

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

Introduction and context:

This submission is made in respect of the invitation for written representations (Examination Timetable deadline 2) and as owners / occupiers of land and property that will be severely affected by the road scheme proposals.

The submission is made for and on behalf of The Turner Family together and including the following individuals and legal entities:

- Mr Robert Turner, Mrs Fiona Turner
- Mr Matthew Turner, Mrs Rachel Turner
- Mrs Phillipa Crook
- J M Turner & Son
- Turner Winterbourne Stoke Ltd

We farm and live at Winterbourne Stoke. The family ownership includes arable and pasture land extending to approximately 1,400 acres together with 11 residential properties, let commercial buildings and an events and wedding venue business (Manor Barn, Winterbourne Stoke www.manorbarnwilts.co.uk) The main land registry Title Number is: WT215748. We are also agricultural tenants on 800 acres owned by the National Trust under a Farm Business Tenancy (five years remaining) which farm under the same holding number as the land we own. Please refer to accompanying Plans 1. A and 1.B (showing the owned and rented land in the context of the scheme and main features of the farm).

Farm work is undertaken by Mr Robert Turner () and Mr Matthew Turner () In addition, there are two full time members of staff both of whom live in the village. Therefore, all personnel working on the farm reside in properties that will be severed by the route alignment. Accessing the greater part of the holding (especially during construction) will therefore be greatly impeded.

The proposed alignment of the road together with the creation of the River Till Viaduct and Longbarrow Junction are all primarily on our land. As a consequence, we stand to permanently lose circa 90 acres of productive land from the farm. In addition, the temporary land take removes a further 185 acres of land from production for the period of construction. These factors significantly impact on how we continue to manage the business, both during and after construction.

To date, we have made representations that due to the impact of the project upon our outdoor calving operations, we would have to move critical infrastructure to Foredown Buildings (this would have had to include a new dwelling). However, as a result of timing and cost constraints we have decided that this solution would not be feasible. Instead, we expect to have to change our system from outdoor to indoor calving. This would necessitate the construction of a new cattle building and other infrastructure together with operational changes. Whilst this is not our preferred resolution, we consider that as a direct result of the scheme, it is the only means of being able to continue to viably farm the holding.

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

Summary:

The principle matters and representations made under this submission are as follows:

- Excessive land take (temporary and permanent).
- Severance and impact upon the farming business.
- Public Rights of Way.
- Water resource resilience.
- Compaction.
- Community legacy – amenity, injurious affection, including access to the World Heritage Site.

Content:

We have made this representation in two parts;

Part 1: Written response to the questions posed by the Planning Inspectorate (as referred to under the letter dated 11th April 2019).

Part 2: Written representations in regard to DCO proposals submitted.

Please note we have adopted the numbering of the settlement ponds consistent with previous consultation responses.

For ease of reference, annotated plans have been provided.

PART 1.

ExQ 1 Written responses to questions asked:

Qu: Ref		Response	Annotated Plan
Ag.1.5	<p>Agricultural land (access) Please provide clarity in respect of your concern about access to land at Manor Farm from the B30803. In responding please provide an annotated map indicating the location(s) of the affected land.</p>	<p>There is an absolute requirement for unimpeded access off the B3083 to the Turner’s land to the east through the existing field gateway just to the south of the CPO red line.</p> <p>The proposed realignment of the B3083 to the west will result in discrepancies between the legal title boundaries and the physical road boundaries. Clarification is required over how these small isolated land parcels will be owned and managed and by whom.</p>	Plan 2
Ag.1.22	<p>Agricultural land (severance) Please provide greater detail in respect of your concerns that the Proposed Development would result in severance of the calving operation at Foredown House and the main holding.</p> <p>In answering this question, please provide annotated maps setting out the locations of the affected land and buildings and detail the impacts this would have on the agricultural operations.</p>	<p>The main hub of our farming operations is Manor Farm Buildings (located on the northern side of the existing A303). This site is positioned in the southwest corner of the farm and provides the core farm infrastructure including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grain storage (4,000 t). • General purpose buildings for storage of fertiliser machinery etc. • Livestock buildings. <p>The alignment of the proposed route, will isolate the infrastructure (including plant and storage facilities) from the rest of the farm. This creates three principle severance concerns.</p> <p>1) Calving operations: Manor Farm runs a suckler herd of up to 500 beef cattle on an extensive system. This is the optimum use for the 1,000 acres of unimproved grass included within the farm. Calving is mostly undertaken outside (not in buildings) in the spring. Currently, the cows are turned out so that they are relaxed and able to give birth as naturally as possible.</p> <p>The proposed road alignment would cut in two the nursery / calving enclosures used by the farm. We are concerned that the severance and land take would leave insufficient space to accommodate the cattle under the current outside calving system. We also have concerns that the road itself will disturb and agitate the animals increasing the risk of lost calves and mothers.</p>	Plans 1 (A&B) Plan 2.

