



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) - Day 2 - Part 3
Date:	30 April 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. 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 hearing.

00:00:05:00 - 00:00:25:09

So it's time to resume the hiring. We've had a bit of a discussion and chasing of parties as to whether or not we've got people who are due to attend. I believe that we have representatives for Mr. Sharpe online.

00:00:28:28 - 00:00:33:12

Thank you very much. I'm seeing a camera coming on.

00:00:34:12 - 00:00:41:03

Yes, sir. My name is Stephen Hopkins. I'm solicitor and partner at Hobson Hills LLP, and I appear on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe.

00:00:41:14 - 00:00:45:24

Thank you very much. If you're just there, I'd like to make your submissions to us then.

00:00:46:17 - 00:01:22:15

Yes. I mean, concerns and objections have consistently been raised on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe throughout this process, both during the informal and formal pre-application consultation rounds and then in relation to the formal DCO application itself. Mr. and Mrs. Sharp's cattle farming operation is one of the largest in the UK. Their estate at Hall Farm and Margaret Hall Farm extends to 1000 acres. It is a ring fenced estate which is farmed in a ranch style with no conventional paddocks or field enclosures. There are three areas of barns and hard standings, which are used to provide care for cattle that need to be brought in.

00:01:23:22 - 00:01:54:23

This is not a usual farming operation. It's a large scale enterprise with 4 to 5000 cattle at any one time, which needs to be clearly understood to seek to assess the impact that the proposed scheme will have on it during the construction phase and thereafter. There has been a total lack of engagement with the business, and at no stage, as National Grid or its agents sought to obtain information from our clients to truly understand the farming operations and the complexities of works being carried out on the estate with livestock present.

00:01:55:01 - 00:02:25:29

Further, there has been no attempt to engage with Mr. or Mrs. Sharpe about the various development projects underway on the estate. Requests for cost undertakings from National Grid for professional fees. To support any early discussions have been declined when our clients have managed to speak with the agents. The approach has been we are not asking you or we are telling you that's wholly unacceptable. In light of the impact this has on my client's farming operations and their lives. A meeting has only been proposed very recently. It remains unacceptable.

00:02:26:01 - 00:02:59:09

There has been no meaningful attempt to engage at any earlier stage. The proposal will have a significant impact on part of the estate and in turn, on our clients farming operations. Pylons are proposed to be erected on the footprint of an essential agricultural farm workers cottage, located next to one of the three sets of barns that I've mentioned. The path of the pylons. We will run through those

barns and the farmyard. A site, compound and access road will run through the site of a further set of proposed barns. Planning, references and plans will be provided with a summary note following this.

00:03:00:11 - 00:03:30:21

The proposal seeks to make use of the network of farm roads on the estate during the construction phase, and that will be in conflict with the farming operations. No discussions have taken place to understand this conflict throughout. The following concerns and objections have been maintained by Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe in summary. Unacceptable impact on the grade two listed Margaret Hall and Grade one listed church. Harmful impact on farming operations. Impact on authorised agricultural development. Impact on proposed development.

00:03:30:25 - 00:04:07:20

The pylons would have a clear and harmful impact on the setting of Margaret Hall, which is a grade two listed building on the estate and the ancient lane leading up to the historic church in close proximity to the hall, which is grade one listed. A farm workers cottage was recently refused planning permission for its alleged harmful impact on the setting of these heritage assets. The pylons will have a far greater effect. The harmful impact on farming operations and authorized agricultural development has been touched upon during the construction phase. A large part of the estate will simply be unusable, as it is not possible for works to be carried out with cows presence present on that part of the estate.

00:04:07:24 - 00:04:40:26

This will have a significant impact on our clients farming operations, and require a total change in approach to the current management regime. This will necessitate reduction in the size of the enterprise, which in turn will impact the viability of the business, which has been growing from scratch over the last 20 years and is now flourishing. Temporary use of a large construction compound on part of the estate is proposed, which will have a significant impact on Mr. and Mrs. Sharp's farming operations. It's located where new agricultural barns have been proposed. No justification has been provided as to why such a large area is required for this purpose.

