

**SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS BY MR HENRY BRICE OF IAN JUDD & PARTNERS
ON BEHALF OF MR. GEOFFREY CARPENTER & MR. PETER CARPENTER IN RELATION TO LITTLE
DENMEAD FARM
IN THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION HEARING 3
ON 19TH FEBRUARY 2021
IN RELATION TO THE AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR PROJECT**

I am Henry Brice BSc (Hon) MRICS FAAV, RICS, Registered Valuer and Partner of Ian Judd and Partners LLP, Rural Surveyors and Land Agents of 4, High Street, Bishops Waltham, Hampshire, SO32 1AB.

I act on behalf of Mr Geoffrey Carpenter and Mr Peter Carpenter, who own Little Denmead Farm

The basic principle of CPO Compensation is to put the Affected Landowner in no worse a position after a Scheme as they are in before a Scheme.

It appears that Aquind have made no allowance in their CPO compensation calculations for any severance of land, injurious affection or disturbance and as such have grossly undervalued the impact of the Scheme for which development consent within the Planning Act 2008 is sought and upon on my Client's property and the Applicant's valuation is also fundamentally misconceived and flawed.

It can be assumed that they have made a similar underestimate across the entire Scheme and the total land acquisition costs are likely to be significantly greater than the applicant assessment. There is no evidence to suggest that the Applicant has discriminated against my Clients in their approach to valuation.

Aquind has so far failed to reach any agreement at all with 96% of affected landowners and occupiers.

This supports the reasonable assumption that Aquind are relying on Compulsory Acquisition as a first resort and not as a last resort and considering (inadvisably) that there is no point in agreeing terms to avoid acquisition and so they are not trying to reach a private agreement with affected parties to avoid compulsory acquisition. Indeed, the Terms that Aquind are offering are worse than (i.e. less than) what the Carpenters would receive if they just relied on statutory compensation procedures. No doubt that reflects the situation faced by others in the Order Limits.

A significant and high percentage - 96% - of affected parties do not even have heads of terms agreed yet with Aquind (from my reading of the latest Statement of Reasons). I can only reasonably conclude that based on my personal dealings with Aquind's agents, this could also be because others consider they are being proposed less than what they would receive under Compulsory Acquisition?