

Representation made by Brockthorpe Consultancy Ltd on behalf of Messrs Beal of [REDACTED]

I write on behalf of Messrs Beal of [REDACTED] following the latest oral submissions and in line with Deadline 10.

My clients still wish to object to the scheme on the following grounds:

1. The proposed route and scheme involve the loss of circa 25% of their farmland. There is land being taken on all 4 sides of the road network. The loss will mean a significant impact on the future viability of the farm. It is currently an organic run business and with the reduced area, it will not become viable for Mr Beal to operate it and earn a living. This scheme will deprive him of his ability to derive an income from his farm business.
2. The proposed route will take out the caravan storage business which is run by Mrs Beal and pays the farm partnership a rent. This is a significant diversification business which will not be able to operate as there is no other location to operate from. Not only will they lose the capital value of this enterprise, but they will also lose the income which provides a valuable source of ongoing revenue. No account has been made by HE to provide an alternative site for which to be able to continue to operate this business.
3. The proposed route means the destruction of the farmhouse and the farm buildings and yard. The farmhouse has been lived in by Mr Beal all his life and this is a major upheaval for him at his age. He has already [REDACTED] of this proposed scheme. No agreement has been reached on future accommodation and at this moment in time Mr & Mrs Beal senior have nowhere to go and live. They are [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has been taken into account by HE. There is serious concern that a property cannot be found in time and [REDACTED]. We are being told that HE intend to take occupation in around spring 2022, yet there are no homes available locally to enable Martin to care and look after his elderly parents. We have grave concerns that they will be forced to live in a caravan at [REDACTED], this is not acceptable.
4. The Beals are going to lose their farmyard and they will have nowhere to store any machinery or provide accommodation for their sheep or anywhere for animal welfare purposes. This is a serious concern especially as the time at which the land may be taken is during lambing. Providing accommodation elsewhere off the farm is going to be very expensive and significantly costly to the Beals as they will have to travel during times of housing and will mean Martin Beal will have to live effectively in a shed during lambing time.
5. We do not believe that HE considered the alternative options of location of the flyover. There were other options originally proposed which would have meant the [REDACTED] would not have been destroyed. Why were these never considered? What we are left with is the serious concern that the Beals will lose 25% of their farm, the farmhouse and the farm yard and be left with a serious problem, which will be costly and [REDACTED] as a result.
6. There is currently an underpass used for moving sheep from the east to the west of the A1. This is only just possible to move sheep through due to the narrowness of it. However, the new scheme only suggest extending this. This will not work. The underpass will not be wide enough to allow livestock to run through it because it will be too narrow and too dark. It will become very dangerous and there is no allowance for this animal welfare issue.
7. In November 2017, the agent acting on behalf of HE in open correspondence agreed that the basis of compensation to the Beals would be on the basis of the cost of relocating what exists at the moment at the farm that would be lost. This was made in open correspondence and was the basis at which the Beals in good faith continued to engage with HE. However that promise made on behalf of HE has not been followed through. The result of which is

serious stress to the Beals who are faced with the real uncertainty of what is going to happen in under a year. We would seriously suggest that the Planning Inspectorate insist that the alternative options are considered that would not involve the destruction of [REDACTED] Farmhouse and yard. It is shame that HE are unwilling to follow through with their promise made in 2017.

8. I will also note that no doubt the acquiring authority's solicitors will point to the fact that a Blight notice has been accepted. However, a Blight notice can be withdrawn at any time and one cannot just say that their voice and objection is now restricted following the Blight notice acceptance.

Finally, I wish to stress that this is causing significant stress and impact on the welfare of the Beal family as a whole. It has been going on for 3 years at least now and it is extremely unsettling faced with the [REDACTED] and livelihood. We would urge the planning inspectorate to insist that an alternative route is found which there clearly is which would not mean the loss of a farmhouse and farmyard.