00:04:41:04 - 00:05:25:01

Without such justification, Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe considered there is no reasonable, proportionate or necessary or necessary for National Grid to proceed with the proposed temporary use of this part of the estate, there will be an unreasonable, unnecessary and disproportionate impact to Mr. Bishop's interests and agricultural operations as a result of the exercise of compulsory powers under the scheme. No alternative routings were discussed with Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe prior to the application. It is not clear the extent to which any alternatives were contemplated or investigated by National Grid prior to the application, which might have led to a less impactful outcome insofar as a single state estate is concerned in terms of the impact on proposed development.

00:05:25:03 - 00:05:57:06

The scheme for 220 houses have been submitted to Brentwood Council to seek to address, in part, the lack of housing provision in the borough and meet the identified need for housing in the area. The location of this proposal has been chosen carefully at a position on the outer perimeter of the estate, which will have the least impact on agricultural operations and in a location brought forward within the local planning process. The proposed route of the pylons runs through the middle of the scheme,

and will mean that it will not be possible to develop large parts of the housing proposal for much needed new homes in ingot stone.

00:05:57:20 - 00:06:27:16

Any public interest case for the pylon scheme needs to be balanced against the unreasonable, unnecessary and disproportionate interference with the exercise of compulsory power acquisition powers associated with the scheme and what that will have on Mr. and Mrs. Sharp's interests in farming operations, and also on the public interest in ensuring enough homes come forward through the accepted planning channels to meet the national housing needs in appropriate locations. Thank you for giving me the time to make these representations.

00:06:29:10 - 00:06:40:21

Thank you very much for your comments there. If I can just turn to the applicant and ask for with a national grid of any comments they would wish to make in response.

00:06:41:12 - 00:06:53:06

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. I'm going to turn first to Mr. Going. In relation to the engagement and then to Mr. Crawford just to pick up some of the points that were made around routing. Thank you.

00:06:54:22 - 00:07:25:17

Thank you. James, going on behalf of the applicant. Noting the many attempts at engagement, we have obviously written and sought meetings with the AP in this regard. We are now aware that there is dialogue with their representatives, and meeting dates have been proposed, for which we await a response and would welcome the opportunity to meet with the AP and understand fully the impact that the project may have on the agricultural operations and further discussions around the heads of terms.

00:07:29:18 - 00:07:33:17

Josh Crawford, on behalf of the applicant. If you'd just like to get the map up, please.

00:07:35:23 - 00:08:13:13

Okay, so just for a little bit of context, we're just a little bit further south than one of the AP's earlier on today. So we've got ingots down sort of just to the west of the railway there. the west of the old limits. The APRS land is kind of central on the screen there. Um, the sighting of the overhead line, um, is restricted somewhat by, you see, the first angle just to the north of the image, you've got a small green blob of ancient woodland, kind of on the inside, on the eastern side of the angle, just before we cross the, um, across the road, the A12.

00:08:13:18 - 00:08:45:07

And then we must cross also the railway in the next span, A2, which is also followed by you've got the gas pipeline on the cut, I think. I think if you can just about say there's a gas pipeline dashed on the map in as well, that that route through the same location. Um, we then cross the railway and then head in a kind of south easterly direction, kind of away from Ingatestone, before we then get to the angle that head south, um, to the east of a couple of listed buildings.

00:08:46:08 - 00:09:17:17

Um, Different alternatives have been looked at over the years. Um, the we talked earlier on about the kind of more eastern option that would have avoided that would have gone to the east of Margarita. Um, that went closer to Highland Park and the various listed buildings on approach on the south side of the railway. On the eastern side there. We also then had the original graduated slave corridor that went to the west of the, um, current position of the overhead line.

00:09:17:19 - 00:09:51:14

Um, that was moved based on feedback and further assessments and gets the whole hall and um, the Church of Saint Giles, which is located just to the west of um and southwest of the aprs land. But yeah. The reason, the reason I'm kind of mentioning that is it dictates that angle position at the southern end of the AP's land, um, to be east of those linked receptors. Um, we also previously looked at an option going kind of to the west of to follow the railway along siding gets done.

