



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Event Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Event:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1) – Part 2
Date:	27 January 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

File Name: SL_27JAN_CAH1_PART2.mp3

File Length: 01:28:56

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:15:29

Welcome back. We will now recommence this hearing. Can I just confirm with the case team that everyone can hear me, and that the live streaming has recommenced? Thank you.

00:00:19:00 - 00:00:28:16

Now I'm conscious. We did have a hand up at the end of the last session. I did not spot it. I'm sorry, I it's ScottishPower renewables. I think if you'd like to speak now.

00:00:29:08 - 00:01:02:15

Yes. Thank you Colin. And on behalf of the Scottish Power renewable entities, it was, um, I've got a wider point that I'll come to you with that later in the agenda under 2.4. But it was just one point of clarification into the strip that Mr. Rix referenced, uh, to the east of Littlemore farm. The little strip to the far north eastern portion of plot two is backslash 20. Um, and that's a landscaping strip. And it's just we're going to be coming on to discuss probably tomorrow or the next day.

00:01:02:24 - 00:01:37:11

Uh, the matter of landscaping. It's just to say that in terms of the finalized, um, uh, East Anglia landscape management plan that's been submitted, that the landscaping proposed is actually using the northern part of plot 220 and goes slightly further north than is shown on this plan. But it's just to show that in terms of the point that was being made by Mr. Rix is that the Scottish power take, um, has been smaller there than plot 20, and some of the landscaping actually goes to the north of that, uh, track.

00:01:37:13 - 00:02:07:00

So that was just to give you a reason why Mr. Riggs might be raising that particular issue and arises from the slight, slight nuances of the landscape management plan submitted compared to the alarms. Um, and that arises from, uh, consultation and further detailed consideration of where the landscaping should go at this location, but I was just flagging at that particular point to explain the point that was being made by Mr. Ricks and why that has occurred.

00:02:07:02 - 00:02:14:24

We are we talking about the part of 220 that goes to the West or the bit that goes to the north? There's sort of two to.

00:02:14:26 - 00:02:15:25

The north, to northeast.

00:02:15:27 - 00:02:16:12

A bit to the.

00:02:16:14 - 00:02:31:11

North northeast. Yeah, the north eastern little section. And it's the northern section of that is in terms of the East Anglia landscape management plan. It only takes the northern sliver of 220 and extends slightly further north.

00:02:31:23 - 00:02:33:09

Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

00:02:33:19 - 00:03:09:16

It's going to be the other side of the track, is what you mean isn't it? On that map? Yes. Yeah. So yeah. But that's another thing. Would we be able to, if ScottishPower have got the bit on the north of the track? Do you see link? Surely they want to remove the bit on the south side? Or are you going to do both sides of the track? Seems unnecessary for us to lose even more land where we're not necessary. Because I mean, I. Yeah. Because I know it's this is one project, but we've already lost over 90 acres been taken from us by SVR. We've got a line link coming after Sealink, and we've just been given the consultation for the water pipe project.

00:03:09:18 - 00:03:42:28

I know they're doing a big one all the way up and down the eastern, so every bit of land that we can retain and keep is hugely important to us. And that's why, um, because we're a family business. It's what we depend on to make our living. I've got my father, my mother and my two siblings, which we, um, we all, we all live out the farm, so every bit that we can keep is really important. And that's why I was saying back to the service road that I mentioned earlier, if SVR have got it through planning, got it taking the land for it, why does Sealink even need any more than what has been taken by SVR there? Um, it's the necessity.

00:03:43:00 - 00:03:59:13

I know that it's mitigation and trees, but why do you need mitigation of trees along the road? No one's going to see it apart from us on our tractors, farming that field. Who is going to. It just seems unnecessary to me. So the pure necessity of that is. That's what I mean. That's what I'm struggling with.

00:04:00:09 - 00:04:20:11

Yeah. No, thank you very much for explaining it in detail. And there are action points for the applicant's takeaway to consider the plots in that area in terms of what they can, the minimum land that they actually need. Um. Thank you. Okay. Well, we'll now move on to Suffolk plot 112. And if you could just display the land plans for this plot, please.

00:04:28:06 - 00:05:00:08

So any question one Jan 81. We asked for clarification regarding the variable width of this Suffolk plot. 112 the applicant responded in oh 69 that the plot 112 increases in width along the north south section of the B1 119 adjacent to plot 113, to enable flexibility in the access, drainage and public right of way diversion works in this location due to the potential coordination with National Grid Ventures Land Link project.

00:05:01:04 - 00:05:09:21

Can the applicant just explain why it is appropriate to seek a wider area, albeit for temporary use, to accommodate a consented CIP?

00:05:16:03 - 00:05:47:18

Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. I think it's fair to say that throughout the entire pre-application process with sealing, we have considered other projects because co-location and coordination, you know, is a priority and it seems more of an imposition to then have to move something that's gone in without trying to do that coordination up front. And the full extent of the highway here is to allow us to implement traffic control measures as well as those those works, so that, again, we can reduce the impact there.

00:05:48:03 - 00:05:48:18

Um.

00:05:50:24 - 00:06:09:19

I mean, in terms of, you potentially landing in the future. I mean, that could be coming if it even gets consented. Quite a while after, after years. I'm just not quite sure why you need to take an extra width now for something that you don't even know will need coordinating with your scheme.

00:06:10:17 - 00:06:41:21

James McClure, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we need to wait for traffic management to allow the drainage works and the. Because we're going to plant the hedgerow along and the other side of the ditch. Um, as temporary pond sits in that area for, uh, construction, drainage. So we will need to tie into the existing ditch. So the possession over the road is for the traffic management to allow that work safely to take place. It just so happens it's the same place that line link will cross the road and their drainage works will come out to go to their permanent pond.

00:06:41:23 - 00:06:48:01

So it's for our project, but it also coordinates with what they are putting forward in their stack on plants.

00:06:48:03 - 00:06:50:23

So even without line you you need that.

00:06:50:25 - 00:06:51:10

Line.

00:06:51:25 - 00:07:07:12

Great. That's. That's understood. Um. And can I just ask? Are there any other plots on this project where you're looking to temporary possess or compulsory acquire, where additional land is being taken to account for any other scheme in the future?

00:07:10:13 - 00:07:33:29

James Barclay, on behalf of the applicant, um, the only area in on around plot 112 and areas we've got the three potential, uh, construction compounds which have been which will only take one of and

that's been to allow the flexibility should line link. Um. Come ahead. We can move our compound to be suitable and not again. They're not taking land that we need and vice versa.

00:07:34:06 - 00:07:38:00

Can you just remind me the plot numbers for those, please?

00:07:49:22 - 00:07:54:21

On behalf of the applicant states. Plot 122129.

00:08:02:09 - 00:08:07:24

The once I122129.

00:08:15:20 - 00:08:24:15

138 and one. Dash four two. And the plots is a number of plots in that area. We can provide a list.

00:08:25:08 - 00:08:32:12

Okay. Yeah. If you as a person submission. If you could just give me that information. Just just summarize in terms of that, that location, that would be helpful.

00:08:33:08 - 00:08:42:03

Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant, if I may, the statement of reasons does also confirm that we would only take one of those plots, and it's to provide for that flexibility.

00:08:44:02 - 00:08:44:28

Thank you.

00:08:47:12 - 00:08:58:07

Okay. So I'd like to move on now to plot four seven and the surrounding plots. Again, if this is Suffolk, if this could be shown on the screen with the land plans and the works plans.

00:09:25:16 - 00:09:42:09

So in response to question 185, the applicant has revised the lamb plans to reduce the size of the plot required for the six hectares of acid grassland. Um, I just want to ask the applicant why the work plans were also not amended because at the moment it's showing the whole field. However.

00:09:43:07 - 00:09:48:15

On behalf of the applicant, um, you're absolutely right. We spotted that. It's on our list of actions.

00:09:48:17 - 00:10:21:08

Thank you. Um, to reduce the size of plot four seven, two new plots have been created. So that's plot 427 and 428, and they've been given the designation of class ten. So I understand from the statement of reasons, appendix A, so that's rep 3014 that there are now three plots which are designated with this with class ten, the two associated with this change, and also plot 197 in Suffolk. Um, however, the book of reference only lists plot 197 and the Book of Reference.

