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SECOND ADDITIONAL PROVISION (AP2) TO THE HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS TO CREWE) BILL February 2019

Please find set out herewith our Parliamentary Petition on behalf of Robert and Joseph Hopley of Daisy Bank Farm, Thorney Lanes, Newborough, Staffordshire DE13 8RY.

1. **Background**

1.1 Robert and Joseph Hopley farm around 970 acres of land in and around Newborough, Staffordshire which is affected by a new overhead powerline in AP2. More particularly the requirement to place an electricity sub station on their land.

1.2 It is a mixed farm comprising dairy, arable and beef, milking 125 cows with 200 or so beef cattle and heifer calves kept on the farm.

1.3 The farm runs around 750 acres of arable land with 220 of maize and grass. Annoyingly the location of the electricity sub station (see Appendix A attached) is on a parcel of 117 acres of land which they own and occupy.

1.4 The farm also runs a commercial shoot in this location with an adjoining landowner which will also be affected by the scheme.

2. **Issues**

2.1 The sub station and associated tree planting takes up around 25 acres of land. This is a huge area for what is effectively a relatively simple requirement.

**REQUEST**

Your petitioners request in the first instance that the sub station site itself be kept to an absolute minimum to reduce the amount of land take for the scheme.

2.2.1 The tree planting takes up around 15 acres of land. Having traced the route of the new pylons, your petitioners can see no trees of any significance that are being taken out along the way. Nonetheless, there are dozens of acres of trees planted on your petitioners' land and other parties' land along the route. No justification for these has been given. Apart from considering this a waste of taxpayers' money, the tree planting also damages one of the main drives on the shoot. Birds are driven along the route of the blue arrows over pegs shown by blue dots.

2.2.2 Within an area of about 2.5 miles by 2.5 miles there are approximately 650 acres of trees in existence in any event. These are part of the former shooting estate belonging to the Duchy and are largely still managed for shooting and sporting now. As there are no trees being taken for this part of the project (ie the overhead power line route) does this not highlight that HS2’s ecologists have been given free rein to do whatever they want regardless of cost to the taxpayer and the impact on people’s businesses?
REQUEST
As your petitioners can see no justification for the trees being planted they request that they be removed from this area. It is noted that a neighbour, Mr Hough, has without prejudice, offered some land to plant trees in order to square off his boundaries but your petitioners can see no justification for them here. They will be costly in terms of:
- diminution in land value
- cost of planting trees
- cost of maintaining trees
- damage to the shoot
- loss of agricultural production

2.3 See Appendix B1, B2 and B3 - photographs showing extent of landtake post scheme.

2.4 See Appendix A. Main access to this block of land is via a gateway at point A. Land at this location is flat and level with good roadside visibility. This access will be removed. Further access exists at point B although this will be removed during the construction process and it is little used due to poor visibility to the main road and a steep approach up grassland as indicated. A good but lesser used access exists at point C (see photograph B4) and will need re-opening and utilising as the only access to the entire block of land. The bridge crossing the Pur Brook at point E will need upgrading and bringing back into use.

REQUEST
As the only usable access to this land will be via the gateway at point C and over the old bridge at point E (see photograph B5) your petitioners request that the bridge at E be replaced with one to modern standards, suitable as a point of access to otherwise landlocked land at point D.

REQUEST
Going forwards, as there will only be one access to the land your Petitioner request a trackway be built along the route C-E shown by the pink line at Appendix A to allow access for machinery and equipment throughout the year.

We commend these comments to the Committee.