00:09:51:16 - 00:10:21:09

That had its own challenges with various scattered properties at the edge of Ingatestone, um, before having to turn back into to route through the rings Grove um pinch point at the at the bottom of the screen there. So that was discounted. And the fact that it was longer, less direct and transfer, transfer or effect on other residential building, um receptors. And I think that's, that's kind of the summary. Um. Thank you.

00:10:23:06 - 00:10:24:22

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:10:27:13 - 00:10:31:02

Is there anything that you would like to come back to us on then? Uh.

00:10:31:21 - 00:10:41:04

Yes. Please. Can we just in response to that? Yes. Can we just identify the two heritage assets that I've referred to on that plan? Be helpful if we can have the plan back up on screen.

00:10:46:04 - 00:11:18:17

And I think they can be seen as a, um, a yellow yellow dot, the green dot. And then you can see the ancient lane coming down. Um, towards the, towards the church. And you can see the size of the compound proposed. Um, to the northwest of the green dot. And I think that can be seen here. Um, and then we can see how the, um, the red line area extends right up to Margaret Hall. Um, and to make use of the farm, um, network of farm roads here.

00:11:18:19 - 00:11:50:08

So this runs very close and has clearly has an impact on those two heritage assets. I'm not sure to what extent there's been a sequential test in terms of impact on all of the heritage assets that are along the routes and proposed routes. Um, and whether these two heritage assets have been given adequate or particular consideration compared against the harm to other heritage heritage assets that have just been mentioned. And the other point I would like to quickly come back on is the reference to engagement. And the meeting has now been proposed. That meeting has been proposed within the last couple of weeks.

00:11:50:10 - 00:12:09:21

So at this in this stage, this part of the examination process, the applicant can say to the inspector that there has been some engagement in the engagement has been woeful, it's far too late. And that that proposal has only recently been made. Um, I have no other points to make in response. Thank you.

00:12:10:20 - 00:12:42:00

Yeah. Yesterday I was dealing with landscape and heritage. I understand that that was curtailed a little bit and that a number of the questions were put or will be put in a rule 17 letter to the applicant. But we have different themes running through the examination. And one of the significant issues is obviously going to be the impact on landscape and The impact on heritage assets.

00:12:42:02 - 00:13:17:23

So yes, that is a matter that we take on board, but we're focusing today in terms of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession and in terms of what the objections to that are. So yes, those issues are live. Yes, they're in front of us, but they will they are ongoing on a separate on a, on a separate theme. Um, I'll just ask whether or not the applicant is any further comments about whether they've got to. I appreciate that you say that engagement has been poor up to now.

00:13:18:17 - 00:13:54:19

Um, but that engagement has commenced. So I'd just like to understand from the applicant when that engagement is going to take place. And obviously, as many of the points were made yesterday, it's about ensuring we're well into the examination Heading down towards the end of the examination, and we wish to make sure that as much engagement is concluded before the finish of the examination as is possible. So just understand a little bit about what the applicant's intended timescale is for this.

00:13:55:17 - 00:14:17:14

Thank you. James going on behalf of the applicant. Applicant. Just to confirm, through the various iterations of heads of terms that have been issued to the AP to date, all of those have included the offer of a meeting. And we are now more advanced in those discussions, and we await a response from the AP on the offered meeting dates of the week commencing the 11th of May.

00:14:26:08 - 00:14:26:23

Okay.

00:14:26:25 - 00:14:27:10

Thank you.

00:14:28:01 - 00:14:29:07

Just in response to that point.

00:14:29:19 - 00:14:31:21

Can we just clarify? Yeah.

00:14:32:09 - 00:14:39:21

I was just waiting to see whether or not the applicant had any other comments to put them all back to you rather than bits and pieces.

