

In response to a request from PINS a plan of Sleastonhow Farm is attached showing the extent of severance created by the proposed DCO boundary. Whilst NH continue with their efforts to reduce land take within the Temple-Sowerby- Appleby section their primary objection is to reduce the BCR. There continues to be no focus on what impact the proposed land take will have on landowners and whether this is proportionate .

The Temple Sowerby -Appleby section accounts for approximately one-third of this projects total cost and although just one of the 9 planned section its estimated cost half a billion pounds.

Reducing land take at Sleastonhow will not reduce the impact on the farming business and will not improve issues of severance or accessibility as the farm will be divided. At least one third of the farm will be severed. Whilst it is currently possible for farm vehicles to access all fields at the front of the farm, either from Sleastonhow Lane or from the private farm track, this would no longer be possible. Access issues have been ignored. The fact that this land floods and stock need to be able to access higher ground in winter at short notice has been ignored. Stock would now be cut off in the event of floods which are an increasingly common event.

The fields at Sleastonhow within the DCO boundary that would be lost or severed are prime agricultural land. Sleastonhow has traditionally been a mixed farm with both livestock and agriculture providing spreading risk and enhancing the farm's resilience. The front fields impacted by the DCO boundary have traditionally been used for arable crops which provides feed and bedding for livestock over winter. The fields to the rear have been used for grazing livestock in a rotational grazing pattern using regenerative methods.

Sleastonhow Farm has recently entered a new scheme focused on woodland pasture which has required significant tree planting . This reduces the flexibility of these rear fields as they cannot be used for arable purposes. It will not be possible to simply swap arable crops to the northern fields at the rear of the farm.

Sleastonhow is therefore disproportionately impacted by this development far beyond the land take proposed. The loss of the its entire grade two agricultural land will reduce both profitability and sustainability .

No agricultural or business impact assessment has been conducted by NH to establish whether this loss to a private individual is justified by the public gain. Despite previously agreeing to produce the BCR for this most expensive section, NH are once again refusing to do so . This does indicate concern that the test is not met.

At the most recent ISH in Penrith NH remained unable to confirm the following more than half way through the examination process.:

- 1- That the DCO boundary was now fixed and no further change would be sought resulting in more or less land take at Sleastonhow Farm .
- 2- That there would be no further changes to land take sought as permanent as opposed to temporary.
3. That there would be no further changes to the proposed mitigation or land sought for mitigation.

All of the above adds to the criticism that the development of this project, driven by Project Speed has taken place in the wrong order. NH failed to design its scheme before deciding what land take was required and is now desperately back peddling. The description given of changes to land take and boundaries as being at the request of Landowners is disingenuous and is entirely connected to the fact it still doesn't know what land it requires.