

**SUMMARY OF PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF PETER HODGES**  
**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992**  
**THE TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2004**  
**THE PROPOSED ROTHER VALLEY RAILWAY (BODIAM TO ROBERTSBRIDGE JUNCTION)**  
**ORDER**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My name is Peter Hodges FRICS CAAV. I have been practicing as a Chartered Surveyor and Agricultural Valuer for over 40 years. I have, until recently, been a Partner/Director of Lambert & Foster Ltd. I now act as a Consultant. My areas of practice have included compulsory purchase and compensation work mainly on agricultural property in connection with utility, pipeline and electricity lines and highway improvement works.
- 1.2 Lambert & Foster have been acting on behalf of RVR since 2010 and I personally since 2018. I have prepared a report on the agricultural and impact on Parsonage Farm, Redlands Farm and Moat Farm, Robertsbridge of the reinstatement of RVR (**RVR 67**) and a supplementary report (**RVR 68**).
- 1.3 My evidence covers the following:
- (a) Paragraph 3, 9c and 9d of the Secretary of State's Statement of Matters.
  - (b) Work done on behalf of Rother Valley Railway Limited (RVRL) by Lambert & Foster.
  - (c) The justification of the use of compulsory purchase powers as sought by RVR.
  - (d) Consideration of the landowner's ability to recover compensation for any property losses.
  - (e) Consideration of Human Rights issues in connection with the justification of the railway.
  - (f) Summary of the Farming Impact Reports.
  - (g) How the impact of the railway on the farms can be mitigated.
  - (h) The consideration of the Agricultural Act.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

- (b) As well as providing the Agricultural Impact Report, Lambert & Foster have also been advising on valuation matters.
- (c) Due to the economic benefits of the railway and other transport and socio-economic benefits and given the impacts on the landowners are by comparison small and capable of being mitigated or fully compensated, that in my professional opinion compulsory powers are justified.
- (d) The Compensation Code is an amalgamation of numerous Acts of Parliament and legal precedents which have evolved over time. The Code provides for recovery of loss of value of the interest taken, severance and injurious affection and disturbance losses.
- (e) Although there is interference with public rights, there is a public good and impacts on landowners can either be mitigated or compensated.
- (f) In respect of Parsonage Farm, the Agricultural Impact Report concluded that *“there will be inconvenience in the immediate locality of the railway and it is likely that after adjustments have been made to farming operation there will be a small reduction in income/profitability”*.

In respect of Moat Farm, it concluded that *“if there is provision for providing sufficient accommodation crossings that the impact on farming activities would not be significant”*.

- (g) Overall, the impact of the railway on the farms can be mitigated by the provision of accommodation crossings and the reinstatement of a farm bridge.
- (h) The introduction of the Agricultural Act will change the emphasis of agricultural subsidies towards environmental goods. The changes could be advantageous to Parsonage and Redland Farm in respect of those smaller areas created by the railway. In respect of Moat Farm, I conclude where the farming system is already focused on environmental and stewardship farming policies, future farming policies through ELMS are likely to be of greater benefit than with the existing system.