Pin 20052722

Reference: Alice Margaret Mason



And

George Rigby Mason



Parcel ID references to include 10-018B through to 11-001A

We object to the project on a number of reasons which include:

- 1. The **heads of terms** which were sent on 8 November are yet to be agreed. They are not in a format that have been accepted by my appointed Land Agent and representative. The commercial terms have yet to be agreed therefore we object.
- 2. The location and position of the proposed project will have huge negative affect on our land. The cable corridors go through our farm including productive arable and grassland. The land is highly productive and used to sustain our tenants large scale farming business of Dairy and beef production, the grass is used for silage and grazing but the land is also vital to their slurry management system.
- 3. The route cuts the farm in half and has a huge detrimental affect on the farming business, impacting the ability to continue dairy farming as the cattle use the proposed working area for grazing and milk production. The land is closely affected by surface water and the drainage system is vital any interruption to the main drains in the area will cause significant flooding to the whole area.
- 4. We object to the plans submitted as the operation accesses proposed run separately across unaffected fields and uses the farm's private track, this impacts day to day farm management and creates potential health and safety issues with livestock present, it also weakens the security of the land and farm which we regard very highly. The operational access can all be gained direct from Hillock Lane where is crosses the road without recourse of affecting more of our land
- 5. We object to the project on the location of the cable route and easement. My land would be sterilised by the cable easement, preventing any alternative use of the land.
- 6. The land has a number of important ditches and drains and no open cut trenching must be used as these cannot be disturbed.

- 7. There are various documents that we object to due to the lack of information provided for this specific area these are just standard documents that do not address the conditions of this specific location and area which include
 - a) APP-193 (J1) Code of Construction Practice
 - b) APP-203 J1.10 Outline Construction Plan

We object to the Outline Construction Fencing, there is not the full details of all fencing, the materials and detailed specification is required at this stage. The wording relating to the fencing of the working width is inadequate to cover full security and to minimise affected parties to include fencing of crossing points.

c) APP-202 J1.9 Surface and Groundwater Management Plan

we object to the proposals and measures to control water run-off from the working width. No discharge of any water from the working width should be released on any adjoining land. Full detailed drainage matters need to be addressed.

d) APP-200 J.1.7 Outline Soil Management Plan

We object to the submission of the Outline Soil Management Plan which formed part of the outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Outline Soil Management Plan which has been submitted on behalf of the Project is not specific to the area and the route between Penwortham and Blackpool. It is not site specific and does not deal with the variants of the soil structures within the proposed route. We object to the responsibility of the implementation of the Soil Management Plan being delivered by the principal contractor and the Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO). This must be underpinned by the Project. Section 1.7.2 Soil Stripping – it identifies that it will be recorded by the ALO prior to commencement of any construction. This does not deal with any point of discussion or input by the affected parties such as myself and essential information that has been suggested does not fully complete the evidence of the soil quality

- 8. I have serious concerns with regard to the project, There is no certainty offered by either Morgan or Morecambe that they will develop the project, simultaneously if granted, therefore if the SOS allow this then construction of this project could last in excess of 7 years which is just not acceptable or via for my business. Timing and controls have to be issued by the SoS
- The operational access as shown from Hillock lane is unnecessary, I have had no input into this and object strongly, it creates a health and safety issue and impacts on the security of my land.
- 10. We wish to be present or our land agent present at the walk over inspection

Therefore, until all these queries and have been fully answered and dealt with appropriately for our land, we object to the scheme/project