00:10:21:10 - 00:10:37:21

The other two plots fall 27 428 and the Book of Reference. Can I just ask the applicant to explain why class ten is required, as opposed to just removing these plots from the order limit? And in the case of plot 197, uh, why is that not just removed from the book of reference as well?

00:10:39:26 - 00:11:01:03

Jackie, on behalf of the applicant, will undertake a review of those plots and update as necessary. Um, the straightforward answer about, um, White's class ten is, is the impact across the suite of documents that would need updating. We quite honestly felt it was more straightforward just to mark those as no land rights required.

00:11:03:08 - 00:11:17:25

No, I appreciate that. And when it was just plot 197 that I understand why you didn't want to have to change the order limits, but now it's some quite large areas. Um, will you be able to consider whether they should be removed?

00:11:18:02 - 00:11:21:07

Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. Yes. We'll take that away and look at it.

00:11:21:09 - 00:11:27:21

Okay. Thank you. I'll put that as an action point. Deadline. Deadline for. Thanks.

00:11:29:07 - 00:11:50:26

Um, I think just to just to add to that, just so you understand where I'm coming from, it's a concern is if plots remain in the order limits, then I'm sort of concerned at how article 27 would affect them, because although you're not taking any rights, article 27 would still probably affect those plots because they are in the old limits. So just just so you understand where I'm coming from on this.

00:12:01:02 - 00:12:05:15

Madam, I wonder if it would be helpful if I can just assist on article 27.

00:12:05:26 - 00:12:06:11

Yes.

00:12:06:14 - 00:12:46:21

James Parker, solicitor, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just picking up on the point that Mr. Dart's just made in terms of the implications, which I'm sure will appreciate of adjusting the old limits across the entire suite. I'm sure that's lost on no one. But in terms of article 27, it expressly refers to the authorised project. And therefore, if one follows through the definitions in terms of schedule one and the numbered works, etc., I think the power self limits effectively such that if you follow through. So for example, the compulsory acquisition powers, you follow them through and they specify in terms of what is set out in the book of reference, and therefore the class of rights where the class is effectively.

00:12:46:23 - 00:12:59:28

Other projects I've had they call it class zero. There are zero land powers available. I mean, obviously we will take the point away, but I think the answer is found in the drafting itself. But we'll take that away as part of the wider question.

00:13:00:07 - 00:13:33:18

Yes, yes. If you if you could, because it does talk about land within the old limits. So it's just I'm just a bit nervous at how, you know, these plots would be affected. I do understand your concern with changing the odds limits, because obviously that would invoke a change which nobody wants, but it would be a change that would reduce the odds of areas. So it's not, um, the sort of the significant amount of work that we have had when we've increased it for, say, the, the horror part. So, um, I would want that in though, before.

00:13:34:21 - 00:13:40:25

Well, as soon as possible, but definitely before deadline five in order that we could accommodate it if that was going to occur.

00:13:42:19 - 00:14:00:09

James Parker on behalf of the applicant. Obviously, as you've indicated, very hopefully we will take that away. Would it be satisfactory to the WSA if the applicant can explain as to why the concern used outlined is addressed for the older drafting, such that a change to the limits isn't necessitated?

00:14:03:22 - 00:14:31:10

I'd have to think about that. At the moment, I feel the the cleanest and most straightforward way is to reduce the old limits, to only show the land that that you do want to, to compulsorily acquire or temporary possess. Um, I do appreciate the work that's involved. Um, but in terms of writing my report to the Secretary of State, obviously I have to justify all the lands, and it's not very easy. It's this is quite a large area that would need to be justified.

00:14:33:23 - 00:14:34:15

For the applicant.

00:14:34:17 - 00:14:37:09

We'll take that away and come back with something comprehensive.

00:14:37:22 - 00:14:51:20

Thank you. Um, can we now move on to Kent? Plot two. One, two. Three and two. One. Three. Three. So again, if you could show the land plans and the corresponding works plans for this area.

00:15:15:25 - 00:15:30:22

So again, I appreciate on the works plans you have shown more information as to to what's happening. Um, but again, if you could just talk me through this area in terms of, of what you need and particularly explaining the environmental mitigation proposed in this area.

00:15:32:00 - 00:15:43:06

Jackie. Sara, on behalf of the applicant, if we take the first point, um, if I may, um, can we show the general arrangement piece. I think that helps explain it better.

00:15:48:27 - 00:16:19:02

Just while we're waiting for those plans to be uploaded. In this area alone, we have a significant number of different works. So there's work number eight, which is the temporary construction compound, work number nine A, which is the proposed access road to the converter and substation work number nine B, which is the proposed converter station and associated equipment work number ten which is the converter station and substation connection works. Work number 11, the proposed substation. Work number 12.

00:16:19:04 - 00:16:23:25

Proposed overhead line works work. Number 13 proposed drainage

00:16:25:21 - 00:16:34:23

work. Number 14 proposed access for construction, monitoring and maintenance, and work number 15 proposed environmental mitigation and landscaping.

00:16:37:20 - 00:16:59:14

The yellow area that you can see on the plan is the area needed for the converter station. Um, orange is substation and connecting works. You can see the blue areas, the attenuation ponds for the drainage. The remainder of those areas that have been identified for landscape and mitigation around those works.

00:17:01:08 - 00:17:04:20

If I may pass to James, do you want to add anything?

00:17:06:13 - 00:17:20:21

James Booker, on behalf of the applicant? Um, yeah, I think Jackie's explained through it all we've got, the overhead line works as well. Um, to the to the south in the orange block. Um, and that covers all of the work areas.

00:17:21:28 - 00:17:54:16

Okay. Yeah. Know that there is a lot going on in this location. I appreciate that. And obviously we've talked about the area of in Suffolk, which is equally complicated. If you do come up with any ways of explaining it better on the plans, Can you apply it to the serve as well? That would be appreciated. Um, because it is hard to to understand with all the all the overlap. Um, I understand that eastern extent of plot two one, three three is being shown for a temporary construction compound and which the applicant seeking permanent land acquisition.

00:17:54:25 - 00:18:15:02

Can you just provide a bit of further justifications? Why are you seeking to acquire this land? Um, and if this land has also been required for the mitigation, for the mitigation, how can you justify reinstating a construction compound during the lifetime of the development, even temporarily? So what's the mitigation proposal and how would it be affected? Would it be damaged?

00:18:27:21 - 00:18:42:22

On behalf of the applicant. Can we take the latter point away about how it interacts with with the mitigation? I think we've explained earlier this morning the need to have the ability to reinstate a compound. So we'll come back and confirm how that fits with the mitigation proposals.

00:18:42:24 - 00:18:46:09

Okay, I appreciate that. I'll put that down as an action point then.

00:19:03:11 - 00:19:20:07

Before I move on from this plot of land, can I ask if anyone else would like to raise any comments on this? I know Steve Minster Marshes did submit a video into the examination, uh, earlier this week. I don't know whether they want to say anything on this point.

00:19:24:06 - 00:19:26:05

I'm not seeing any hands up.

00:19:28:18 - 00:19:30:04

Okay, we'll move on.

00:19:33:15 - 00:20:09:20

So I'm going to move on to item 2.3. So the purpose of today isn't to hear detailed discussions on individual plots, because at this stage, we're expecting the applicant to be attempting to resolve any differences outside the examination where we have not received a representation where we're assuming there's no objection, they are aware from the relevant representations and submissions that subsequent deadlines, that there are a number of plots where there are outstanding concerns. And obviously, I've seen the schedule of negotiations that were submitted at deadline three that set out the current status of the negotiations.

00:20:09:22 - 00:20:44:06

That's Rep 306. I just want to start by asking the applicant to provide an update with regard to the status of negotiations, um, exclude National Trust and the Crown because we'll deal with those under item three. And also you can exclude anything that's going to be dealt with by means of protected provision, because we'll cover that under item four. Um, I need to know the likelihood of a voluntary agreement being reached. The timeline for submission of these agreements, and if there's going to be withdrawal of the objection from the examination. And maybe if we could go through the parties in order as listed in the schedule of negotiations.

00:20:44:15 - 00:20:55:17

Um, albeit only covering those who have made a specific objection by raising the relevant representation. So I don't know whether it would help you to bring up the schedule of negotiations and go through.

00:20:55:27 - 00:20:59:19

Um, so for the applicant, yes, I think it would be helpful to bring that schedule up.

