

PLANNING ACT 2008

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

**SUBMISSIONS OF LENTON FARMS REGARDING THE A14 CAMBRIDGE TO HUNTINGDON
IMPROVEMENT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER 201[...]**

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE NO TR010018

**SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF LENTON FARMS
BY BROWN & CO ALEXANDERS**

(REGISTRATION REFS: 10030966, 10030967 & 10030968)

DATE: 2 SEPTEMBER 2015

REF DAVID SINFIELD FRICS FAAV
ASSOCIATE PARTNER
BROWN & CO ALEXANDERS
ACRE HOUSE
70C HIGH STREET
HUNTINGDON
PE29 3DJ

A. CONTEXT: PLOT SERIES 5, 6, 7 AND 8.

1. My name is David Sinfield, I am an Associate Partner at Brown & Co Alexanders, Chartered Surveyors, Land Agents and Agri Business Consultants in Huntingdon. I act for the George Lenton Trust, Lenton Bros Ltd and Mrs E A Ruston (collectively known as "Lenton Farms").
2. They are variously very long standing owners and tenants of some 488 (actually 532) contiguous hectares of productive, predominantly arable, Grade 2 farmland essentially either side of the existing A1. They farm from their base at Park Farm, Brampton, west and north thereof to Brampton Hut and with a connected enterprise to the south, (R & L Farming LLP at Southoe).
3. Of the 488 ha (actually 532ha) we calculate that approx. 200 ha or 41% (actually 38%) is proposed to be taken one way or another for the scheme; this will have a devastating effect on the farming unit. Of those 200 ha we calculate that approx. 110 ha, or 55%, is for Borrow Pits, Environmental Areas and Flood Compensation Areas. Excluding the Borrow Pits, the resultant area still forms no small part of the net gain of 271 ha of semi natural habitat proposed for the Scheme as a whole, (HE's responses to written representations – Report 5, Land Interests Para 28.3.1 – p.216). Such areas are considered to be either unnecessary or excessive – the arguments against which are being presented by the NFU, the A14 Agents Association and Barry Denyer-Green on behalf of my clients and many others.
4. My clients accept the principle of an upgraded A14, but are virtually overwhelmed by the vast areas of land to be taken from them, some of which are to apparently revert to scrub, [HE/A14/EX/104 – Borrow Pits – Design, Restoration and Aftercare Proposals, Fig 3B – Borrow Pit 2 (Sheet 2)] in addition to that necessarily required for the road itself.

B. SPECIFIC PLOTS

I now refer to specific plots and as a Guide, I'll start on the East side of the proposed road and firstly between it, Buckden Road, RAF Brampton/Park Farm and Park Road:-

- 1.0 **The Plots being 8/4 and 7/19, being Borrow Pits 2 and adjoining Environmental Areas.**
- 1.1 My clients particularly object to the taking of the very large areas of productive arable farmland close to the farmstead where there is also medium term potential for development.
- 1.2 This is particularly so in respect of the smaller BP2 to the east, in the context of the large areas already being taken for Borrow Pits and the availability of existing quarries locally or regionally. By comparison with the small area of this pit the adjoining environmental area is disproportionately large; the Pit being about 2.38 ha within an area of about 7.34 ha. (HE/A14/EX 104 as under A para 4 above).
- 1.3 In HE's response to my clients' written representations, (Report 5 Land Interests paras 36.2.1 (p276) and 36.2.18 (p.279), the HE state that "the creation and long term management of habitats is required to mitigate the effects of habitat loss during the creation of the borrow pits and provide compensation for the probably moderate and significant adverse effects on bats and breeding birds." This infers that if the borrow pits aren't required then the habitat isn't either, as it is not replacing other habitat lost. The starting point is a landscape of open farmland which, without a need for borrow pits, should remain as such, although in the Design, Restoration and Aftercare Proposals for

Borrow Pits (HE/A14/EX/104) on Figure 3b, Restoration Plan, under A para 4 above) it is proposed that scrub be included with all the inherent problems that entails!

- 1.4 My clients would like to see at least a proportion of the Borrow Pits 2 areas returned to agriculture, and if nothing else, preferably the smaller eastern area.

