

Mr and Mrs Sharp lodged a relevant representation [RR-1170] in which they expressed their objection to the NG proposal.

Mr and Mrs Sharp maintain their objection to the proposed overhead alignment and associated works with particular concern about the works proposed in relation their property and the impact this would have on their specific style/ method of farming operation.

In their relevant representation it was noted that Mr and Mrs Sharp had previously requested to meet with National Grid to discuss the Scheme proposals further, but these discussions stalled as National Grid was unwilling to meet Mr and Mrs Sharp's reasonable meeting costs.

There has been no further attempt by National Grid or its agents to engage with Mr and Mrs Sharp in any meaningful way, despite the fact that; (1) Mr and Mrs Sharp have a significant landholding which is directly impacted by the proposals and which will be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition if the scheme is confirmed; and (2) relevant guidance expects that voluntary negotiations should progress in tandem with the development consent order proposal.

Mr and Mrs Sharp are disappointed by the generic response provided by NG to their original representations [REP2-023]; [RR-1170] raised site-specific concerns and objections - not generic concerns. The points raised require a fact-specific, unique and considered response.

National Grid has not responded to Mr and Mrs Sharp's points individually but has relied on generalised assertions that impacts have already been considered.

However, a generic response, not informed by case-specific assessment or engagement, is inadequate to demonstrate lawful decision-making.

- No meaningful direct engagement has taken place with Mr and Mrs Sharp.
- It is not clear why there is no alternative to running the line across Mr and Mrs Sharp's Estate.
- The justification for the extensive amount of land proposed to be taken temporarily has not been provided and yet this will seriously disrupt Mr and Mrs Sharp's unique and specialized farming operations.
- No meaningful detail has been provided regarding operation, duration, or mitigation.

Compulsory Purchase

In terms of the use of compulsory purchase powers (or ability to impose rights on/over land compulsorily), NG assert that this is proportionate. In the NG document "Comments on Relevant Representations" [REP2-023] NG state that such powers "will be justified as necessary and proportionate to deliver the Project and associated mitigation works and where appropriate" and that "engaging with landowners of affected land parcels to explain the requirement for additional land and to seek the consent of those landowners to the inclusion within the draft DCO of compulsory acquisition powers for new land rights in respect of the land affected by the proposed change".

Mr and Mrs Sharp have not seen any assessment which demonstrates how the use of such powers will not have a disproportionate impact upon their Estate; there has been minimal meaningful engagement. NG cannot just assert that the use of compulsory powers is proportionate in Mr and Mrs Sharp's case as no case-specific assessment has been undertaken to justify use of compulsory powers in relation to this property.

Mr and Mrs Sharp reserve the right to supplement this submission further.