

## **PINS Deadline 2, 12<sup>th</sup> March 2026**

**From:** Tritton Farming Partnership LLP and its members and related parties, including Lowleys Farm (referred to as “TFP”). Reference Number NTOT-AFP1405 (& Other AFPs)

Additional comments since Deadline 1:

### 1. Open Hearing Responses

In EN020027-001975-8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings National Grid state that Tritton Farming Partnership LLP, its members and related Parties (“TFP”) raised several themes on Pages 43 & 44. However, in addition to those stated TFP, in written submission, raised other points including: Alternatives at Great & Little Waltham, Devaluation of properties, Consultation of Alternatives and Impact of Haul Roads, which are not marked on this report.

TFP notes that in EN020027-001967-8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations, these are included.

### 2. TFP & NG Discussions

Discussions are ongoing between TFP and National Grid (“NG”) to reduce the amount of sterilizations of minerals and housing and reduce the size of the farming disruption on Tritton Farming Partnership LLP, its members and related Parties (“TFP”), while accepting at present this cannot be fully eradicated on the present proposed route. TFP also notes NG comments that it is “committed to continue engagement with Allocated and Candidate mineral sites to ensure impacts are minimized as far as is practicable.” Page 302 of EN020027-001967-8.4.1

TFP’s preferred solution is to re-route to the “Great Waltham Alternative Route”, NG June 2023 or other routes. However, as a last resort TFP would support National Grid Route B over Route A at Lowleys (Tritton Farming Partnership, aka Lions Minerals) on page 31 of National Grid Document: 8.6.1 Deadline 1 Cover Letter (Planning Inspector Reference EN020027). TFP, however, notes that Route B details are insufficient at this stage for TFP to fully comment on and proposed surveys etc. do not include the area of Route B.

### 3. Quiet Lanes / Protected Lanes

NG treats Protected Lanes in the same Environmental report as Quiet Lanes. They are essentially the same if not more important.

NG state, Page 94 EN020027-001967-8.4.1, there are only two instances where “Quiet Lanes are used as a vehicle crossover point between two proposed site access points, to allow construction vehicles to continue along the haul road”. These are Millway Lane and Tye Lane.

However, there are two additional vehicle crossover points over Protected Lanes on TFP land. These are Paulk Hall Lane and Goodmans Lane in Great Leighs. CCC has identified these and a number of other Protected Lanes in their response, none of which have been included in NG analysis.

#### 4. Great Waltham Alternative Route

TFP supports Chelmsford City Council (“CCC”) proposal in their Deadline 1, Feb 2026 representation to move the Route to North of Waltham. Details of this route can be found at page 58, figure 5.13, Indicative alternative route of the Norwich to Tilbury Design Development Report June 2023.

NG quotes on Page 11 of Document - EN020027-001975-8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings: “Whilst noting the respondent’s preference for one of these alternatives, no new factors have been identified, nor new evidence provided or identified, to remove the basis for previous decision making”.

TFP would argue strongly that there are new factors, and NG should combine TFP and Great Waltham issues as the Alternative Route mitigate both. New issues, since 2027 report, include mineral and housing development sterilization, as well as the problems being faced in Great Waltham.

The alternative route has the additional advantages of not crossing the Protected Lane of Goodmans Lane, raised by CCC, and takes the route further away from the River Ter SSSI, which is only 100m away from present route.

TFP would argue that NG’s Alternative Great Waltham Route, reduces compensation, heritage impact, environmental impact and avoiding development making it more Compliant with Holford Rules 1,2 & 7 with ShetI 2003 Clarifications. NG should once again investigate this alternative and its reasons for not choosing it now.

#### 5. Compensation Budget

NG’s Funding statement shows the following (using March 2021 date, as initial date says 2020/21):

- a. Total costs increased from £895m to £1200, an increase of 34%
- b. Compensation increased from £184.9 from £180.2m, an increase of 2.6%
- c. Inflation has increased by 30.6% in this period
- d. In addition, during this time National Grid has discovered many issues such as Dunton Hills, sterilizations, increased property values, Government discounting energy bills for local residents and many other compensation issues.

Therefore, is it correct to believe that compensation has only increased by 2.6% over the last 5 years? If so is that fair?