		<p>The cattle are currently ‘walked’ to the nursery enclosures from the pastures / buildings at Foredown (prior to calving). This allows them to be closely monitored. Calving, requires more than one person to be close at hand. The presence of the road would (during construction) mean that the cattle would have to be trailer hauled between the different parts of the farm. This greatly decreases efficiency and adds costs.</p> <p>It is not possible to relocate the calving operations elsewhere on the farm as proximity to Foredown House and the other residential property is required for husbandry purposes.</p> <p>2) Segregation during construction: Segregation of the farm’s infrastructure by the proposed route / viaduct will give rise to significant logistical difficulties and impairment of farm activities especially during periods of harvest whilst the construction phase is ongoing.</p> <p>The layout of the farm and topographical constraints mean that all grain, straw, livestock and input trailers / transporters serving the wider farm will have to cross the proposed route alignment (at the point of the River Till Viaduct). There will be times during the construction of the viaduct (a significant aspect of the scheme) when this will not be possible due to management of health and safety on the construction site. The prevention of farm traffic from crossing over during the harvest period would result in unacceptable delays and financial loss. Harvesting especially is both time and weather critical and necessitates intense vehicle movements. It is simply not possible to defer or hurry the process. Equally, it is not possible to pre-plan and schedule activities to a set a timetable.</p> <p>3) Increased fragmentation and gating: Many isolated enclosures are to be created by the various aspects of the scheme. Many of these fragmented parts will be of significantly diminished agricultural productivity. Accessing and working these areas will be further impeded by the need to create additional gateways, which will lead to time and effort lost to unlocking and re-securing gates and access points. This requirement diminishes the efficiency of operations.</p> <p>Proposed Mitigation:</p> <p>I. The loss of grazing land within the CPO area requires a change from the current extensive outdoor calving system to an intensive indoor system to mitigate the effect of the scheme on the farm</p>	
--	--	---	--

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

		<p>business. The farm therefore requires the construction of purpose built buildings to provide an indoor calving unit at Manor Farm Buildings, details of which are being assessed.</p> <p>II. It is imperative that full unimpeded access is maintained across the haul road during constructions. Seemingly minor delays in ‘giving way’ or awaiting supervised crossing will compromise farm efficiency, safety and profitability. This may partially be achieved by scheduling the construction of the underbridge (B3083) together with the private means of access prior to the creation of the Viaduct or haul road. This would allow a proportion of the Manor farm traffic to reach the northern part of the farm without having to cross an active construction route. Movement of the compound located north of the underbridge would allow a clear route through for the farm traffic.</p> <p>III. We request that planning inspectorate supports our suggestions to reduce land take and severance.</p>	
Ag.1.23	<p>Agricultural land (land ownership and severance) Please provide information, including annotated maps, showing the agricultural land interests within, and immediately adjoining, the proposed Order limits to include: i. land owned and tenanted by each affected agricultural business; and ii. highlight any areas where land would be severed by the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Please see above and annotated plans.</p> <p>i. The entire holding suffers some degree of severance (see overview plan) causing the following reductions to farm profitability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short field working • isolated crossing points leading to increased travel time, fuel consumption & wear & tear of machinery <p>ii. the proposed alignment also leaves unworkable pockets of land where field boundaries have changed.</p> <p>iii. Where the holding was previously ring fenced the scheme has now created delinked pockets of land and field enclosures.</p>	Plan1 (A&B)
Ag.1.24	<p>Agricultural land (water supplies) i. Please highlight (including through the provision of annotated maps) which agricultural businesses rely on private boreholes for their water supplies. ii. Please also indicate</p>	<p>The farming business is entirely reliant on borehole water to provide all water for livestock and for arable crop spraying. The business does not have access to an adequate alternative mains supply.</p>	

