

28<sup>th</sup> November 2024

M5 J10 Programme Improvements Scheme  
The Planning Inspectorate  
National Infrastructure  
Temple Quay  
2 The Square  
BRISTOL BS1 6PN

By email to [M5Junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:M5Junction10@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Dear Sirs,

**M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme- proposed Development Consent Order  
Interested Party Reference No. M510-AFP046**

I submit the following written representations, on behalf of my clients, the landowners of the farm land adjoining the A4019 known as land at [REDACTED] - Mrs Mary Bruton & Ms Elizabeth Counsell. This follows my previous letter of 29<sup>th</sup> October 2024, with an update on the limited progress of engagement with the Applicant, as follows:

**1. Proposed shared farm access track**

The swept path analysis provided included agricultural machinery that is no longer made; current machinery such as trailers and combine harvesters are larger and it is important that we have confidence that they can not only navigate the access track bends, but also safely make the turn in to and out from my clients' land, when under heavy and high loads, without having to cross the adjoining land owned by the Applicant. One of the reasons for this is that my clients' must be able to keep the track level for the stability of bales of straw, which are at their most danger of toppling when a tight turn is being made over uneven ground. Updated drawings have been requested and chased but are yet to be received.

I met with the Applicant's agent on 27<sup>th</sup> November but no further offer was made by them with regard to the suggested proposal of the direct access in to my client's land, as set out to you previously.

**2. Equivalence**

I again repeat my belief that it is within the Applicant's ability to grant an equivalent type and unencumbered form of straight access from the A4019, in line with an early drawing proposed by them and then withdrawn without reason.

**3. Ransom**


At yesterday's meeting the Applicant's Asset Management & Property Services team were represented by Neil Corbett. Mr Corbett was not prepared to agree to provide a replacement access of any form across the Applicant's retained land at this stage, but merely offered to consider any proposal that was put in writing. Mr Corbett would not discuss even the broadest of terms in an attempt to move matters forward before the final Deadline.

I have been trying to negotiate with the Applicant for about four years and specifically been asking for a meeting with AMPS since a site meeting with their agent in April 2023; given the DCO Inquiry is about to close this does not seem to be negotiating in the spirit or method required under the DCO legislation. Nothing new was proposed by me at our meeting yesterday and the offers had all been discussed several times with Carter Jonas during 2023 and 2024.

#### 4. Summary

Whilst my clients are keen to support this DCO scheme and work with the Applicant in delivering the improvements, this support can only be given without reservation if the Applicant takes into account the serious impediments proposed to the ongoing farming operations on my clients' land and ensures that a position of equivalence is achieved. We have on numerous occasions set out clear ways as to how that equivalence could be delivered and continue to hope that the Applicant will take these into account at this late stage- but ask that the Inspectors recommend an independent straight line access free of restrictions in use, with the ability to widen it as necessary for any future uses on the land, as is the current position.

Yours faithfully,



Andrew Bower  
Agent for the Landowners