

We represent the interests of Richard Infield in his capacity as tenant under an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 Tenancy and partner of the farming partnership, W A Infield & Sons. Mr Infield occupies land that is directly affected by the Scheme, some of which lie within the proposed Order Limits. On behalf of Mr Infield, we are instructed to make written representations further to the representations made on 10th June 2021 via the Planning Inspectorate's website. Representations are made without prejudice to making further objections/representations for different reasons, or to amplify these representations.

We have reviewed the plans included within the Developer's application insofar as they relate to our clients' land and these representations are based upon the information contained therein.

The aforementioned plans do not provide sufficient detail to ascertain the full impact on my client's requisite interest. We would therefore like to formally record our principal concerns, based upon the information that is available. Our client does not wish to be put in a position whereby when it comes to the 'detailed design stage', he is told that design issues raised should have been dealt with earlier on in the Scheme and it is too late. The Developer cannot say that they will deal with matters in dispute at a later stage. These issues should either be dealt with during the application process or determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

In addition to the representations of 8th June 2021, we submitted earlier representations to the supplementary consultation held in July 2020. To date, we have not received a formal response and not reached agreement in respect of any of the issues raised. Our client wishes to make clear his principle concerns:

Post Scheme Access: At present, an isolated parcel of land off the Barford Road benefits from two access points from the Barford Road. During previous consultation with the Developer, we requested detailed design information concerning the proposed accesses to assess whether access will be equally commodious. From the information available, it would appear that the northern-most access will be stopped up; it is not clear how the southern-most access will be affected. In recent discussions with the Developer, our client has had verbal assurance from the Developer and their representatives that the southern-most access will not be affected, and my client has relied upon that assurance. In terms of the northern-most access, we note that a new access is being provided to serve land owned by my client's landlord and occupied by a third party, Mr John Lammie. It would be pragmatic for this access to be shared providing access to my client and Mr Lammie in their capacity as tenants. My client, Mr Lammie and the Landlord's Agent have agreed the principle of a shared access. During earlier rounds of discussions with the Developer and their representatives, the Developer confirmed they were willing to adjust their proposals to include a shared access. However, during the latest round of discussions with the Developer and their representatives, the Developer's position appears to have changed in that they are now saying their representatives will investigate the matter and respond with their proposals. We await their response. For the avoidance of doubt, our client objects to the Developer's proposed access arrangements.

Access during Construction: As well as at Ouse Farm, Tempsford, our client farms land located near to surrounding villages. He relies heavily on the A1, Blackcat Roundabout and connecting local roads; this use is intensified at certain times of year, such as silaging and harvesting. The construction of the Scheme will disrupt the A1, Blackcat Roundabout and connecting local roads. The Developer has confirmed that where possible the Scheme will be constructed 'offline' to avoid road closures but accept that closures are inevitable. Our client requires the Developer to avoid road closures where possible in order to help lessen the impact of the Scheme. In addition, our client requires the Developer to communicate any planned road closures well in advance of the closure date to allow alternative arrangements to be made.

Safety: During previous consultation, our client raised concerns relating to the safety of the Barford Road after alterations have been made as part of the Scheme. In summary, his principle concern relates to the proposal to straighten the alignment of Barford Rad and flatten its contours, which our client believes will allow motorists to travel faster thus increasing the risk of accidents,

especially between road users and slow-moving agricultural equipment entering and exiting fields. Our client has requested a reduction in the speed limit from 60mph, perhaps to 40 or 50 mph, and traffic calming measures, such as on-road markings, road signs highlighting the presence of agriculture traffic, and crash barriers on the bend near to the gas and water works. Based on the information available, we note that our client's request for a reduced speed limit has not been implemented. Furthermore, there is no information available concerning traffic calming measures.

Accommodation Works: We have on numerous occasions reiterated the need for accommodation works and have requested details in respect of the same to ascertain the full impact on our clients' requisite interest. During a virtual meeting on 13 August 2021, the provision of accommodation works, specifically land drainage was discussed but nothing has been agreed. We await further details from the Developer. In the meantime, we reserve our position in respect of accommodation works.