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

	which of these rely solely or partly on such supplies.		
Ag.1.30	Agricultural land (effect on business operations) i. Please provide details of the events business operated at Manor Farm Winterbourne Stoke including what links, if any, it has to the agricultural operations. ii. Please provide greater details as to why you consider trade would be affected by the Proposed Development.	<p>We have diversified our business in order to further support the viability of the holding. In 2013 we converted ‘Manor Barn’ (a traditional stone barn adjacent to the Manor) into a wedding and events venue. Indeed, several A303 consultation meetings have been held in this venue.</p> <p>The conversion necessitated a very significant investment and the enterprise has been successful. However, the scheme proposals have already deterred prospective customers from booking events (weddings in particular) as understandably there are concerns regarding disturbance such as noise and dust as well as traffic congestion during the construction phase. Potential customers are extremely sensitive to any factors that may impact on the success of their wedding event. Weddings bookings are made up to two years in advance so the effects of the scheme upon our business were immediate following notification of the scheme and are ongoing.</p> <p>Due to the high profile of the scheme and the fact that the majority of wedding customers are from the relative locality, there is a definite consciousness of the scheme proposals.</p> <p>This issue will persist to the end of construction and the effect upon the enterprise will be such as to make it unviable during this time. It is also expected that the business will take considerable time to recover to pre-scheme levels after completion of completion.</p>	Plan 1 (A)
CA.1.50	Please provide further details of the objection to the extent of the area proposed to be subject to the exercise of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition and the impact that the exercise of those powers would have upon your client’s farming business.	<p>The extent of the land take is significant and will greatly impact upon the operations of the farm both in the short and longer term.</p> <p>The extent of the land loss is such as to undermine our ability to continue to employ two members of staff. It is probable that we would need to make one staff member redundant. Efficient farming is dependent upon the spreading of fixed costs. The larger acreage that is cropped within the capability of the staff and equipment, the more viable the unit. The farm might not be able to sustain two independent salaries in the event that approximately 275 acres are removed from production for a period of years.</p> <p>There are similar impacts upon the calculated payback and justification of machinery. For example; the more acreage worked by a combine harvester the less it costs to run per acre.</p> <p>We request that the extent of the land take across our holding is confirmed. Having confirmation of areas of the holding on a ‘before’, ‘planned’ and ‘after’ basis. Is critical to understanding the impact of land loss and severance.</p>	Plans 1 – 4

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

		<p>We calculate the areas approximately as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="695 341 1789 500"> <thead> <tr> <th>Acquisition</th> <th>Ha</th> <th>Ac</th> <th>Percentage of Holding</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Permanent</td> <td>36.51</td> <td>90.22</td> <td>6.44 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temporary</td> <td>73.74</td> <td>182.21</td> <td>13.02 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temporary & Subject to Permanent Rights</td> <td>1.11</td> <td>2.74</td> <td>0.19 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>111.36</td> <td>275.17</td> <td>19.65%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The proposed acquisitions could be reduced to a lesser area. In particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of the compounds should be scaled back or removed from the holding. • The settlement ponds should be reduced in size or redrawn to minimise land take. It is understood that the size and extent of settlement ponds in the vicinity of Countess Roundabout have been minimised through the use of absorbent replenishable materials. We request that this approach should be replicated for those ponds positioned along the length of the project. • Boundaries could be realigned more efficiently. 	Acquisition	Ha	Ac	Percentage of Holding	Permanent	36.51	90.22	6.44 %	Temporary	73.74	182.21	13.02 %	Temporary & Subject to Permanent Rights	1.11	2.74	0.19 %	TOTAL	111.36	275.17	19.65%	
Acquisition	Ha	Ac	Percentage of Holding																				
Permanent	36.51	90.22	6.44 %																				
Temporary	73.74	182.21	13.02 %																				
Temporary & Subject to Permanent Rights	1.11	2.74	0.19 %																				
TOTAL	111.36	275.17	19.65%																				
	<p>Would the National Farmers’ Union and other parties state the extent to which the assessment methodology of the effects upon the different holdings as set out in Chapter 13 of the ES and Table 13.22 (during construction) and 13.23 (during operation/post construction) are agreed and provide evidence to support any disagreement?</p>	<p>Please note that The Environmental Statement (Chapter 13 Table 13.16) Summary of characteristics of agricultural holdings is incorrect. The table states that Manor Farm is an arable and beef holding. There is a distinction between ‘beef’ (finishing cattle) and ‘suckler herd’ (breeding cattle) the later operation is more significantly affected by the impacts of severance (as explained above).</p> <p>We strongly contest the portrayal of information contained within table 13.23 of The Environmental Statement (Chapter 13). This table summarises the permanent effects of the scheme upon the holding and concludes that the lasting effects of the scheme upon the farm is only minor or negligible. This is startlingly incorrect and shows a complete lack of understanding of our business operations. The permanent loss of 90 acres can surely not ever be ‘minor’ for a family run farm. The extent of the severance is evident from looking at Plan 1, and we have detailed above how this degree of severance will impact upon the farm.</p>	<p>Plan1 (A&B)</p>																				

PART 2.