00:14:40:02 - 00:15:14:11

Josh Crawford on behalf of the applicant, just to. Just to clarify that part of the odd limit that's closest to. Margaret Hall Cottages is for the permanent. Permanent access to permanent right of access. So it's not proposed for the construction period. And yeah it's not. Yeah. Just want to clarify that that bit. That's very close to Margaret and Hall. And the compound mentioned is the stone lay down area associated with the Hall Road and the um, and the compound for the traffic and transport for the installation of the Belmont. So it's not a main or a satellite overhead line compound that is specific for those those works.

00:15:14:13 - 00:15:16:17

I just want to clarify that for the for the AP.

00:15:16:19 - 00:15:41:07

But the the Red line area was quite significantly close to it. And I think that that was. Yeah. That's correct. That's what the nature of the works and operations are within that and the impact that they will have and the duration of the length that that will be there. But as I say, those are those are matters really in terms of assessing the impact on the heritage I serve as such. Yes. So sorry. Back to you.

00:15:42:07 - 00:15:42:28

Can we just have.

00:15:43:02 - 00:15:47:03

Can we just have the date of the proposal for the meeting on the 11th of May?

00:15:48:19 - 00:15:53:16

I don't think the applicant actually explained when when that proposal was made or gave the date for it.

00:15:56:13 - 00:16:14:16

James, going on behalf of the applicant, accepting the meeting offer for the week commencing the 11th of May was recent. I think the point I was making there have been recent or more historic attempts to set up meetings, but it's encouraging to note that we now have a willingness to meet and we look forward to engaging further.

00:16:14:18 - 00:16:23:20

I think they look a bit confused because they might not have been told about that. So when you say recent, you're being a bit obscure. Was that yesterday or was it last week, or.

00:16:23:22 - 00:16:24:07

Was.

00:16:24:09 - 00:16:28:20

It the check and confirm with the colleague who's arranging that meeting? But it's been over the course of the last week.

00:16:29:04 - 00:16:29:24

Yeah I've.

00:16:31:15 - 00:16:34:06

22nd of April I think is the date that we're looking.

00:16:34:09 - 00:16:34:24

For.

00:16:40:04 - 00:16:44:00

Okay. Do you have any other comments that you missed? Given what you've heard today.

00:16:44:12 - 00:16:44:29

And I.

00:16:45:11 - 00:16:47:21

Maintain that maintain the points I've just made.

00:16:48:16 - 00:16:54:12

Thank you very much. Applicant have you got any further comments? Okay. Thank you very much.

00:16:54:22 - 00:16:55:07

All.

00:16:59:10 - 00:17:34:00

Right. As far as we're aware, the final speaker for this afternoon in this speaker's list is Mr. Warner, who's not yet able to join us. And he was towards the end of the agenda. Um, and we're expecting him to probably join us about 2:20 or something of that nature. So we've got a little bit of time before that. Um, what we normally do at the end of the speakers is ask if there's anybody else in the room or online who wishes to speak to me? We'll jump to that.

00:17:34:02 - 00:17:41:10

First of all. So is there anybody else in the room who would like to make any comments on their, uh,

00:17:43:05 - 00:17:44:21

on the on their land?

00:17:49:05 - 00:17:52:08

You would like to. Do you want to come up and introduce yourself?

00:17:54:09 - 00:18:05:10

Yeah. We can't hear you. And the recording can't hear you. So if you could come forward, press it. Press the button in the middle of the dash and then just tell us who you are.

00:18:05:13 - 00:18:40:24

Yes, I'm Camilla McAdam and my husband, Andrew Andrew Buxton. One, either my husband or I was going to talk. I just wanted to say that your, um, level of grid is proposing to take a little bit of a field south of the, um, cable ceiling end in Redding, and it's that that particular field I was hoping possibly to use as enabling development in future in in order to restore some historic buildings.

00:18:41:00 - 00:19:13:07

And this is a long process if you have eight historic buildings. It takes a long process over many, many, many years to work out how you're going to finance them. And we've just got planning permission for some of the barns. But, um, anyway, I wanted to talk just specifically about this particular field. It's a cable and you can put, um, over it. You can put farmland, you know, you can make it back to farmland.