00:21:01:06 - 00:21:24:11

And then, um, I'm going to, um, ask. Uh, miss, uh, Jasmine Lister, um, to go through, um, the points that you've raised just now, which is to update on the progress of the negotiations and the deadlines for their conclusions. Uh, just in relation to the outstanding objections. Um, and whether it's likely that those objections are going to be withdrawn.

00:21:30:21 - 00:21:33:00

And this list if you would also just look at the timeline.

00:21:50:28 - 00:21:55:04

So we should have the schedule coming up. Thank you.

00:21:57:18 - 00:21:59:02

Can we zoom in a bit?

00:22:11:06 - 00:22:45:19

Jasmine Lester, on behalf of the applicant. Would it be helpful to give a general overview to start with, or would you just want to go straight into the detail? I think I think really I mean, if we start with the first one, uh, Jean Stanton, I mean, I suppose my question is that from what you've told me in the stage of negotiations, the London Sun was given a copy of the heads of terms. So I suppose what I want to know is, has you had any feedback since then? Um, what's what's going on in terms of progress? What's the chance of it being resolved before the end of the examination? Does minister on behalf of the applicant?

00:22:45:25 - 00:22:46:27

Um, we have.

00:22:46:29 - 00:23:03:14

Had some feedback from the agent since we spoke with the landowner's son. We're working through kind of refining the exact nature of vehicle movements through the temporary access. Um, and we're also looking to agree commercial points.

00:23:10:11 - 00:23:25:21

Thank you. That's helpful. And I think what I'll say at the end is if you can get an updated version of the schedule of negotiations for all these points for deadline for just so we can see. Um, I'm conscious that time is moving on and we need to make progress on as much as possible.

00:23:26:05 - 00:23:33:13

We'll we'll definitely do that update. But in the meantime, I think if Miss Lister could just go through the various of the outstanding objection.

00:23:47:11 - 00:23:51:23

So I think the next one will be Kent County Council have got an objection.

00:23:59:17 - 00:24:03:09

On behalf of the applicant, the applicant's agent,

00:24:04:24 - 00:24:32:28

sorry, the landowner's agent responded to the applicant's agent with some queries on the heads of terms on the 21st of January, um and the applicant issued revised heads of terms to clarify the easement consideration. And we are continuing to negotiate with Kent County Council. Okay. Thank you. Yeah. And I notice in the schedule negotiations. It doesn't. It says there's no relevant that. But there was a relevant map for that one. If you when you're updating if you'd like to have that in.

00:24:56:08 - 00:24:58:19

The next one we've got is Edward Stanton.

00:25:00:14 - 00:25:26:10

I know he um submitted didn't actually submit a specific um objection. It was part of the mash arms. Um, so because there's no specific objection, it's not someone that I am, um, concerned with. Am I looking for people who specifically came in and objected? Um, but if you want to give me an update on how that's going, that's fine. We can move on. Okay.

00:25:31:07 - 00:26:04:22

Senate. District council. Um, we, the applicants agent, have been informed in January 2026 that the district council have appointed a land agent to progress heads of terms negotiations. Um, they provided their initial comments on the terms on the 16th of January, and the applicant's agent had responded on the 19th of January to those points. And we envisage that negotiations will be ongoing. And do you think there'll be agreement during the examination and then council will remove their objection?

00:26:06:28 - 00:26:37:00

I think it's possible that we could get to that point, given the comments that they had on the heads of terms. Okay. I understand that we have a representative, uh, fourth District Council. Um, the key Hudson Squire. Um, do you like to make a comment on this? And I can comment now, or I can comment in 2.4. Whichever is whichever is fine. For now 2.5 I'll just be a worship of anyone that we haven't covered. So if you'd like to give me a give me an update now. Perfect. Okay.

00:26:37:02 - 00:27:18:24

Vicki Hutton, Esquire, on behalf of Senate District Council regarding the proposed acquisition of rights. So if a council owned land, we wish to update on the current status of negotiations under this agenda item. So Senate District Council has formally pushed back on the applicant's initial offer to acquire rights. We do not believe the current terms adequately reflect the impact on the council's assets, and the matter remains under active debate with National Grid's agents. At present, Thanet District Council have not been provided with sufficient detail regarding the risk assessment and method statement for the proposed construction.

00:27:19:09 - 00:27:55:20

Consequently, we cannot yet fully assess the wider implications for land stability, for future land use, or the impact on adjacent council holdings. Crucially, the time scale and diameter of the cabling infrastructure were only clarified and rectified to an increased size within the last week or so. This late stage adjustment significantly alters our technical assessment of the easements physical footprint. Given these outstanding technical uncertainties and the recent change in the project scope.

00:27:55:24 - 00:28:17:12

The Council maintains that the necessity and proportionality of the right sort have not yet been demonstrated. We remain committed to resolving these matters with the applicant, but we cannot withdraw our concerns until a full impact assessment is completed based upon the updated infrastructure scale. Thank you.

00:28:18:18 - 00:28:23:00

Thank you. Um, could the applicant comment on that now, please?

00:28:30:00 - 00:28:59:29

Jasmine Lister for the applicant noted all of the points which we will take away. I just want to clarify in relation to the easement width. Um, nothing has changed in terms of the design proposals or the DCO proposals. It was just a matter of the initial heads of terms, not reflecting the actual easement width we were seeking. So we sought to clarify that in the latest heads of terms issued. And that was just a kind of drafting mistake in the original heads of terms issued to the council.

00:29:01:01 - 00:29:05:16

Okay. Is that similar to I know National Trust have also raised something. Is that.

00:29:05:23 - 00:29:07:13

The same? The same reason?

00:29:08:05 - 00:29:17:16

Okay. Um, if you could, um, work with planets between now and deadline for and give us as much an update as possible. We'd appreciate that.

00:29:17:18 - 00:29:21:06

Yeah, we would, um, look to set up a meeting as soon as possible.

00:29:21:14 - 00:29:22:08

Thank you.

00:29:50:00 - 00:29:54:10

Minister for the applicant. The next on my list is Ian David Mather.

00:29:59:13 - 00:30:25:23

I note that his objections are not directly in relation to the terms. The heads of terms and the rights that we are seeking to acquire. Um, however, we have had, uh, various meetings with the landowners agent, including a meeting on, um, sorry, I think it was on the 14th of January, a teams meeting with the landowners agent. Um, and we're looking to finalize how to terms within the next month or so.

00:30:26:13 - 00:30:43:21

Yeah. I was going to say the relevant map, um, said it was on behalf of Great Oaks Small School, but they're not affected specifically by CA or TPI. So. So do you think you're going to get agreement with mister, um, matha maple about the land.

00:30:44:24 - 00:30:47:28

His the landowners agent indicates that they will get.

00:30:48:00 - 00:30:50:13

No. Great. Thank you. Okay.

00:31:22:05 - 00:31:26:21

Just minister for the applicant. Could you just indicate who's next on your list?

00:31:27:14 - 00:31:49:08

I think it's, uh, Struan Robertson. Uh, so it does say no relevant, but, um, the relevant map was submitted. Um, again, a part of the Marsh farmer representations, but also he, uh, submitted a representation saying he wanted to be heard at a court hearing. So I'm taking from that that he is objecting.

00:31:52:28 - 00:32:22:08

Um, the. Sorry. Just Minister, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the applicant agent continues to engage with the landowners agents. There is a meeting set up with the landowners agent on the 5th of February, um, to discuss ahead of terms further. We're currently, um, looking to discuss accommodation. Works in terms of access during construction and after construction, um, which is one of the main discussion points along with the commercials of the agreement.

00:32:23:19 - 00:32:30:12

As I understand from the latest statement of negotiations, there was a meeting in January 16th of January that made that happen.

00:32:30:14 - 00:32:33:01

That was pushed back to the 5th of February.

00:32:33:03 - 00:32:33:20

Okay.

00:32:49:19 - 00:32:52:07

The next on our list is Kent Wildlife Trust.

00:32:52:13 - 00:32:53:02

Yes.

00:32:53:04 - 00:33:14:17

Um, in. Sorry, Desmond. On behalf of the applicant, um, in Kent Wildlife Trust capacity as a landowner on the scheme. We the applicant is not receiving any engagement from Kent Wildlife Trust. We continue to write to their agent and them directly, but we don't see that we're going to reach an agreement.