Written representations in regard to DCO plans submitted.

	Request / Requirement	Annotated Plan
1	<p>Former A303 Stopping Up to West of Scotland Lodge:</p> <p>By not preventing vehicular traffic from accessing the section of the former A303 (which will become a no through road) there is almost certainty that the current lay-by will become a location for unlawful parking, camping and antisocial activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the former section of A303 is gated and the lay-by removed. 	Plan 2
2	<p>B3083 realignment and underbridge:</p> <p>There are numerous changes in ownership boundaries which will create fragmented land parcels. We seek clarification and confirmation that all that land currently in our ownership that may become severed is (regardless of size) retained in our ownership.</p> <p>The existing route of the B3083 forms our perimeter boundary. The realignment therefore means the loss of road frontage. We would like legal clarity as to whether the ground underlying the existing B3083 belongs to the local authority or should 'in fact' be part of our title when 'stopped up'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request a detailed plan (for the areas surrounding the B3083 realignment) showing current and future ownership following the proposed CPO. • We request that Highways England provide title information in respect to the historic and current ownership of the land upon which the B3083 is currently aligned. 	Plan 2
3	<p>Landscaping in the vicinity of the B3083:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that Settlement Pond 2 is relocated to the west and / or is made narrower in shape to reduce unnecessary land take and to prevent pockets of land being made unworkable. • We request additional areas of hedging (as marked on the annotated plans). In particular, we would ask that the hedge line alongside the proposed A303 includes tree planting as well as hedge plants. 	Plan 2

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

4	<p>Redline amendment surrounding Foredown House:</p> <p>We acknowledge and welcome the removal of Settlement Pond 1 from the scheme. However, we believe that the red line boundary at this location has not been altered to reflect the fact that the pond is no longer proposed.</p> <p>The red line is therefore set unnecessarily wide and significantly hampers farming activity. The extent of the red line also prevents us from making our own planned changes to the curtilage of Foredown House (partly to increase screening of the road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the red line is amended as per the annotated plan. 	Plan 1 & 6
5	<p>River Till Viaduct, Human Health and Injurious Affection:</p> <p>The property known as Foredown House (which forms part of our ownership) is occupied by [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]). The house is within 160m of the proposed viaduct and as a consequence, there is an enhanced risk that dust, noise and light pollution will cause harm. The [REDACTED] children mean that they are especially vulnerable to the effects of dust which could trigger asthma and other respiratory health concerns. We do not feel that the duty of care that is owed by the authority to our and other local families has been appropriately met.</p> <p>We are therefore very concerned to ensure that the following provisions are included within the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screens to reduce noise pollution should be fitted to both sides of the viaduct and should be non-reflective and a neutral colour. • The road is surfaced in material designed to minimise noise. • Additional planting is added to the earth bank on the north side of the eastern bridgehead. • There should be no night work. • Filtrating room ventilation should be offered and fitted to nearby homes and businesses (to help reduce issues with dust). • Dust suppression is carried out during the construction phase. 	Plan 2
6	<p>River Till Viaduct, flood risk:</p> <p>The eastern bridgehead and earthworks from which the viaduct will project, create a pinch point in the watermeadows / flood plain. During times of high rainfall, this will serve to increase the current and force of flood water entering Winterbourne Stoke. The flood plain will be significantly altered. It therefore stands to reason that there will be impact upon the control of flood waters downstream within the settlement itself. Ultimately, the flood risk is being heightened. Therefore the bridgehead should be redesigned for flood and alluvial reasons.</p>	Plan 2

