

Day Nine

Julia Tindale

Examination in Chief

Ms Tindale was asked to read her summary proof.

Ms Tindale was referred to s6.7 of her full proof and asked if discussions with local landowners had progressed. Ms Tindale referred to s5.17 of her proof. She said that there continued to be issues Mr Painter, Mr and Mrs Shepherd and also with Mrs Britton, who has a paddock at the back of her house.

Cross Examination

SP8. Many hectares of agricultural land lost to production. Don't disagree with statement as a statement of fact?

-No

SP9. Detailed examination of alternative routes?

-No

Non-road build option would not cause loss of agricultural land?

-Agreed

FP3.14. Would agree with statement as a statement of fact?

-Agreed

FP3.17. Is it the case that the scheme has been directed to land of lowest grade?

-One consideration of number of planning factors

-Does include some BAMVL

What consideration was given to trying to avoid BAMVL, or is it unavoidable?

-Not personally involved in route alignment process, but would have been one factor

Within E corridor, is there land available which is of a lower grade?

-Cannot say categorically, but same applies to W route

FP3.18. Presumably not the Council's case that scheme will encourage diversification?

-No

-However scheme would not have effect on rural economy

No agricultural or forestry justification for scheme?

-No

Essential transport improvement placed on a par with schemes of national importance?

-Not field of expertise

Agree that scheme is a development proposal in the open countryside?

-Not aware of how to define open countryside

-Agriculture part of countryside

FP3.19. Understanding of local level?

-Matter for LA's to decide what is 'best and most versatile land'.

-For LA's to decide whether BAMVL can be developed.

-Importance judged within local context.

Include SWRA?

-Yes, part of process

Fall within local level?

-Not with local planning authorities

Sec of State needs to take into consideration need to conserve BAMVL?

-Lot less emphasis on protecting land compared to other environmental factors.

East of Westbury is predominantly arable. West more livestock.

-Agreed

FP5.3. Total of 50 hectares affected. 38 permanently affected. Effect on remaining 12 hectares?

-Some of 12 hec not actually agricultural

-Affected during construction.

-Restored with existing soil material.

Of 12 hectares, breakdown of how much under livestock or arable?

-Information not available, however the majority is arable land. No objections from landowners regarding regrading and restoration.

Possibility land may not be as suitable after regrading?

-Would probably take 1-2 years to come back into agricultural use.

Provided the restoration and reclamation works, the 12 hectares returned to current use?

-That would be the expectation, providing farmers agree

FP5.8. Significance criteria solely based on area?

-Agreed

-20 hectares common cut off point.

-Stringent criteria.

If just over one more hectare affected, would go up to moderate adverse?

-Agreed

Distinction between slight adverse and moderate adverse.

-Arable farms suffer greater adverse effect.

-Overall viability of holdings not in doubt.

FP5.18. Potential mitigation measures. Have things moved on in terms of mitigation measures since ES published?

-Discussions with landowners ongoing.

FP6.4. 0.015% of county's arable land being affected. Is there any indication of value of agricultural production lost?

-Rough figures can be worked out from area of arable land and current prices.

-Affected farms not going to go out of business.

Permanent loss of 38 hec. Almost 20 hec BAMVL. In terms of overall cost/benefit assessment, has loss of land been factored in?

-Any scheme would affect similar area of land

This scheme is the subject of the inquiry. Loss of value of production relevant.

-In context of wider economy.

-Very difficult to assess exact value, especially as prices change.

Agree that relevant consideration?

-Drop in the ocean.

Very small percentage of county's land. What is value of agricultural production in Wiltshire?

-Do not have figure.

Inspector's Questions

Mr Yellowley asked for the source of the significance criteria in Tables 5.3 and 5.4 of Ms Tindale's full proof. Ms Tindale said it was common practice to use these criteria, but there is no source, as there is no definitive criteria.