00:33:20:14 - 00:33:45:24

Um, salary sheet for the applicant. I also issued heads of terms recently, again to Kent Wildlife Trust and haven't heard back as yet, but we continue to try to engage. Okay. Um, what I can do that could try to help is, um, we'll put an action point in this hearing, um, and mention the fact of engagement from Kent Wildlife Trust. Um, that's fine too. Richard.

00:33:47:16 - 00:33:57:03

Thank you. Um, I think there is, um, confusion about this aspect and their position in relation to the scheme generally. Um, so that would be helpful.

00:34:21:09 - 00:34:39:06

The next. Sorry, Jasmine. List of the applicant. The next on my list is John Robert Collins. Does that. Um. And Richborough Estates, which are the next party in the list. But I probably deal with them together. Okay, so I have the same representation.

00:34:42:12 - 00:35:18:05

Um, in relation to John Collins and Richborough Estates, we have we issued heads of terms, um, and the their agent has not engaged with us, um, to a point that we've been to visit John Collins, um, and to understand his position in relation to the scheme. Um, and we now understand that he's going to engage with his agent to progress matters. Um, their objection cited that the heads of terms would stop them objecting to the scheme.

00:35:18:11 - 00:35:33:09

Um, as to clarify, that clause has been changed in the heads of terms throughout Suffolk and Kent, so that it now reflects a more up to date position, which is just in relation to the use of compulsory acquisition powers on the ground. Toseland.

00:35:34:12 - 00:35:42:06

Yeah. No, that's that's helpful because people still object to the scheme. But yes, it's the objection in terms of CA and TP that we're concerned about.

00:36:06:16 - 00:36:24:07

But just minister on behalf of the applicant. The next one I have is Andrew Johnson as an administrator to the estate of Michael Cotton Garrett, um, which also encompasses Quex Park Estates. Um, I understand that the objection.

00:36:26:25 - 00:37:07:01

Uh, relates to consultation with them. Um, and also the fact that on their land, the cables are overhead lines rather than underground cables. Um, I think the project has addressed the queries in relation to the, um, underground stuff, uh, in underground and overhead elements. Um, the applicant's agent continues to engage with the landowners agent, um, most recently, in relation to the use of white House drove and the vehicle movements along the, um, we've been in email correspondence throughout January with the applicants.

00:37:07:03 - 00:37:08:03

The landowners agent.

00:37:08:05 - 00:37:08:24

Sorry

00:37:10:17 - 00:37:19:20

again. If that could be updating the shadow negotiations. It's useful to know what discussions are occurring. In particular using the use of white House. Drove.

00:37:27:15 - 00:37:53:29

The applicant and the Marquess of Conyngham. Um. They have submitted a relevant representation. However, I think it was just to state that they had an interest in specific land parcels. Um, we continue to negotiate with that agent. There has been a probate claim going on. Um, however, we've had indication from the agent that they're happy with the terms that we've put forward at this stage.

00:38:09:23 - 00:38:10:17

Um, the next.

00:38:10:19 - 00:38:24:06

So I just on that one. So in terms of timescales for getting some sort of agreement and also for them hopefully removing their objection, withdrawing their objection. Do you know, give me some ideas in terms of the examination timetable.

00:38:25:11 - 00:38:31:06

Um, it's hard to say with the probate issue, um, as we don't know when that will be settled.

00:38:34:21 - 00:38:41:29

Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. I think in that circumstance, what we would like to do is try and get an agreement in principle, subject to the grant of probate.

00:38:42:23 - 00:38:51:21

That that'd be really helpful. Anything I can get so that we can say this will move on will be helpful to the Secretary of State, so they know what's what's occurring with those plots. Thanks.

00:38:58:21 - 00:39:10:16

Giles. Minister, on behalf of the applicant, um, Ian, Peter Alan Smith, um, is in relation to the Kent Temporary Construction compound. And

00:39:12:02 - 00:39:16:07

whilst I'm not sure if they've their objection.

00:39:16:20 - 00:39:30:13

Again, I think that Ian Smith objected as part of the Marsh farmer representation, but again also requested to be heard at a compulsory acquisition hearing. So that's why I'm considering, um, his objection.

00:39:32:28 - 00:40:03:02

Jackie said on behalf of the applicant, we're aware that this particular landowner has got some, um, alternative development considerations, and we're looking to work with them to understand the time frame for that development, because our understanding is the two things can coexist or happen sequentially. So we're not looking to extinguish their development opportunity. The compound is temporary possession. Once we're constructed, we'll be out of the area. So we would expect to clarify those timelines.

00:40:03:04 - 00:40:06:25

Um, certainly for the next update of the the tracker.

00:40:08:00 - 00:40:08:24

Thank you.

00:40:33:29 - 00:40:58:15

Jasmine listed for the applicant. If we move to Nicholas John's Dutch field and understand that the objection talks about impact on residential amenity. Um, we have arranged a meeting with the landowner and their agent for the 23rd of February and will take the appropriate, um, people from National Grid to discuss those points in relation to their objection.

00:40:59:06 - 00:41:09:02

Yes. Because I notice from the latest schedule negotiations, A meeting was requested on the 18th of November. I assume nothing's happened since then.

00:41:09:14 - 00:41:39:08

We have been in in correspondence and phone calls, emails with the landowners agent who asked for a number of people in Suffolk. So we have been negotiating the template terms with the agent, and now we're looking to bespoke those to each landowner where we can for the for that agents, landowners. We've also got a separate meeting with the agent on the 12th of February to finalize any outstanding queries in relation to the heads of terms.

00:41:39:10 - 00:41:44:13

And what's the likelihood of getting agreement during the examination?

00:41:47:25 - 00:41:48:21

So it's likely.

00:41:49:09 - 00:41:51:03

Okay. Thank you.

00:42:03:15 - 00:42:05:27

The minister on behalf of the applicant.

00:42:11:18 - 00:42:14:13

Um, James Henry Rogers.

00:42:19:25 - 00:42:29:14

Um, we've held various meetings with Mr. Rogers and his agent. His primary concerns are in relation to overlapping developments and, um,

00:42:31:00 - 00:42:42:05

in relation to an option he has with a battery storage site. Um, and how that will overlap with the cable limits of deviation in this area.

00:42:43:21 - 00:42:49:02

And again, what's the likelihood of this being resolved during this examination.

00:42:50:24 - 00:43:10:28

Jack, is that on behalf of the applicant, I think there's a little bit more to do to again, understand the timelines and how far their alternative developments progressed so we can. I mean, the ultimate aim is to look for coexistence, but we just need to understand a bit more about the parameters of their development. We'll absolutely work towards getting agreement before the end of examination, but I think in this instance we wouldn't guarantee it.

00:43:12:12 - 00:43:22:24

Okay. Thank you. And again, if that extra detail can be added to the schedule negotiations, it's really helpful for me to understand why it's what the issues are and why it's potentially being delayed.

00:43:31:27 - 00:44:04:14

Jasmine is the applicant, William Scott Estates Limited, the applicant have been working with the landowner to agree the principles of the rights that we're seeking in relation to the access road and the mitigation areas, as well as the permanent compound. Um, we're looking to issue, um, kind of final terms, which should address the outstanding concerns in relation to retained access and access across the permanent easement, if possible.

00:44:05:00 - 00:44:10:09

So we're looking to issue those within the next week in order to finalize the agreements.

00:44:11:19 - 00:44:13:11

Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

00:44:30:03 - 00:44:57:18

Uh, Minister, on behalf of the applicant, Michael Mahoney, um, obviously, the summary of negotiations states that National Grid proposed to rely on their existing rights, which is still the case. However, we are looking to, um, meet with Mr. Mahoney in the coming weeks to discuss the works that are required to the existing towers and, um, you know, the timescales for those?

00:44:58:16 - 00:45:10:10

Yeah. Thank you. Could you just explain a bit more? Um, because I've noticed on a few of them about you've got existing rights, so you don't need to do voluntary turns. You just give me a bit of background to that, just to explain it in detail.

00:45:10:19 - 00:45:45:06

Jack, is that on behalf of the applicant? Um, so this particular plot here, um, sits underneath an existing overhead line that we're looking to turn into the new substation to make the connection. So there is a deed of easement that covers that line already, and it does permit a degree of maintenance and repair work to it. The element that affects Mr. Martin is, if I'm right, James is actually just something that we would look to, um, get access back to the next tower, which the current deed does already permit. And we've left the option in there to, um, effectively negotiate an update to that deed if Mr.

