

Dear Sir / Madam,

We write on behalf of our clients, D.N. Grady & Sons Limited, the owners of agricultural land directly affected by the proposed National Grid overhead line route and associated construction works.

These representations are submitted in continuation of earlier correspondence and set out our client's ongoing concerns regarding route justification, engagement failures, procedural clarity, and unresolved technical matters.

#### 1. Impact of the Current Proposed Route

The latest alignment directly affects our client's landholding through the installation of overhead cables and two pylons, one positioned centrally within a field and the other close to the boundary. The proposed arrangement will cause severe and lasting disruption to agricultural operations. Key impacts include:

- Fragmentation of fields and reduced machinery efficiency
- Loss of productive land
- Interference with cropping rotation
- Restrictions on access for large agricultural equipment
- Increased operational time and costs
- Disruption from haul roads, compounds, and utility diversions
- Long term risks to drainage and soil structure
- Permanent constraints on land management practices

These impacts have not been properly assessed, justified, or explained in relation to this specific holding.

#### 2. Lack of Engagement

Our client's principal concerns relate to the location of pylons, haul road, utility diversions, attenuation ponds, and construction compounds. In particular the need for the haul road to divert from the construction corridor.

At an early stage, our client, together with adjoining landowners, expressed a clear preference for an alternative route designed to avoid conflict with a solar farm Option affecting land within the vicinity, including part of the subject holding. (see attached). This alternative does not appear to have been afforded meaningful consideration, and no response has been received providing a rationale or justification for its rejection.

More recently, our client has been directed to public website documents. Given the scale of disruption, matters of this nature require direct dialogue with affected landowners and not general references to extensive, complex documentation. A meeting was held with Fisher German on 24 February 2026, attended by myself. Limited additional detail on the project was provided. As this was the first meaningful contact, our client has not had a reasonable or fair opportunity to consider the proposals or respond in an informed manner.

During the meeting, we discussed several elements of the scheme.

To properly understand the implications of the scheme and its long term impact on the agricultural holding, our client requires detailed and specific technical information. This includes, but is not limited to:

1. Soil Storage, Handling, Reinstatement and Aftercare
2. Field Drainage Strategy and Reinstatement
3. Location, Design and Restoration of Haul Roads
4. Access arrangements agreed with the landowner
5. Attenuation Ponds and Water Infrastructure
6. Flood Risk and Water Management
7. Water mitigation measures
8. Dust, Noise and Crop Quality
9. Noise management
10. Measures to protect crop quality and farm operations
11. Access routes to Order Limits
12. Restrictive Rights and Operational Constraints
13. Full clarity on permanent rights and easements
14. Assurance there are no unnecessary constraints on cultivation depth, drainage, future cropping or land use

Furthermore, our client requires clarity on the proposed mitigation measures to:

- Reduce loss of productive farmland
- Manage short term and long term operational inefficiencies
- Minimise disruption to farm management and viability

To date, none of this information has been provided in sufficient detail.

#### 3. Negotiations on Heads of Terms

Heads of Terms were issued to our client by Fisher German on 31 October 2025. An initial meeting took place on 23 January 2026 to commence negotiations and discuss practical issues arising from the scheme.

Despite that meeting, no feedback, clarification or substantive response has been received. As a result, negotiations remain stalled, and fundamental uncertainties persist.

This continued absence of engagement is causing significant concern. For progress to be made, timely and meaningful communication is essential. We therefore request an urgent update addressing all outstanding matters in full.

#### 4. Conclusion

Our client does not oppose the principle of the project. However, the current route and associated works are:

- unnecessarily damaging,
- insufficiently justified, and
- inadequately explained.

We therefore respectfully request that the Examining Authority require National Grid to:

1. Provide detailed responses to all outstanding technical queries;
2. Give full and proper consideration to the alternative alignment previously submitted;
3. Engage meaningfully with our client on all matters, including agreeing a voluntary agreement and addressing impacts on the farming business.

Given the ongoing concerns and the lack of adequate engagement to date, our client formally requests the opportunity to

make oral representations at the relevant Examination hearings.

Our client remains willing to engage constructively and seeks only to protect the viability and long term sustainability of their farming enterprise.

Yours faithfully,

██████████ MRICS FAAV FALA



Yellow line = suggested new route

Blue = metres above sea level

Purple = National grid proposed route