00:19:13:09 - 00:19:52:19

But the point is that if it's enabling development, I might want to put trees. I don't want to I might want to do a lots of things with that and to develop that field, um, which I've been in contact with Bieber District Council and various different people over the years. Somehow I have to finance eight historic buildings now. These historic buildings are on the edge of Cape Saint Mary Village, which has 3200 inhabitants, and in 20 years, it's going to have another thousand to make it up to 4000.

00:19:52:24 - 00:20:24:26

They have nowhere. The inhabitants of Cable Saint Mary have nowhere to walk, except because the A12 goes round on two sides. And where do they walk? They walk on my four and a half miles of footpaths and around the historic buildings which I keep. And Historic and Historic England says it's the main place for them to have, um, tranquility.

00:20:25:05 - 00:20:56:25

If you don't at the weekend, you want to go out and take the pram with a child or go for a run? They come on my place because it's literally adjacent to it. Now somehow I've got to pay for these. Eight historic buildings started in 1260. Much more valuable than, um, a woodland which can be replaced. I have Boy Scouts. It's in the Vale of the Dedham Vale setting.

00:20:56:27 - 00:21:28:18

It's the setting of the Dedham Vale, just on the edge. I have people coming. Constable painted it. If. What options do I have? If I'm left with these buildings? I'm very old. I will have to pay. Either. I have to set up, go. What am I going to do? Or how am I going to keep all these buildings going? You know, what could I do if you take away that Possibility of me farming that field.

00:21:30:02 - 00:21:41:22

Um, not farming it, but developing it as well as another field on the edge of the estate. I can't do it. I'll have to sell up. So that's what I was going to say.

00:21:41:24 - 00:21:49:06

Okay. Thank you, thank you. Are they. Have you identified the field in.

00:21:49:09 - 00:21:51:16

It's just directly in writing.

00:21:51:18 - 00:21:55:02

Have you provided a plant? Um, well they're aware.

00:21:55:10 - 00:22:32:28

Well, interestingly enough, um, yesterday at the meeting, um, the my next door neighbor, who, I don't know, I've never met, actually, because he's new, but he said that the, um, on the aerodrome, it's dangerous what they're going to do. So they might have to look into it. And he wanted the route to go northward. Now Savills has found an alternative route, which if my neighbor and me both wanted north because my buildings are scheduled, which is far more important than national than grade one.

00:22:33:04 - 00:23:00:17

And they should never, never be, um, altered the setting of it. And I look at the moment. The proposal is that I look straight on to the an angle tower, which is appalling. And all the Boy Scouts, everybody who comes and the people who want to come from the dead end Vale and look at it where Constable painted all gone. So I've only got it. One option is to sell up and go.

00:23:01:09 - 00:23:05:05

No, indeed. And could you just remind me what the estate is?

00:23:05:07 - 00:23:11:14

It's called little Wenham Hall farm partnership. When a Wenham Hall farm partnership.

00:23:13:24 - 00:23:14:21

Thank you.

00:23:18:14 - 00:23:19:05

Thank you.

00:23:23:21 - 00:23:27:18

The applicant could any comment that they would wish to make on anything that they've just heard?

00:23:29:12 - 00:23:37:00

Um, so I'm going to ask Mr. Reston, who I don't think this hearing has heard from yet, to introduce himself and then continue from there. Thank you.

00:23:37:15 - 00:23:38:09

Thank you.

00:23:38:18 - 00:23:39:16

Hello? Yes, Paul.

00:23:40:01 - 00:23:55:12

Paul reads them for the applicant. Have we maybe get the map up? Um. And if you could zoom in a little, we can, just for everybody's benefit, sort of, um, identify the relevant areas of ground, just even a little bit apart, if you could.

00:23:57:23 - 00:24:03:04

So up to far, too far, uh, a bit. And I'll go out a little bit. Um,

00:24:04:27 - 00:24:08:25

and have you got the listed buildings on scheduled monuments?

00:24:10:12 - 00:24:11:22

You know, have to zoom.

