

As per previous submission:

1. Commenting, we are submitting our concerns at this moment in time. We are currently not objecting, nor supporting, but reserve the right to either further down the road.

2. What your primary reason is for submitting a representation, for example 'air quality'. To ensure the scheme is designed sympathetic way to existing land uses. There are also various other factors we would like you to consider regarding the process to date:

- Engagement - We, along with our agent, have given significant landowner engagement with National Grid (NG) and Fisher German (FG) as NG's agent. We recently reviewed the changed plans and submitted our responses as part of the Landowner Consultation. We have still not received a response to our points (submitted on 29th of July 2025 following an extension due to an incorrect supply of mapping), of which we took time to review and formulate, as well as meeting with FG (and our agent) to discuss this and the planned trenching works. During the Landowner Consultation we were also supplied with numerous incorrect plans and of such a low resolution that we could not view the planned works – this caused us stress and unnecessary time spent trying to obtain the correct maps. The lack of clarity provided us with confusion and a lack of confidence in NG and FG, considering this project will cause us a massive upheaval. We are still awaiting a response to our Consultation points (all of which were simple and manageable requests to allow the Estate to carry on functioning), we have been told this will only be addressed in the DCO – what was the point in all of the landowner engagement to date?
- Impact – the process to date has caused all of those involved a significant amount of work and stress. Considering our responses haven't been responded to this feels disheartening.
- Environmental and Landscape Harm – the proposed works will cause upheaval to the farming operations (during and after construction), and we wish for our representation to be registered in the hope of minimising the farming practices where possible.
- Land drainage – we have briefly discussed land drainage with FG, we wish for the land drains to be left intact, as per the drainage maps we have provided.
- Compaction – we are concerned of the ground compaction and 'mess' the construction works will make. Will this permanently damage the fields? The farming business will likely be affected for years to come, with yields reducing as a result.
- Cable Depth – we suggest a minimum soil cover of 1.2m.
- Management of farm during construction – numerous staff members will/have been required to deliver this scheme to date on the ground. Negotiations, provision of access, farming the surrounding area etc - all of which are labour intensive and time consuming on top of 'normal' day to day activities, and are expected only to get worse in terms of time provisions.
- Heads of Terms – not yet in a position to negotiate, we are awaiting instruction from our agent. The need for a properly designed scheme and suitable HoTs is highly significant.

3. If applicable, please state if you are a statutory undertaker or a statutory consultee or an affected person (someone who is listed as a category 1 or category 2 person in the book of reference). Affected person.

Additional 'have your say' comments:

Pylon Locations :

- It is requested that TB116 be moved as far east as possible, up to the hedged boundary to reduce the impact on farming operations.
- It is requested that pylon TB117 be locate at least 40m from the southern field boundary to allow sufficient space for a sprayer to pass through

Permanent Access Routes – Change Request:

- Plan 1275 – Permanent access route to follow field boundaries, rather than into the field as planned.

BNG :

- We would like to request that the woodland identified for BNG on plan 1275 is removed from the order limits as the estate has no intention or desire to sell the woodland for BNG to National Grid.
- The woodland is used as part of the estate's commercial shoot and is a fundamental drive associated with such.

Solar DCO :

- As you are aware however for the avoidance of doubt, there is an approved DCO for Longfield Solar Farm on the land owned.
- There are therefore third-party rights over such and it is therefore critical we have early engagement between National Grid, LRF & Longfield Solar Farm to minimise the impact on the development

Shooting & Farming Operations:

- The estate runs a commercial shoot whereby the proposals would effect two of the main drives on such, making them potentially unviable.
- It is therefore requested that National Grid, undertake to work with the estate so to avoid the shooting seasons during construction and to minimise the impact on such. This will be to the benefit of both National Grid and the Estate.
- Should this not be undertaken then this will cost National Grid in compensation to the estate for the loss of multiple seasons of shooting over such.
- It should also be undertaken to work with the estate to minimise the impact on the commercial farming operations.