, Marton.

We write in response to your question, Q2.5.6 to meet deadline 4 of the Examination process.

We agree the Applicant's summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH 1) represents their oral submission however we refute the Applicants post-hearing submission.

The Applicant states that 'Mr and Mrs Hill would or should reasonably have been expected to have had regard to sellers property information and due diligence undertaken by legal advisors, all of which should have provided them with notice of our proposals before they made the decision to acquire it.' However, neither the Auctioneers Legal Pack nor information provided by our Solicitor mentioned cable routes affecting the land in question. Therefore, we purchased the land without the knowledge of a proposed cable route.

In light of the above, the Applicants statement that, 'Nonetheless, the purchase took place on notice of the Gate Burton proposals, which indicates those proposals would not interfere with their "long held plans" for the land', is incorrect. Again, we refute this statement.

The land at Marton had been used in the past for grazing beef cows. We bought the land on the basis that we wished to re-instate this practice. After purchasing the land we spent 3 months preparing the ground for a sugar beet crop, which has proved successful. This will assist in raising funds to implement the works in relation to the planning permission for two

barns and associated access. Once this is established, the next step in our agricultural business is to raise beef cattle and grow vegetables to sell locally from a future farm shop. Therefore, to realise these plans, we will need buildings and construction on site to house; cattle, hay and straw, animal feed, and produce. Also we will need a work shop and a parking area. We believe the proposed cable route will have a major negative impact on our ability to realise our future plans.

We are not proposing to withdraw our objection to the Compulsory Acquisition of our land. To do so would prejudice our ability to realise our agricultural business plans.

In addition to the above, we have been in contact with the Applicant's representatives over a period of several months and have engaged with them in good faith. During this period we [REDACTED]. In light of these circumstances we have been very accommodating to the Applicant's and their representatives.

The Applicant requires a permanent easement for the cable route however, if the Application is of a temporary nature, the basis for a permanent easement is not required. Nevertheless, we have offered to agree a wayleave or lease of the land. The Applicant has refused to negotiate on these terms. We also raised the possibility of the Applicant exploring reasonable alternative parcels of land in the neighbouring vicinity during a meeting on the land in question. The Applicant's representatives dismissed our suggestion.

Furthermore, we believe the claims the Applicant is making in terms of energy production and benefit to the nation are highly exaggerated and not credible. The Applicant does not make a compelling case in terms of public interest or benefit and as such any loss of private land by way of Compulsory Acquisition is unnecessary and a breach of our Human Rights.

We hope this letter explains our position and that our main desire is to realise our ambitions for our land and new agricultural business.

Yours Sincerely

Nick & Emma Hill