00:45:45:08 - 00:46:08:07

Mahony would like. But we're confident we can do the works under the existing the rights as they are. And I think the other thing that we were considering when putting the application together is, Um, trying to give a picture of all of the work that's needed to develop this project rather than bits of it. So just because we've got an existing right, we didn't think it was appropriate not to show it as part of the development.

00:46:09:27 - 00:46:16:09

Yeah. No. Thank you. Thank you for explaining that. Okay. Can move on to the next person, please.

00:46:19:06 - 00:46:50:04

Jasmine Lister for the applicant. Um, in relation to Lindsay, Peter Tomlinson, um, we, the applicants agent, have been working with the landowners agent to agree to template terms. We are still looking to arrange a meeting with the landowner who does not live at this address. Um, so it's been more difficult to arrange a face to face meeting with them. Um, however, the applicants agent are meeting with the landowners agent on the 12th of February to hopefully agree.

00:46:50:06 - 00:46:51:09

Heads of terms.

00:47:18:13 - 00:47:48:27

The applicant. The next one was Andrew Michael Heald. Um, the objection or relevant rep did not specifically state any land matters. Um, historically, we've had limited engagement from that agent. However, before Christmas, their agent wrote to the applicant's agent to explain they wish to engage in the heads of terms negotiations. And we held an initial meeting. Teams meeting with their agent on the 14th of January.

00:47:48:29 - 00:47:50:28

And we've followed up with them since.

00:47:55:20 - 00:48:05:03

So just from the meeting on the 14th of January, um, is there a likelihood of getting agreement in terms of this, these plots? Yes. Yeah.

00:48:24:08 - 00:48:34:20

So I, I noticed for Simon Fulford and also for Nicola Fulford, um, again, you're saying you want to rely on existing rights. Is that the same reason as Mr. Mahony.

00:48:34:29 - 00:48:37:16

Is that on behalf of the applicant? Yes. Same principle.

00:48:39:12 - 00:48:44:21

Is there anything else that you have been discussing with the forwards in terms of negotiations?

00:48:46:24 - 00:48:48:27

Does the applicant know?

00:48:54:05 - 00:49:28:19

Jasmine Lester on behalf of the applicant, Blackheath Farms limited their relevant sites. Mostly practical matters in relation to the farming enterprise and the applicant agent have had numerous meetings with Blackheath to agree um practical matters within the heads of terms, but also accommodation measures for construction. We have a meeting with the agent for Blackheath Farms on the 4th of February, and we understand that the agent has sent the heads of terms to their client and the recommendation.

00:49:51:22 - 00:49:54:27

Minister on behalf of the applicant and Robert Nicoll.

00:49:56:20 - 00:50:28:02

His objections talk about the impact on agricultural land and drainage, and we have been working with his agent and he will do links to Caroline Nicoll and Glenda Edmonds. Um, we've been in discussions with that agent for a number of months. Um, in relation to the commercial of the offer that National Grid are making. Um, again, we're meeting with that agent on the 12th of February, and we're expecting before that date something came writing in relation to the commercial terms.

00:50:29:06 - 00:50:46:28

So again, that sounds positive in terms of getting some sort of agreement between the dissemination with all the parties that are potentially you get agreement with, if you can remind them to withdraw their objection from the examination, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

00:51:17:07 - 00:51:18:22

On behalf of the applicant.

00:51:22:04 - 00:51:55:17

Um, I understand. Suffolk Council have an outstanding objection in relation to project need. Um, alternative locations and cumulative impact. Um, the applicant's agent has been in correspondence with East Suffolk Council. Um, in relation to the heads of terms um for um since February 2025. Um and Suffolk Council informed the applicant of appointing an agent in October 2025, and the applicant's agent held an initial meeting on the 4th of December.

00:51:55:19 - 00:52:06:24

Teams meeting with with their agent um. The applicant agent has followed up with various clarifications and queries, and we're awaiting substantial feedback on the heads of terms.

00:52:08:09 - 00:52:17:03

So I understand Mister Westmoreland, uh, Smith is online, um, which is only if you'd like to comment on this point.

00:52:19:03 - 00:52:49:03

Uh, thank you. Mark Western and Smith Casey for East Suffolk, uh, Council. Um, that is, uh, right. We're in active negotiations and they're being conducted by the respective parties, land agents, as you would expect. Um, issues have narrowed since the first issue of the heads of terms. Um, but there remain a number of issues that need further resolution.

00:52:49:21 - 00:53:39:18

Um, to give you a flavor. We are concerned about the extent of the right sort as compared to the development proposed across the plots in question, which are up on the screen. Um, because what's proposed is HD, but the rights, um, rather reflect a cut and fill, um, approach to laying the cable. So there are discussions and there are further issues that you don't need to be troubled with. Um, at this time, I think for your purposes now, um, you just need to understand that negotiations, uh, are ongoing, and we think with a degree of flexibility from the applicant, uh, agreement ought to be able to be reached within the examination timetable.

00:53:40:04 - 00:53:40:28

Thank you.

00:53:42:00 - 00:53:46:21

Thank you. That's very helpful. Okay. We can move on.

00:53:52:23 - 00:53:58:06

Charles, Minister, on behalf of the applicant. The next I've got is the RSPB.

00:54:01:23 - 00:54:23:05

I understand the objections are in relation to most environmental concerns. The applicant's agent have had ongoing meetings and dialogue in relation to heads of terms for the rights being sought. Um, most recent correspondence in the last week. Um, we think it is likely that we will reach agreement.

00:54:43:17 - 00:55:02:16

Gentlemen. On behalf of the applicant in relation to Ian Charles. Rex. Um, I think David Rex highlighted earlier there's a number of, um, outstanding issues that we need to work through with them. Um, however, we're, you know, open to doing so and looking to set up a meeting with them via their agent as soon as possible.

00:55:03:02 - 00:55:10:10

Yes, I know it did say there was going to be an age meeting in early January. I assume the meeting hasn't occurred yet. Uh.

00:55:10:18 - 00:55:17:20

We haven't met with them face to face, but I've had various. We've had various phone calls with both Ian, Rex, David, Rex and their agents.

00:55:18:00 - 00:55:18:18

Okay.

00:55:21:15 - 00:55:30:18

Um, would Mr. David Ritz like to raise anything else in terms of any of the other plots, um, that are affected that we haven't already discussed?

00:55:31:05 - 00:55:55:02

Um, well, there's ones I want to discuss later today. Um. Ah. 193194199 and 1-1 hundred. Um, a lot. If we could do that today, that'd be fantastic. Um, yeah. And just a point on the meeting. Nothing has been put in the diary as far as am I. So, um. Yeah. So that's progress. We.

00:55:57:21 - 00:56:17:25

Okay. I mean, if you if, um, there is an action point with the applicant to progress these discussions and to set up a meeting ASAP. And if you'd like to, um, just briefly, because we don't need to go into detail the discussions that you should be having with the applicant. But if you just want to briefly highlight your issues with those plots that you mentioned, uh, so that I have an understanding.

00:56:18:12 - 00:56:56:07

Uh, those plots there. Um, so the plots there basically. So we're already losing a large amount of land that is that we utilize for our Christmas tree business that we operate at the farm. Um, the land that we use, it's got to be it's a certain soil type which produces the best trees. And we are at the limit of what we can use. So we're effectively having a whole swathe of land being sterilised by sealing, putting the cables through, because according to them, we're never going to be allowed to plant Christmas trees above that land again, where the cable roots are cutting, they're cutting, and they're coming straight through the middle.

00:56:56:09 - 00:57:28:19

They then want to take 18m where we are utilising at the moment for tree planting. They want to take 18m in terms of mitigation to plant a hedge, but in our opinion personally we can't see the need for screening there. One because the only thing you're screening is trees and a hedge at the top of the hill. This part of the land sits within the low um and also 18m for a hedge. To me seems very excessive when we've got plenty on the farm that are only 2 or 3m.