- 2.0 **Also, in this area it is noted from the Proposed Non Material Changes to the Application of August 2015** (HE/A14/EX/99 Change Ref DR1.79), that a “new bridleway” is proposed to the north of Borrow Pits 2 running west from “existing BW3” whereas there isn’t an “existing BW3”. However there is an existing “FP3” as shown (adjoining RAF Brampton) on the General Arrangement Plans Sheet 5. My clients wish to see the proposed BW3 deleted as there is no need for it.

(Please also refer to the important Postscript at the end of this submission).

- 3.0 **I now refer to the area around my clients’ existing fishing lakes North of Park Road being Plots 6/16b, 6/21, 7/6b, 7/6c, 7/8a, 6/16c & 7/6a.**

- 3.1 The General Arrangement Plan does not really show Plots 6/16b to 7/6a (there is no Sheet adjoining Sheets 3 and 5), although they are shown respectively in pink, for permanent acquisition, and green, for temporary, on the Land Plans (Sheets 6 & 7).

- 3.2 Despite repeated requests no satisfactory explanation of the need or purpose for such large areas to be taken has been given. My clients are aware of the proposed relatively small area of land take for a BW and access to the Balancing Ponds to the north, which adjoins the A1, and their fishing lakes and, by reference to the Works Plans, Sheet 5, a relatively small oddly shaped Flood Compensation Area adjoining the fishing lakes.

- 3.3 Apart from the, as yet, lack of purpose for such large areas, the taking of these plots, even on a temporary basis, cuts off access from Park Road to the remainder of the field to the north other than via Brampton village and West End – a route unsuitable for heavy farm machinery.

- 3.4 In this area I also refer to proposed private and public rights of access in Plots 6/16a and 7/6a incorporating PMA (1) (& (2) – error) (Sheets 5 & 6).

- 3.5 Access to the balancing ponds near West End is proposed off Park Road, much further south. My clients object to this and propose that access be taken from West End which would be shorter and more commodious involving less land take and reduced construction cost.

- 3.6 With regard to the BW also proposed along this route, whilst accepting the length going north from West End, my clients object to the southern length from Park Road to West End, because there are existing or new bridleways that link to BW28/19, on the west side of the A1, by going over the Grafham overbridge to the south, and the new A14 NMU overbridge, accessible from West End, to the north.

- 3.7 Further, my clients have serious concerns with regard to safety and security in respect of the BW being proposed in close proximity to their fishing lakes.

- 3.8 With regard to the proposed Flood Compensation Areas on this area (Works Plans Sheet 5 FCA9), and Plots 7/13b and c west of the A1, (Works Plans Sheet 6 FCA 11 & 12) the latter in conjunction with the Church Commissioners, my clients have questioned the

need and, if proved necessary, requested that the configuration thereof be such to allow continued farming with the land being returned to the owners.

4.0 And finally west of the A1 regarding plot 6/9

4.1 This plot is an area of productive arable farmland adjoining the north side of BW28/19 (Plot 6/10) known as Wood Lane to Brampton Wood and separated from the BW by a substantial hedge and trees. Despite a number of requests no satisfactory explanation has been given as to the need for this strip of land to be taken and my clients object to it being taken.

5.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, whilst all of the foregoing are very important to my clients, of the utmost importance are the matters raised under **B 1.0 – 1.3 and 2.0** along with the Postscript below.

POSTSCRIPT TO PARA 2.0 ABOVE

8 September 2015

It was noted at the Hearing that the Inspectorate requested from the HE a “before and after” plan of public rights of way on land occupied by Lenton Farms.

It is submitted that of relevance to this is that the proposed continuation of FP3 as a bridleway from RAF Brampton to Park Road conflicts with discussions held with the Cambs County Council (CCC) Highways by the developers of RAF Brampton, JCAM Commercial Real Estate VII Property (3) (JCAM) whereby an agreement has been reached, in the knowledge of CCC Highways, and is ready for signing between the developers and my clients with the intention of improving public access in view of the development of RAF Brampton and the County Council’s desire to provide a cycle track to the north. This includes a continuation of FP3 from RAF Brampton to Park Road on my clients’ land comprising the farm track from Park Road and headland to RAF Brampton agreed with HE to be excluded from the DCO in the SOCG (Matters Agreed – item 4). JCAM have only very recently become aware of the proposed BW3 in HE/A14/EX/99, Proposed Material Changes to the Application of August 2015 and are instructing their solicitors to make a submission in early course, and by Thursday 10th September being the date by which this document and public rights of way information is required by the Inspectorate.