00:24:13:11 - 00:24:45:07

Right. Okay. So. Thank you. Hold it there. Um, I think, um, miss McAdam. So we've had a number of discussions at various events. The Little Wenham, the cluster of listed buildings and the the castle are the sort of you can just see at the sort of the bottom right there. And I think yesterday at the issue specific aiming, I think there was a suggestion that this was being considered as an accompanying site visit location. Um, there are sort of it is the um, yeah, there's a sort of the castle.

00:24:45:09 - 00:25:24:23

It's, um, I can't remember exactly the date. We've, um, 1200 and something. I think, um, it has views to the north, um, and very sort of screening vegetation for lower level stuff. Um, if you can scroll, scroll to the north a little bit, but, um, and I think the, the piece of land in question, um, is what sort of where the, um, you can if you see the, the green square, which is the cable ceiling and compound proposal just to the north of Wenham Grove, um, Where it then sort of rotates, sort of initially heading to the southeast, then south and then southwest.

00:25:25:00 - 00:26:04:24

Um, it's sort of just after it goes out of that, um, dark area. There is a sort of a triangle of land that the cable cuts across the corner of. That's miss McAdams. Um, field of interest. Um, we are, of course, sympathetic to the proposals, but, um, in our view, there's, uh, and to our understanding, there's no actual planning application. It's not an allocated site at this stage. Um, and we have to work within the, the realms of, you know, what the current context is rather than, um, any sort of speculation about, um, particular development potential.

00:26:05:06 - 00:26:41:04

Um, there is, of course, um, I think something that we, we have discussed. Um, is the cable swathe itself is within a only part of that corridor and that, um, it's a subject of detailed design as to exactly where that cable would be and how much of the, um, that cable swathe, which would be the element that would restrict development above it, or the planting of trees or buildings? How close and how far into the, um, that piece of land it would actually encroach, but much of that piece of land would still be available.

00:26:42:00 - 00:26:54:25

So it would be a cable run and that could be anywhere within that. So it could be moved within the context of that, within the order limits to reduce the impact a little.

00:26:55:14 - 00:27:11:16

Yes, sir. I think at the moment it's shown with a sort of a central hall road with cables either side, but again subject to detailed design and bending radius coming around the um, from the grove that could that has some potential to be to be moved.

00:27:12:15 - 00:27:14:07

Okay. Thank you.

00:27:17:02 - 00:27:27:14

Mrs. McCabe, do you want to actually sit at the desk so we can hear what you're saying and do? Do you have any comments on what you've just heard?

00:27:27:16 - 00:27:59:20

Yes. I mean, completely useless, leaving me a little bit of field on the left or, you know, that bit that you're just cutting off, and also that Savills has produced a really good and experienced other route, which would avoid me having a G 27 cable. A view of a complete from my historic buildings looking straight onto an angled tower which is completely not allowed with a scheduled building.

00:27:59:22 - 00:28:07:16

And at J 27 and I'm sorry, I'm not a very good speaker, but, um.

00:28:07:18 - 00:28:08:03

Doing.

00:28:08:14 - 00:28:45:04

Well. Well, um, they've got a much better route, and it's been cleared by Savills, who are very experienced team, and they said it could go north and straight. And I mean, obviously we'd all like it in the Vale of the Dedham Vale to be underground, but you can't do that. Then the next thing was when I suggested to start with it's elevated land by six foot. Um, the cable they've done and to put high pylons on an elevated land is just to me, mad.

00:28:45:06 - 00:29:18:29

I got an answer from contact from National Grid who said to me, oh, sorry, t pylons are too expensive. Um, they are more expensive, so we're not going to do it. And they've got a scheduled monument. I mean, what to do? Put high pylons on a piece of elevated land bridge land in Dedham Vale setting. What have I to do? You're working against against it when there is an alternative route.

00:29:20:06 - 00:29:54:03

And also, um, the people next door say it's dangerous. The wings reading wings said it was dangerous. Their plan. So, I mean, they want it to go north. Surely we could look at carefully. Really carefully Savills, who are incredibly experienced people. Um, there are other route. If I got. I just didn't want an answer to just say we have to go cheaper. Because if acceptable, the answer is it is not acceptable.