00:57:28:21 - 00:58:01:12

So why they one need to take 18m and two um, what are they even screening? And considering how much land we're really losing, they're already losing the effect to our business. It's just seems unnecessary. Excessive. And if you actually stand in where they want to put the screening, it's at the bottom of a hill. The whole load of trees on top of it. What is the nature of the screening that they're actually trying to achieve? Or like a lot of the things, I don't know if it's just trying to get more tree planting wherever they can to hit their objectives or whatever.

00:58:01:14 - 00:58:14:06

But, um, I don't really understand it, but it seems to be because like the road which I brought up earlier, they want a tree plant along the side of that. I can't understand the need for for all of this when it really genuinely affects us as a family and a business.

00:58:16:01 - 00:58:39:25

Thank you. Thank you for the, um, the information on that. Um, so the action is on the applicant to arrange a meeting with yourselves to discuss these issues. Um, and then I'd like, um, a sort of a full detail, um, information on what happened in that, that meeting and in terms of what the what the concerns are on on the mister exercise, just so I can understand what what the, um, The ashes. Ah, that would be really helpful.

00:58:42:23 - 00:58:43:14

I think.

00:58:43:16 - 00:58:45:13

Um, sorry for the applicant. I think this leader.

00:58:45:15 - 00:58:46:00

Can give a.

00:58:46:02 - 00:58:52:02

Very brief, um, update for you now, if that's helpful. Hi, Annie. Leader for the.

00:58:52:04 - 00:58:52:21

Applicant.

00:58:52:23 - 00:59:26:20

Um, I mean, just to clarify, we have had a number of teams meetings on this issue and particularly along the hedge that's been discussed. And to provide reassurance this is essential landscape mitigation. Um, it is detailed in the Olymp. Um, and it is, you know, it has evolved through negotiations with the likes of the local planning authority. And the reason that there is a significant width in this area is because there is also a highways drainage ditch in this area, and there needs to be access to that drainage ditch.

00:59:26:22 - 00:59:58:04

And this is actually something that was pointed out to us by the landowner, um, that there was a need to make sure that this ditch, um, was maintained for the safety of highways users, and also for the drainage of the site itself. And then we also have the tree planting, and we need the space to maintain that tree planting. And so once you put those things in, that's where you get to this space. We have looked to minimize that as narrow as we possibly can, recognizing, of course, the impact on their business.

00:59:58:06 - 01:00:04:08

But we feel that the rights we're seeking are necessary and proportional and the minimum we can have in this area.

01:00:05:04 - 01:00:10:18

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, Mister VIX, would you like to say anything in response to that now?

01:00:12:05 - 01:00:44:05

Um, at the moment. Well we have had um, we have had meetings where plenty of meetings, um, about this, but yeah, it, the whole thing is, is frustration, as we were assured by Sealink representatives both from National Grid and Alcohol McLaren, that there was not going to be this hedge and it would be taken out. And then it it got put in, got made wider, more aggressive and worse for us as a business, but it's just the need for it. But when we were assured it was to be taken out.

01:00:44:07 - 01:01:16:18

Um, it's yeah, it's quite frustrating to have it more and we're always going to disagree on that. It is being essential. But I mean you're more than welcome to come out. I'll show you where it is. I think most people and every single National Grid representative, apart from the people who designed the landscape mitigation, everyone has said to us privately or at the meeting in there and said they cannot get their head around it. It's just it seems to be one of those things. But there are people from National Grid, um, people that sat in that room.

01:01:17:13 - 01:01:17:28

Yeah.

01:01:18:25 - 01:01:40:12

Okay. Thank you. Um, if you're completely welcome to submit, uh, representation at any point, supplying more detail in terms of your concerns about compulsory acquisition of your land and giving more detail as to why you're Objecting. If you want to submit that into the examination. Then I can use that when I'm looking at what the applicants are saying in that location.

01:01:44:19 - 01:01:46:01

Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

01:01:48:11 - 01:01:50:07

Okay. Moving on.

01:01:56:17 - 01:02:05:01

Minister for the applicant, the next on the list we've got is, um, the personal representatives to the estate of Terrence Jones. However,

01:02:06:18 - 01:02:14:11

uh, I understand the objection as is in relation to cumulative impacts of the project, um,

01:02:16:06 - 01:02:37:07

and impacts on local communities. Um, in relation to the heads of terms we've had ongoing. Um, the applicant's agent has had ongoing communications with the landowners agent. We have a provisional date for a meeting on the 11th of February, and a follow up meeting with the agent on the 12th of February, um, in order to progress the heads of terms negotiations.

01:02:38:03 - 01:02:45:10

So is this another one where they're objecting to the scheme in principle rather than objecting to CAA? Okay. Thank you.

01:02:55:28 - 01:03:00:21

Minister for the applicant. The next is Obra Golf Club Limited. Um,

01:03:02:14 - 01:03:34:18

again, the golf club. Relevant reps are in relation to the need for the project and the routing of the cable and landfall site. Um, rather than specific CA points. However, we have had ongoing negotiations with the golf club and that agent. We are meeting with them on the 29th of January. Um, in relation to the heads of terms, discussions have been sent around the golf course extension and their development of a reservoir and how the projects can coexist.

01:03:35:13 - 01:03:38:14

Okay. And again, the likelihood of this being agreed.

01:03:40:25 - 01:03:41:10

Uh.

01:03:41:26 - 01:03:52:05

We think it's likely that we would reach an agreement in principle. However, we have to allow for the membership of the golf club and whether their sign off is required.

01:03:53:19 - 01:04:11:26

James Brooking, on behalf, the applicant should make the point that we changed the cable route ever so slightly around the golf course as a new development, and we are looking to work with them on the development of their new reservoir, which they require because of EU rules on extraction of water. So we have been working very closely with them for the last 3 to 4 years.

01:04:12:27 - 01:04:19:01

Okay. Again, if that detail could be added into the schedule negotiations, that would be helpful. Thank you.

01:04:20:06 - 01:04:28:06

Jasmine, I still have the applicant. Um, I believe that's the end of my list. I don't know if you have any others that we've missed off.

01:04:29:11 - 01:05:05:22

I have got ScottishPower renewables on the list. Um, and I know we have a representative here for ScottishPower renewables, so I don't know whether you want to give an update on negotiations with them. Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. We have been talking to ScottishPower for quite some time and as you be aware, they've relatively recently exercised their options and we've updated our book of reference and land rights tracker on the back of that. We are in discussion in relation to the land rights required, and I would expect to reach an agreement by the end of examination.

01:05:08:22 - 01:05:13:22

But Mr. Evans from ScottishPower renewables like to comment on this point.

01:05:14:08 - 01:05:57:07

Yes. Um, yes. On behalf of ScottishPower renewables. Um, I think I have a good deal with the first point. It is absolutely correct that, uh, the relevant project companies, uh, have been exercising options to acquire land in the vicinity of the proposed Kilmaine substations. And that has been proceeding apace. Um, the current land plans do not reflect the extent of ownership that exists at the current time. We have been sharing information with the applicant, and we've just received back a shapefile, which is an updated version of that land ownership, and we would anticipate that that will be updated at the next deadline.

01:05:57:17 - 01:06:28:19

Um, in terms of anticipated, there are likely to be further purchases in the vicinity of Kiln Lane, uh, to finalise the necessary, um, land, uh, to construct this substation and ancillary, um, development in terms of, uh, where we are with the applicant. Uh, clearly one of the issues is they seek to acquire by compulsory purchase.

01:06:28:21 - 01:06:59:12

Large areas of the land which, um, the project companies have just purchased. Um, that clearly is an issue. Um, for a party that's, uh, currently embarking upon the construction of an onset in terms of of where that leads us to is, um, the next stage in the process, as we outlined at the outset of this examination, is there's likely to be a transfer of the benefits of the East Anglia to order to the applicant.

01:06:59:14 - 01:07:33:22

And through that mechanism, uh, they will be given the rights to be able to construct the National grid substation. And that will be essentially the process whereby the necessary rights, um, can be acquired by the applicant in relation of carrying out those works. Um, and I can say that we have started that process with the applicant, uh, and in the context of, uh, uh, the process we have at the start of the first draft of one of the elements, key elements of the transfer documentation that's already been exchanged.

01:07:33:24 - 01:08:12:26

So in terms of this examination, one of the key issues will be the extent to which that documentation can be completed. Because if it is, then a lot of the compulsory acquisition powers will potentially become redundant. And in that context, whether we complete it now during the examination or in the immediate aftermath, um, there may well need to be provision within the degree within the DCO to allow the falling off of compulsory purchase rights where they're no longer necessary.

