

We represent the interests of Mrs Diane Sharman and the Partners of the farming partnership, H G Sharman & Son of Coxfield Farm, Colmworth, who are directly affected by the Scheme; the current partners are Diane Sharman, Robert Sharman, Catherine Sharman & Rebecca Sharman. Mrs Diane Sharman owns land directly affected by the Scheme, which is farmed by the partnership. In addition, the partnership are tenant of several parcels of land directly affected by the Scheme. On behalf of Mrs Sharman and the partnership, we are instructed to make written representations further to the representation that was made on 8th June 2021 via the Planning Inspectorate's website. Representations are made without prejudice to making further objections/representations at a later stage 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' and these representations are based upon the information contained therein.

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

In addition to the representations of 8th June 2021, we submitted representations to the supplementary consultation held in July 2020. To date, though we have had meetings with the Developer to discuss the issues raised within our representations, we have not received any formal response and have not reached agreement in respect of any of the issues raised. Our clients' wish to make clear their principle concerns:

Land East of Roxton Road and North of A421: The northern part of this parcel of land is owned by Mrs Sharman, and the southern part is rented by the partnership; both parts are currently farmed as one by the partnership. 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 is not clear whether the existing access will be affected. During the latest round of discussions with the Developer and their representatives, the Developer's representatives agreed to investigate the matter and confirm that the access will not be affected. We await written confirmation from the Developer that the access will not be affected.

During previous discussions with the Developer and their representatives, we questioned the need for a proposed new ditch given the free draining nature of the soil in this location. If a ditch is considered necessary, we requested that the ditch be aligned closer to the Scheme to reduce the amount of land lost. Following recent discussions with the Developer, we are told the alignment is necessary to avoid an existing underground gas pipeline. During a virtual meeting on 7 June 2021, the Developer confirmed they would seek confirmation as to whether the ditch is required. We await a response. For the avoidance of doubt, our clients' object to the provision of the ditch in this location and its proposed alignment.

Land South-East of Roxton Garden Centre: The northern part of this parcel is rented by the partnership. The southern part is owned by Mrs Sharman and farmed by the partnership; both parts are currently farmed as one. During previous consultation and within our representation of 8th June 2021, we highlighted the short-term development potential of this land. The land together with adjoining land, totalling approximately 39.37 acres, is being promoted for distribution use owing to the site being ideally located at the important interchange between the existing A428, A421 and the A1. Representations have made in the Call for Sites by Bedford Borough Council; a Heritage Assets review and Minerals Assessment has been undertaken and the promoting agent is currently responding to the next stage of the Call for Sites and the Issues and Options phase. Demand for employment land is expected to remain high, especially for

logistics given the ever-increasing emphasis on online sales. Current land values for sites in this area with a consented distribution use are significantly greater than agricultural values. Therefore, the land has an increased value over and above its agricultural value, meaning the compensation will be vastly greater than for agricultural land without development potential and the cost to the taxpayer will be greater.

The provision of a new access to Kelpie Marina and a flood storage area will require the permanent acquisition of the majority of my clients' own land, and a significant amount of land they rent. From the outset, we have highlighted the land's development potential and requested the new access road to Kelpie Marina be aligned closer to the A1, and the flood storage area moved to land without development potential, to mitigate compensation. During a virtual meeting on 7 June 2021, the Developer and their representatives confirmed they would investigate whether their plans could be changed to re-align the new access and relocate the flood storage area. A response was not received. During a virtual meeting on 11 August 2021, we reiterated our concerns and objected to the current alignment of the proposed access road and positioning of the flood storage area. The Developer commented that there were reasons as to why the proposed access road to Kelpie Maria could not be aligned closer to the A1 and the flood storage area relocated but could not recall those reasons. We requested written explanation of those reasons. For the avoidance of doubt, our clients' vehemently object to the current alignment of the proposed access road to Kelpie Marina and the positioning of the flood storage area. Furthermore, we ask that alternative access routes to Kelpie Marina are considered, such as along School Lane at Roxton and over the A1 via an overbridge directly into Kelpie Marina. This would make use of the existing road infrastructure (School Lane) and reduce the permanent acquisition area, thus reducing the overall cost of the scheme.

If the flood storage area cannot be relocated, my client would like to ascertain from the Developer whether the freehold interest in this area can be retained and new rights granted, subject to knowing what those rights might be.

If the Scheme is consented in its current form, the proposed access to my client's own land (distinct from the land they rent) appears to be via the flood storage area. Clearly, this presents a problem when the area is in flood. During virtual meetings with the developer on 7 June 2021 and 11 August 2021, we highlighted this issue and requested that the access be repositioned. The Developer and their representatives have agreed to investigate the matter further. For the avoidance of doubt, my client's object to the access in its current location.

Land North of Chawston Lane, Chawston: This parcel of land is rented and farmed by the partnership. Our clients' primary concern relates to the proposed layout of the new junctions onto Chawston Lane. The new junctions are offset from each other by approximately 50m, effectively creating a chicane for vehicles. This may present a problem for vehicles with restricted manoeuvrability, such as heavy goods vehicles and agricultural traffic. We understand the proposed side road will be the principal access to H E Payne (Transport) Ltd who operate a significant fleet of heavy goods vehicles. We once again urge the Developer to reconsider their proposals and align the junctions opposite each other or as close to that as possible. We understand local residents have expressed similar concerns.

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 11 August 2021, the provision of accommodation works were 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.

East West Rail: We have also asked the Developer for further detail on how their Scheme will relate to the proposed East West Rail, as in some places it appears to use the same land.