00:29:54:05 - 00:30:26:04

It is not acceptable what they produced. I'm going to have to sell up. 4000 people will be up. You know, it's just terrible. Hundreds of people coming to my house. It's open to the public. This is completely different. It gives pleasure to hundreds of people. People come from all over the world. People from. From America, everywhere. To look at this historic place. It's going to be sold up. And what do you think the district council are going to say to let this whole place go? Which gives pleasure to hundreds of people?

00:30:26:06 - 00:30:30:21

No. I understand those issues and the issues. As I was saying previously to another.

00:30:30:29 - 00:30:40:04

At another, another hearing, I see. Forgive me, but the point is that this little bit of land is going to be affected.

00:30:40:06 - 00:30:42:06

Yes. And that's what we're focusing on.

00:30:42:08 - 00:30:42:23

Thank you very.

00:30:42:25 - 00:30:47:11

Much. We're just understanding what the impact is. Thank you.

00:30:50:05 - 00:30:53:06

Do you have any further comments to make?

00:30:54:00 - 00:31:05:23

The only thing I would say is that the issue of alternative locations is covered in the document. AP 122 figure 6.2 shows that an associated text.

00:31:06:29 - 00:31:09:01

Could you just give me the reference again?

00:31:09:03 - 00:31:23:21

It's app. Sorry. App. One. Two. Two. The 2025 Design Development report. And it's figure 6.2. And the paragraph. The text at paragraph 6.1.6.

00:31:26:24 - 00:31:28:00

Thank you very much.

00:31:31:15 - 00:31:32:27

Okay. Thank you.

00:31:39:03 - 00:31:40:21

Just bear with us a second.

00:31:51:15 - 00:32:23:12

Right. Thank you. Um, I think that's taken us to the end of the speakers list, with the exception of Mr. Warner, who hasn't joined us as yet. But to ensure that we're productively using time, uh, we'll give him an opportunity to join us after that, but I think we'll just move on to agenda item four. We've dealt with all the speakers, we've dealt with the speakers in the room and anything online. So let's move to agenda item four. Um, and when Mr.

00:32:23:14 - 00:32:32:01

Warner joins us, we can then come back to him. But I'll pass now to Mr. Sims for agenda item four.

00:32:32:19 - 00:32:39:04

Thank you very much. So, um, this was really just to, um.

00:32:40:14 - 00:32:41:21

Allow us just to

00:32:43:10 - 00:33:24:18

get an update on matters that were presented at, uh, deadline three. Uh, we've listed items in the agenda, but I'm happy to take any other updates you think might be worth mentioning to us or any clarifications, uh, or additional information you wanted to give in terms of the responses you gave us to, our first set of written questions if that's something you'd like to do, but we'd have no particular, um, further questions or clarifications on the responses to written questions that we want to ask, but feel free to give us any further updates if you think it would help us.

00:33:24:28 - 00:33:45:08

Um, so just going through the agenda item, just, um, b I know deadline three wasn't that long ago, but things move quite quickly and I just wondered if there was any further updates on, um, any other statutory undertakers that we haven't heard from over the last two days? Um, and any, any progress on protective provisions in that regard?

00:33:46:00 - 00:34:17:10

So I have a sergeant for the applicant. Just, um, some factual points. I don't know if they're representative still here. Um, but you'll recall, before the adjournment when we were discussing with Inova, um, I looked slightly confused. I think it's fair to say. Um, so they were granted a generation licence by Ofgem on the 2nd of April, which post stated deadline to which was the 12th of March. So that's why when there was a reference to deadline two, I looked confused and they.

00:34:17:20 - 00:34:41:18

It's their response to SSC one from deadline three and that states that they were granted their generation license on the 2nd of April. And so that's something I think that we're intending to just pick up and provide kind of our sort of acknowledgement of all any clarifications at deadline for alongside an updated statutory undertaking, statutory undertakers tracker.

00:34:42:04 - 00:34:44:17

Yeah, that's really useful to know. Thank you for confirming that.