01:08:12:28 - 01:08:52:12

So that really deals with the fairly extensive land holdings at substation. And as I say, we are already commenced the mechanism for resolving issues associated with that. There is also, however, a cable crossing and and that's reflected in the land plans at plots three, backslash 23, backslash 21 and three, backslash 22. And in the context of those particular plots, um, we have the option to acquire rights in them.

01:08:52:14 - 01:09:34:06

And there is a restriction on title that currently is not reflected in the book of reference. Now, insofar as that particular location is concerned, uh, it will effectively be a location where essentially the, our project companies, um, uh, quick, quick collection cables will be crossed by the internet cables. Um, and that will require a separate type of resolution, either through protective provisions in the Development Consent order, or alternatively by the entering into of a crossing agreement.

01:09:34:08 - 01:10:14:03

But as I say in the first instance, will obviously seek to ensure that book of references are correctly updated to reflect those title interests. But I've also, within the submission, sought to identify where this is going, because I know you've got other topics in the agenda, but largely speaking, I was hoping to really have set them out now in the sense of that we are actually undertaken under, um, item four of your agenda, but I've set out here where this is likely to lead, um, either in the context of the transfer of benefits or protective provisions and protective provisions in relation to the crossing of the cables, so that that's an update of where we are.

01:10:14:08 - 01:10:36:21

And I appreciate the applicant to some extent. There has been a slight element of moving feast in the sense of, uh, the plots being acquired, but we are exchanging information effectively with the applicant on a regular basis to ensure that the information that you have is as up to date as it can be at the respective points of time. Thank you.

01:10:37:04 - 01:10:44:25

Thank you. That was very helpful. Is there anything the applicant would like to add against this? Yes, Miss Lida.

01:10:45:17 - 01:11:16:15

I am Alida for the applicant. Um, it's just to say that we absolutely agree. Obviously, we're working in the background to seek agreement. And, you know, effectively. Are you voluntary acquisition, as we are with lots of landowners? Um, the compulsory acquisition position is always a fallback, as it is in this case. And we would only exercise those compulsory acquisition rights if we don't have a voluntary negotiation in that way. The SPR negotiation is the same as it is with other landowners.

01:11:16:21 - 01:11:34:19

And so what we would seek is in those those separate agreements, we would agree not to exercise our compulsory acquisition rights if we have that agreement by negotiation. So we wouldn't propose any changes to our development consent order. It's just that we would agree separately not to exercise those rights.

01:11:36:27 - 01:12:07:00

Thank you. Um, I just want to raise there's a few parties that I have listed that aren't in the statement of negotiation. Should be in negotiations. They aren't in the landmarks tracker, but they have put in objections and they are in the book of reference. So if I could just go through these people now and just try and clarify the reasons why they're not, um, in the negotiations. So the first person I've got is Amyas Peto. Um, a number of plots in Suffolk.

01:12:08:02 - 01:12:40:06

Um, they only come up in the land rights tracker in a tab called table. Comparison of changes. I'm not sure what that is. Um, there are The relevant map, specifically objects to the impact on the value of their property. Um, have you got anything on that party that you could, um. Enlighten me? Uh, sorry for the applicant. I'm going to ask Miss Lister over there, and, uh, if not, we will. We will check and find out and give you a comprehensive response. But I'll just ask her in case she's got a got something she can say.

01:12:41:26 - 01:12:56:06

Uh, Jasmine Lister for the applicant. Um, let's just say I am aware of that person, um, and their location in relation to the scheme. Um, I can't answer why they're not in the relevant documents, but that's something that we can take away.

01:12:56:08 - 01:13:22:28

Okay. That's. That's fine. Um, the next person I have is Steven and Shireen Roberts, again, plots in Suffolk. Um, they have put in a relevant representation, although it is just a general objection to the scheme. But again, they're not in the negotiations and they're not in the land rights tracker. Um, someone else. You could just look up and and find out what's what's what's happening.

01:13:26:17 - 01:13:55:13

Uh, Sarah Shaked with the applicant. Yes. I mean, I think the same applies here. We will do that for all of the parties that you're mentioning now. Um, unless we've got something very, um, substantive to say. Okay. Um. Um, the next person is Eric Collins. Um, interesting. Some Kent plots. Um, again, not in decision negotiations or landmarks. Tracker. Um, Mr. Collins requested to be heard as coherent, which is why I'm considering his objection. Um.

01:14:00:00 - 01:14:18:22

James Booker, on behalf of the applicant, we did meet with Eric Collins, um, this week on last week, um, and discussed the proposal of works. Um, which is generally, um, trimming of hedges that overhang the access road adjacent to his property. And we continue to have conversations with him.

01:14:20:26 - 01:14:52:29

And if he could be added to the negotiations. Thank you. Um, then I've got Hilda, Mary Cheston. Um, Suffolk plot three one. Um, this one's a bit difficult because. Not in negotiations, not in the clean version of the book of reference, but is in the tracked version of the book of reference, um, and is in the landmarks tracker in the table comparison of changes. So I don't know whether it's someone that should be taken out or taken in or again, that needs to check in.

01:14:53:01 - 01:15:12:27

Sara Sheikh, the applicant, we will take that away and reconcile where that's meant to sit. Um, and then next is Jane Taylor and that's Suffolk plot five, slash three. Um, I think her concern was about her property being now blighted and can't be sold. Um, so, again, if you could check, check that party.

01:15:14:26 - 01:15:30:20

Um, I've got Karen Collins, and I'm just checking. It's the same plots as Eric Collins. So, again, request to be heard. Um, so needs to be added to the schedule negotiations.

01:15:32:09 - 01:16:04:07

Um, next is Manston Thorne Limited. Um, I understand they're looking for some sort of protective provisions. Um, they they're saying maybe they need heads of terms. They are in the landmarks tracker, but they're not in such negotiations. Have you got any updates on on that party? Yeah. Jackie's on behalf of the applicant. Yes. Um, we had a meeting with Manston, Thorne and that representatives. Um, I think it was just before Christmas. Um, there's two matters going on there.

01:16:04:09 - 01:16:37:11

One is they own an easement for the benefit of an export cable. But that export cable has since been adopted by UK pm. So we anticipate that being covered in the UK PM protected provisions. I think there's been a slight misunderstanding in terms of what would happen and whose responsibility the operation of that cable is, because their principal concern was outages during that call. So we're thinking the initial term, we've alleviated any concerns, put them in touch with the right people at UK PM, but they do still own an easement for that for those cables, even though they're not operating it.

01:16:37:16 - 01:17:04:05

We think the rights that we're looking for over those plots are completely compatible with that easement, so there's no material effect being imposed by Sealink. Okay. So you mentioned protective provisions. Are you thinking that there's going to be some sort of bespoke protective provisions or is just covered by the the standard ones? Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. The protective provisions that we're negotiating with UK currently would, would cover that arrangement, as far as I understand.

01:17:12:25 - 01:17:37:19

Um, the next person I have on the list is Pippa Severn, um, tenant occupier for a number of Kemp plots. Um also requested to attend today. Um, but told us at last minute that she can she can come. Um, again not in the statement of reasons is in the land rights tracker, though. Um, and her objections are generally to just generally to the scheme. But I know she's she's a farmer. I think it's

01:17:39:04 - 01:17:44:20

coming from the name, but thank you. Um, is there any update on negotiations with Mrs..

01:17:56:26 - 01:18:32:12

Minister for the applicant? Um, the applicant agent has been engaging with Miss Southern, um, since the start of the project. Um, most recently had meetings with her on the 21st of January and on the 15th of January to discuss ongoing concerns in relation to the project. As you've stated, her objections are kind of project wide rather than compulsory acquisition. Um, the applicant is negotiating heads of terms with the freeholder of the land. Um, and we are looking at an occupied consent agreement with New Zealand.

01:18:33:25 - 01:19:07:21

Thank you. Jackie stood up on behalf of the applicant. If I can just add to that, the premise of the agreements that we're seeking is that in the vast majority of cases, the landowner gets the consent of

their occupiers to sign them to the agreement. We have 1 or 2 instances where the landowners have expressed that they would prefer not to do that, and we engage separately. What we've got to be careful to do in that situation is not undermine the landowner agreement with the occupiers, so they kind of have to flow in sequence. So we just need to get the land on a boxed off first with that one before we can issue detailed terms.

