KEYSTOOE LAW

48 Chancery Lane
London WC2A 1JF
United Kingdom

DX 193 Chancery Ln
t +44 (0)20 3319 3700
f +44 (0)845 458 9398

Wekeystone_law
enquiries@keystonelaw.co.uk
www.keystonelaw.co.uk

Our Ref: TBBPRO216.2 Your Ref: EN010155

Direct Dial: @keystonelaw.co.uk

National Infrastructure Planning Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN

By Email Only

23 November 2025

Dear Sirs,

Our client: 12 Property FE Limited **Dean Moor Solar Farm DCO**

Interested Party Reference number:

As you will be aware our client's relevant interest is the freehold mines and minerals and mineral substances registered at the Land Registry with title number CU307418 in or under works plots 1-26, 1-33, 1-35, and 1-38. Our client's title was severed from the surface title and contains no express limitation on depth. In the absence of any such limitation, the courts will consider that the mineral estate begins immediately below the surface.

Firstly, it is our client's submission that the need for CPO powers in relation to their interest has not been justified given the applicant's disclosure of a potential "no dig" solution. The applicant's failure to carry out the necessary investigative survey works to establish the efficacy of this no dig solution isn't sufficient to establish the need for CPO powers.

Secondly, the applicant has repeatedly referred to shortcomings in our clients own "evidence" as to the mines & minerals present at the relevant areas. For clarity our client's freehold interest is expansive and we enclose the title plan to illustrate this. Our client does not hold granular information on the minerals present at each part of the interest, other than to say relevant deposits have been identified throughout it.

Due to a lack of firm information from the applicant as to the depths of the proposed scheme (having been referred to variously as up to 15m, up to 4m and 2m), the need for "exclusion zones" (on which no details have been provided) or the location of the "soil removal" referred to in the applicant's response to relevant representations (REP1-002), our client is clearly unable to provide the more detailed information being requested of them.

It should be noted that the applicant has carried out much more detailed ground surveys to the south of the site, but not the north where our client's interests are. Ther applicant's reasons for not having carried out adequate surveys throughout the application site have not been explained other than to refer to further "detailed design work".

It is our client's position that the application fails to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition, including modifications to the scheme or the use of a "no dig solution", have been explored. Likewise, the application falls well short of demonstrating the use of CPO powers is a "last resort" rather than being simply more convenient to the applicant. The investigative and preparatory work carried out by the applicant is insufficient to justify granting the application at this time.

My client maintains their objection to the Application on this basis.

At the compulsory purchase hearing on 13 November 2025 the Examining Authority requested the parties engage to try and reach a solution to this matter. By way of an updated despite this firm's attempts to engage with the applicant as directed to date they have declined to do so.

Yours faithfully

Keystone Law