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

7	<p>Location and access to Settlement Pond 3:</p> <p>The configuration of Settlement pond 3 and the proposed private means of access (for maintenance by Highways England) creates unnecessary land loss and severance implications. The route of the maintenance access renders a part of the field un-workable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the alternative private means of maintenance access is provided alongside the proposed route of the A303. • The settlement pond is moved closer to the A303. 	Plan 3
8	<p>Landscaping considerations between the eastern side of the viaduct bridgehead and Longbarrow Roundabout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the marked areas are planted with shrubs / trees in order to improve screening. • We ask that a section of proposed hedge is removed in order to decrease the segregation of the fields and allow the enclosure to be farmed as one field. The hedge as currently proposed unnecessarily divides the field and renders the enclosure inefficiently sized. • We seek clarification on who is expected to meet the costs of ongoing hedge maintenance. 	Plan 3
9	<p>The bridleway / cycleway link to Winterbourne Stoke:</p> <p>The bridleway marked as Route 11 merging with shared cycleway Route 12 should be relocated to the southern side of the existing A303. This would improve user experience. Establishing this bridleway on the southern side of the road would improve the safety of those using the route between Winterbourne Stoke and the Longbarrow Roundabout. This is because those coming from the village would only need to cross the road once as opposed to twice (as currently proposed).</p> <p>At the point where Route 12 merges with Route 16 there is a crossing proposed across the A360 (southern roundabout of the Longbarrow Junction). This crossing point should be provided by an underpass suitable for pedestrian, cycle and equestrian users. The current proposal is to have a road crossing managed by traffic lights. This junction carries all traffic from the A360 including many heavy goods vehicles. The heightened risk of a serious accident is evident. It is impractical to expect that equestrian users will be able to ‘press the traffic management button’ and wait safely while either mounted or dismounted. Moreover, users on foot and bicycle will have a more pleasant experience if they could have uninterrupted access.</p> <p>Similarly, the existence of traffic lights at this location (at the end of a slip road leading of the A303 just after the tunnel) will almost certainly create traffic jams to back up onto the A303. Not only does this result in outcomes contrary to the objectives of the scheme, it also enhances the risk of road collision.</p> <p>A legacy opportunity exists to improve the accessibility of Winterbourne Stoke to the World Heritage Site. At present, the proposals do not secure a positive legacy. Indeed the proposed development will crystallise unacceptable risks to the community and visitor users of the local rights of way network.</p>	Plan 3

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

	<p>The proposal provides for land to be taken out of our farm holding and made into Routes 11 & 12. These routes are to be fenced off from the remainder of the field. The southern boundary of these routes will be formed by the existing hedge and tree line (currently the wide field boundary). The existence of the fenced off public right of way will make maintenance of the existing tree line / hedge impracticable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the proposed Routes 11 & 12 are realigned on the southern side of the existing A303. • We request that a pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian underpass is established under the A360 at Longbarrow Junction (removing the requirement for traffic lights to be installed). 	
10	<p>Green Bridge 2 and WST06B: The proposals provide a crossing over the proposed A303 in the form of Green Bridge 2. This feature is to provide continuity of public rights of way. We would ask that as part of the scheme the subject route is downgraded to a restricted byway. A reclassification would prevent the route from being used for overnight camping (a problem prevalent closer to the Stonehenge).</p> <p>Classification of this route as a restricted byway would help ensure a safe and more harmonious network of public rights of way and improve the project legacy for the community.</p>	Plan 3
11	<p>Settlement Pond 5: In preceding discussions with Highways England we have commented that the positioning of Settlement Pond 5 unnecessarily increases land take and wastes farmland. An alternative site for the pond is immediately adjacent on land already made unproductive by route alignment. We propose therefore that the location of the pond is amended to an alternative position shown on the annotation. We have been informed that this is not feasible in engineering terms. However, we do not believe that the potential has been probably assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the location of the settlement pond is reconsidered and moved to the alternative position suggested. 	Plan 5
12	<p>Section of A360 north from the Longbarrow Junction: The current layout includes unreasonable / unnecessary land take, in particular; the extent of highway verge surrounding the dumbbell roundabouts and alongside the A360.</p> <p>The field access point opposite 'Kighton Track' must not be staggered. For safety and function it needs to be aligned immediately opposite the entrance to Kighton Track (this is consistent with one of the options drawn). The option for an offset field access slightly south of the Kighton Track entrance should be disregarded.</p>	Plan 4

