

Submission ID: 14195

Pegasus Prested Investments Limited ('PPI Ltd' - Co no 11230014) is registered as an interested party in relation to these proposals (registered party number (20033132)).

It has a number of subsidiary companies which are involved with business activities at Prested Hall which include:-

• A wedding business (inc hotel)

• A spa

• Gym/pool/fitness club

• Serviced apartments

One of these wholly owned subsidiary companies, Bluemoor Properties Ltd company no 07247080, owns land within the Order limits. PPI/Bluemoor Properties Ltd reserves the right to object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of its land on grounds that the proposals are likely to make a significant negative impact on its business activities and that insufficient work has been done to consider the impacts of the proposals on its business. In addition inadequate consideration has been given to the proposed accommodation works which should, if effective, mitigate the impact of these proposals.

Our client has now seen the representations made by National Highways in response to its original objection to the scheme (RR-034-001)

Our client is not satisfied that the impact of the proposals on the business activities at Prested Hall has been fully and seriously considered. In particular, the wedding/event business relies on its pleasant setting, including the attractive drive into the property; the current ability to use the outside space for weddings (including photography) is crucial to the success of this business. The ability for overnight guests to sleep well is significant for customers of the serviced apartments/hotel and the ease of access is significant for all customers - but in particular those using the gym/spa regularly who may be put off by an increased/ more difficult journey time. The compulsory acquisition of land and implementation of the scheme will bring the A12 and all the physical impacts of that realigned route including noise, vibration, dust, light etc closer to Prested Hall which will be both intrusive and off-putting for customers and will impact on the business operations.

The proposed revised access for Prested Hall will be significantly more convoluted and add to business customer's journey time - particularly for those travelling south off the A12.

A recent survey of members to the gym which elicited around 67 responses confirmed that:-  
Around 22% of those sampled said their route was 'north of A12'; around 69% of those sampled said their route was 'south of the A12'; 9% did not specify a route.  
Around 43% of those who responded had a current journey time to the gym of under ten minutes; A further 40% of those sampled had a current journey time to the gym of between 10-20 minutes. A further 15% of those sampled had a current journey time to the gym of over 20 minutes.  
Many of the feedback forms cited convenience and locality as a key factor for their choice of gym.

The previous submission on behalf of our client highlighted that the revised access to Prested Hall will add significantly to journey time, especially for those travelling on the southbound A12. Given the likely impact on journey time the proposals will have on our client's customers (many of whom it is known from the recent survey value a local/convenient location) the proposals are likely to have a significant detrimental impact on our client's business concerns; National Highways has stated the route design was chosen for efficiency and least impact on trees. The impacts on our client's business concerns have not been considered and there has certainly been

no dialogue between National Highways and our client about how our client and its business interests will be supported during the construction phase and beyond. Our client maintains that the arrangements for access to Prested Hall which form part of the wider proposals are unacceptable.

In the absence of any reassurance that the proposed accommodation works will demonstrably be able to ameliorate these detrimental impacts, our client objects to the compulsory acquisition of its land due to the serious impact the compulsory acquisition will have on its business activities.

National Highways has stated in its response that the applicants will continue to engage with Prested Hall as the landscape designs are developed. Our client is unaware that there has been any significant engagement to date and seeks; (i) confirmation that there will indeed be some engagement with National Highways at any early stage; (2) the opportunity to review the proposed mitigation proposals insofar as they relate to Prested Hall, so that it can be confident that the proposed measures will provide effective noise and visual screening to minimise impact on this business; and (3) an adaptation to the proposals so that equivalent access can be provided to Prested Hall (and its various business operations) both during construction and operation.

Without such reassurance, our client must maintain an objection to the compulsory acquisition of its land.