

## Brenda Taplin

---

**From:** lyndahockey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 November 2022 19:16  
**To:** NATIONALCASEWORK  
**Subject:** Banwell Bypass Mitigation/CPO

18/11/2022  
Land Ref AX/29/51/10 [REDACTED], Sandford.

As joint owner of the identified land, I have no option but to object to the CPO 2022.

Along with the two other joint owners of this land we submitted a planning application to North Somerset, Ref 20/P/1120/OUT, which was received by them on 26/5/2020 and validated 18/6/2020. This application is to include upgrading for a safe route to school through the land. As you can see by the dates this was a considerable time ago! The case officer, [REDACTED], has never responded to the application despite us paying over £[REDACTED] for this service. We are in contract with a house builder taking our application forward. They submitted further tests/assessments to the case officer in July this year which have not even been added to our application portal to date. Mr Stevenson also fails to return communication to our planners and land agent, via e mail and telephone. We are at a loss as to how we move forward with this but if we had a favourable decision from NSC then clearly this objection would not have to be made, and could be withdrawn if he responds favourably. Burrington Estates, who we are in contract with, have made it clear to Fisher German that if we receive outline planning permission they would immediately make the muddy footpath across our land, suitable for walkers and cyclists to use. This would also remove the need for a CPO and costs that the Bypass project would incur. If we don't receive planning permission then we intend to take it to appeal, which would cause further delays in how we move forward. Looking at the time scales that the bypass is seeking the application to be passed makes me question as to why we have waited over two years with no response and NSC intentions are to build the Bypass in this time. Why would a decision be made this quickly as its a huge project. If it does get passed in just a few months then it will be discrimination, in my eyes, in the terms of response time and how applications are dealt with.

Therefore if we have to continue farming on the land, these are my objections and concerns regarding the plans/CPO.

No plans have been sent to me as to how your proposed safe route/cycle way would be constructed over the land. Livestock would need 24/7 access across the route, as they do now, to access barns for feed and shelter. I spoke directly with Joseph Burnell (case officer for the bypass) some weeks ago regarding this and he agreed plans should be sent to us, but nothing has materialised. It again feels like we are being dismissed with any part of the process to move forward.

Machinery will also have to have access in two places across the proposed safe route, where gates currently exist.

The cycle way will cut the farm in half which will de value the property, its difficult enough as a small holding trying to make a living off of it as it is.

In the documents I received it is mentioned in two places Bridleway upgrade, I am certainly opposing this suggestion as it will cause huge difficulties on the smallholding and farming. Ref the document, Statement Of Reasons, P37 11.23 and P41 12.14 (n). If a horse and rider can access through this route then a moped certainly can, this will be unacceptable. NSC are not being transparent in their plans as to whether a bridleway is being considered or not. Fisher German on their visit earlier in the year, on site, said it was not. It is unreasonable to be deceived. What statistics do they have to say a bridleway is required? Very few riders use the village of Sandford as a riding route as it is, plus the exit further North of our land, onto Churchill Green, is dangerous onto a narrow road. It begs to ask does this make a safe route to school if the intention is for horses to use it?

Who will be responsible for maintaining this stopped up route and all the accessible gates/kissing gates etc. NSC presumably as they would then own it?

Fisher German letter said HOT'S were sent out in September. I never received any and had to request them from Fisher German late October. These concern me immensely. The template works in NSC favour that they access land when they want, how disruptive would the tests and works be to a working farm, where would materials be stored, how do they envisage accessing the fields and keeping a PROW functional whilst work is carried out? [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The HOT's also mention confidentiality, not talking to others. The local farming community are a great source of support for each other and have been for years, let alone currently, with concerns over proposals. I find this very intimidating and controlling. I can only assume compensation will be paid in different amounts to people on the basis of paying as least as possible to those who don't complain or understand the process or implications. I for one will still be talking to other affected farmers/land owners.

If I enter into any negotiations regarding a CPO I would not be willing to pay any costs to solicitors and surveyors in producing HOT'S or any other legal fees. This would be at NSC cost in full. This agreement would take a considerable time to come to an agreed conclusion, considering what has been put in the template.

Lynda Hockey

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail

---

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.

---