01:19:09:19 - 01:19:38:27

Thank you. Um, next people I have is Roger, um, and Wendy Skinner. Um, plots in Suffolk. Um, they talk about a grade two listed property that they have that they feel will be blighted by urban noise and light pollution. Um, again, they're not in the statement of reasons that statement schedule negotiations or the land rights tracker. I just another one for your list to to check unless you know any update now.

01:19:42:04 - 01:19:44:24

Sarah Shaikh for the applicant. We want for us to check

01:19:46:13 - 01:19:46:28

uh.

01:19:47:14 - 01:20:10:18

The last two. So I've got stat Craft UK limited. Um, they are in the, um, they're not in the tracker or the negotiations, and they did put a relevant representation out and there seems to be some sort of they've got a concern of a conflict between land that they've got an interest in and land on this project. Has there been negotiations?

01:20:15:29 - 01:20:35:15

Jackie set out on behalf of the applicant. We're aware of the London trust that StarCraft had, but haven't managed to get a meeting set up yet with anybody to discuss the the impact. At this moment in time, we're not aware of their project timelines. Again, it's a case of understanding whether the two things can can be compatible or not.

01:20:38:19 - 01:20:59:18

Okay. And then finally, I've got Steven Roberts, uh, with interests in Suffolk plots. Um, not in the limelight, not in the negotiations. Um, has put in another rep, but it is a general objection to the scheme. But just to cover our base, I need to make sure that, um, that they don't have any outstanding objection.

01:20:59:24 - 01:21:02:23

Sara Sheikh for the applicant. That's one will take away with us.

01:21:04:14 - 01:21:35:11

Um, is there any reason why these people have been missed from the shutdown negotiations. Jackie said on behalf of the applicant. Um, straightforwardly, yes. So I think the vast majority of the people that you've highlighted, there are either a category two or a category three interest within the book of reference. We're not seeking to acquire any land rights from them specifically, but recognize they may well have a compensatory interest. Um, so certainly those with rights in respect of services, for example, private water supplies, etc.,

01:21:35:13 - 01:21:49:22

we're not looking to interfere with any of those rights or extinguish them and, you know, would ensure those services remain. Um, I think the matter of compensation is something to be addressed at a later date when we understand what the impact is.

01:21:52:29 - 01:21:53:15

Thank you.

01:21:53:17 - 01:21:55:03

That's helpful.

01:21:59:00 - 01:22:31:08

And so those are the specific questions that I had. I mean, obviously in response to all the, Um, all the issues. Just need to you need to keep proactively working to try and resolve any outstanding issues. Um, and as you've said in the first instance, land should be acquired voluntarily rather than going through a process. And so I just want to move on to item 2.4 before we finish for lunch to see if there's any other affected persons who want to raise any outstanding concerns that we haven't already discussed in the specific discussion that we've just had under item 2.3.

01:22:34:03 - 01:23:05:16

Okay. I see, uh, so hand number one has got the initial stage. I'm sorry, I can't see full names. If you'd like to turn your camera on and, uh, and let me know what your, um, concern is. Uh, it's Councillor Becky Wing. I'm really sorry. Uh, apologies. I'm trying to jump in on the on the on the, uh. I'm Kent, I'm the Kent area. I'm trying to jump in on the Save Mr. Marsh's video that you asked for responses, and I didn't. I had to email, uh, uh, the Planning Inspectorate last night because I still hadn't got an invite.

01:23:05:18 - 01:23:38:19

So, and I'm not quite sure the rules around this meeting, because last time I just had a slot to speak and now it seems you can engage. So if you're so, so just just like, you know, apologies if you didn't get your invite early. We did get the video and we have looked at it in terms of mince and marshes. This meeting is specifically talking about, um, the effects for compulsory acquisition and temporary possession on specific plots of land. At that point, you did ask for any comments in relation to that, and I do. I sit on the board of Save Mr. Marsh's because I missed that, because I wasn't quite sure how I could operate.

01:23:38:21 - 01:24:09:03

Can I just have two minutes now? Is that okay? Of course you can. Thank you. So I say on planning, I'm a district councillor, and one of the things I want to bring up is cumulative impact and also flooding. I was lucky enough to get to visit the site, visit the marshes in a four wheel drive vehicle at the weekend. Uh, actually last week and it is extremely wet. And one of the things that I don't understand is how the attenuation tanks are going to work. When the when the, when the water table is extremely high.

01:24:09:14 - 01:24:40:00

Lots of other developments in the area, including the large best plant started with suds. And now they've had to go to discharging into the Stour River. So one of the concerns I really have is councillor, I think if this this sounds like it's, it's things that should be discussed that the issue specific hearing that starts tomorrow, because that's where we have the technical experts who can talk about flooding and water environment. Um, and I don't want to, you know, waste your time talking about things now that you'll want to repeat tomorrow.

01:24:40:02 - 01:25:11:14

Have you got anything specifically in terms of, um, compulsory acquisition of land plots, in terms of our rights are being taken? Uh, I mean, I, I, I obviously am concerned about the hover port and the lack of transparency about why they actually need to compulsorily purchase it and the impact, the massive environmental impact. Uh, again, uh, you know, people work. I've got to try and get to work this afternoon. So it would have been really useful if we'd have been allocated a time that we could have managed our work life around.

01:25:11:26 - 01:25:42:07

Uh, I will try and attend tomorrow, but it's really difficult to manage your time. We're not paid money to be here. People are paid money to be here. We're just lay people. So, so, so because this hearing is mainly for affected persons who have land and interest in land, um, with the issue specific hearing tomorrow, we have given an indication of when certain items will be, um, covered. We have obviously a lot to cover, I understand Thursday afternoon we'll be covering sort of the water environment issues. Okay.

01:25:42:20 - 01:25:45:07

And I think, uh, one second.

01:25:48:11 - 01:26:20:22

And then there will probably be discussion on the hopper part tomorrow morning. Okay. Under the ecology and Biodiversity session. But I do appreciate you having to fit this around work. Yeah. So I've I've now got to stop. I've now got to say, I can't attend work tomorrow. And that is. And I think that is an issue that you need to address, because everyday people that want to speak have been hampered by not being able to speak. But cumulative impact is a massive thing. If you take all the projects together and all the people that are affected, uh, it doesn't seem to have been addressed very well.

01:26:21:04 - 01:26:51:15

I would say as well, this is this is predominantly a written process and anything separately writing doesn't have any less weight than what we hear orally. So I would, um, you know, encourage you to put any submissions in writing, especially if you can't attend any hearings to make sure I haven't, I have I have already done that. But I think it's also important for people to speak as well, to have the same access as, as as the applicant has. Uh, otherwise it gets a bit one sided. So. But thank you for your time, I understand. Thank you very much.

01:26:51:28 - 01:26:55:00

Um, next, I have a hand from the initials MK.

01:26:57:08 - 01:27:29:11

Well, madam, that's me again, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. And it was just briefly and we don't need to go into any detail, but just on the, um, affected persons, the county council. There are various plots which rights are sought to be acquired of. It's primarily highways, land or public rights of way land. Um, and we are in, uh, the schedule of negotiations and the land rights tracker and so on.

01:27:29:13 - 01:27:59:11

But the short point is that there have been some, I think, positive discussions between the applicant and the county council in relation to potentially protective provisions, which can be laid alongside, uh, the, uh, works that will be affecting highway assets, uh, of the county council. Those are ongoing negotiations. they are, I'm told, usefully developing.

01:27:59:13 - 01:28:15:23

And it's probably not helpful to you to know anything more than that at this stage. Other than that, there is a process, and the parties are seeking to find a way through that will enable the impact on the county council's highway assets to be adequately safeguarded.

01:28:17:05 - 01:28:24:13

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Bedford, I appreciate that. Um, do we have anyone else who wants to make her comments on item 2.4?

01:28:26:04 - 01:28:50:04

I don't see any more hands. Okay, so in that case, we'll now adjourn for lunch. Um, we'll be back at we'll say five plus two since we're starting a bit later. Um, for those of you watching on the live stream, in order to give clear recording fails, we need to stop the live stream. So when you want to come back on and join, please refresh your browser. Um, to resume watching after the break. So thank you very much.