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

	<p>The extent of the red line includes a long spur of land running north between the entrance to Kighton Track and the roundabout at the Stonehenge Visitor centre. There seems to be no need for this area to be included within the red line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request the extent of land take is reviewed and the roadside verges are reduced in scale. • We request the configuration of the field access across the A360 from Kighton Track is not staggered and the boundary arrangements are changed as per the annotated plan. • The red line is amended to remove the spur of land on the western side of the A360 leading to the visitor centre roundabout. 	
13	<p>Fencing, gates and boundary treatments:</p> <p>The World Heritage Site and the surrounding area is prone to unlawful camping and the anti-social parking of vehicles along byways and in gateways. This is due to draw and interest of the stones. These activities create a significant nuisance to the local community and those deriving a living from the land.</p> <p>As part of the legacy of the project we hope and believe that the problem can be removed or alleviated, by the sensible reclassification of routes and provision of appropriate rights of way furniture (gates etc).</p> <p>Whilst restricted byways are vastly better than unrestricted byways, their existence does result in a predicament as to how to allow lawful use, whilst keeping out motorised vehicles (4x4s, camper vans and motorbikes). The problem is so acute and specific to the World Heritage Site, that we recommend that more creative and dynamic solutions are investigated.</p> <p>Please note that restricted byways are seldom used by horse and cart drivers, whereas where these routes exist on our holding, we require access on a daily basis (often multiple times a day). The predominance of use is therefore for practical farming purposes and the designed solution should accommodate ease and efficiency of access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We specifically request that ‘Kentish Carriage Gates’ and ‘Motorcycle Gates’ are not installed on our holding as they are ineffective and serve only as an obstacle to legitimate farm Traffic (of varying types and vehicle widths). • We request that where fencing is to be installed upon our holding, it is specified that it must be of a metal galvanised type (suitable for cattle and sheep). • The fencing alongside the proposed A303 should be deer proof and 6ft in height. 	
14	<p>Compaction:</p> <p>Please see the attached report prepared by an independent Hydro-geology consultancy ‘Sweet water Resources’. The report explains the impact of construction compaction upon the chalk found at shallow depth under the top soil. The chalk is currently porous and allows water to percolate through and drain downwards. Intense construction activity of the type likely to be undertaken on the compound areas and haul</p>	

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

	<p>road will compress and compact the natural porosity of the rock. The effect will be the creation of a pan of undrained land of diminished productive capability. It would not be possible to remediate this damage once that it has occurred.</p> <p>We request that this issue is carefully assessed and reported upon by suitably qualified persons. We do not believe that it has been assessed at all by Highways England.</p> <p>In the context that we have some 185 acres of land being subject to compounds and other temporary working areas (cut and fill), we seek absolute assurances that the quality and drainage characteristics of the chalk and sub strata, shall not be compromised by the proposed scheme. Part of this assurance should be provided by ‘before and after’ core sampling and analysis.</p>	
15	<p>Water resource protection and reliance:</p> <p>Manor Farm is reliant on borehole water abstraction. There is a significant risk, as a result of the scheme of contamination and interruption of groundwater flow to the farm’s 5 points of abstraction points (please see Appendix 1) attached report prepared by an independent Hydro-geology consultancy ‘Sweet water Resources’).</p> <p>The farm’s internal water pipes traverse the proposed compound areas (for gravity feed purposes) so an alternative secure mains supply is required.</p> <p>The farm cannot in any circumstances be left without water, a suitable and sufficient alternative mains supply needs to be contractually provided by the acquiring authority (with enduring legal rights for use by the farm). This alternative supply needs to be taken to Kighton Buildings. Where use of the mains supply is necessitated by scheme activity, adequate compensation should be given for water charges incurred.</p> <p>We also require that a full network of supply pipes and water troughs are provided to all severed land parcels that are to be pasture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that the Inspector orders a binding Water Supply obligation upon the acquiring authority. 	
16	<p>Western Tunnel Portal</p> <p>We are greatly concerned about the safety of the tunnel when in use. There is significant potential for road traffic accidents and fire. The alignment of the tunnel means that westbound drivers will during the evening emerge directly into the glare of the sun. This would reduce visibility and increase potential for slowed traffic creating obstructions.</p>	

The Turner Family, Representation to Planning Inspectorate A303, CPO process May 2019.

	<p>The A303 is used a lot by hay and straw hauliers. When loaded these lorries carry large quantities of dried material that can and does easily catch fire. The prospect of a straw lorry (or indeed any other flammable cargo) catching alight within the tunnel is truly frightening. We request that this risk is examined in greater detail.</p>	
17	<p>Matters reserved at the discretion of the appointed contractor:</p> <p>It is the acquiring authority’s intent to carry forward the detail of many critical mitigations so that the provisions are at the discretion of the ‘Design and Build Contractors’. The limited detail on mitigation provisions have made it impossible to comment in full in all aspects of the scheme.</p> <p>We request that the Inspector insist that design, treatment and mitigation statements are contractually agreed and included within the DCO. These statements should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Soil and substrata protection, management and aftercare ○ Site compounds (limitation of use and reinstatement) ○ Fencing specifications ○ Field and road Drainage ○ Public Rights of Way and private points of access 	

END.