00:34:44:19 - 00:34:49:29

Thank you. I'll just check whether there's any further clarifications on statutory undertakers.

00:34:53:23 - 00:34:59:00

Um, no, there's nothing to add. So we'll, um, as I said, update the tracker for deadline for.

00:34:59:02 - 00:35:00:15

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:35:03:29 - 00:36:04:25

Just in relation to sort of the statutory undertakers and protective provisions. As a general comment, I suppose it is, is just how you're progressing with those protective provisions. And when we're going to start to see them either populated into the draft development consent order or get sight of drafts of those. I know your intention is to provide them normally whenever they're completed or agreed, but I suppose we're looking for some degree of comfort as to how they're moving along, or what the areas of dispute in the various protective provisions are, so that we can keep an eye on how things are moving in terms of protective provisions and where the areas of dispute are, how many individual protective provisions you're proposing within the order, so that we've got an understanding of workload and how many that there are going to be that we're going to be relying on and things of that nature.

00:36:04:27 - 00:36:22:24

So I just I just wanted to get a bit of a handle on how how that was progressing. I know the schedule gives us a bit of an indication of where you're proposing other agreements or protective provisions and things of that nature, but this is how they're how they're moving and just understand what that is.

00:36:24:20 - 00:37:05:05

Abigail Walters for the applicant. Um, the statutory undertaking tracker does include at deadline three, a list of anticipated deadlines at which the relevant protective provisions will be included in the order based on how negotiations are progressing. And so some are at D4. But, um, we would hope the majority that are likely to be agreed would be at D5 and then following at D6 as negotiations continue. Obviously, if negotiations if it isn't possible to conclude negotiations with any particular, um, statutory undertaker, then we would submit, um, version that's agreed as far as possible, not leaving out any issues of dispute.

00:37:05:12 - 00:37:36:19

Deadline six and we would then make representations to you in relation to section one, two, seven and one three, eight in terms of any outstanding matters, in order to provide you with the reassurance as to how the statutory tests in that respect have been addressed for the statutory undertakers. So that would be that's our current proposal and how we're moving forward. And obviously, the timing at which we can put agreed protective provisions into order does depend on the other side's also engaging with us and responding. So we're seeking to move that along with everybody promptly.

00:37:37:01 - 00:38:09:03

And we have regular meetings to make sure that's all progressed. And I think that the the best place for the details of any issues in dispute is probably in that 127138 submission that we would make at that point. Um, obviously the affected statutory undertakers can, um, list at any deadline or anytime they make the submission outstanding points if they wish to. But I think where I think the general approach that they take is where they feel like we're making progress, they're less minded to do that because they feel that we're making progress with them.

00:38:09:05 - 00:38:43:03

So, um, is there a, I suppose, a potential in the statement of common ground or something of that nature to maintain that update? I suppose it's just so that we, as the examining authority, are kept abreast of the discussions that you were going on because many of the times you get the discussions ongoing in the background, which we may not be either aware of or informed of, and that's not a criticism, but it's just that we don't necessarily know where we're at.

00:38:43:24 - 00:39:05:28

Um, yes, sir. So I understand that we have statements of common ground with most, if not all of the statutory undertakers. And to the extent there isn't already, we can add a line item into that to set out the position And potentially any outstanding. An outline of any outstanding issues between the parties in the Statements of Common Ground, if that would assist.

00:39:06:00 - 00:39:06:15

Yes.

00:39:06:17 - 00:39:22:00

Thank you very much. And then, um, you did ask how many um, if we just update you in our post hearing submission with the exact numbers, um, that might help in terms of what we're anticipating because it just slightly, slightly changes on a regular basis.

00:39:22:02 - 00:39:23:29

Indeed. Yes. That would be very helpful.

00:39:24:01 - 00:39:37:10

Thank you. And we're also conscious that this was discussed briefly at the, um, the issue specific hearing the other day. So we'll obviously confer with our, our panel colleagues and um, and consider the approach that you're suggesting.

00:39:37:27 - 00:40:00:28

Okay. I have been informed that Mr. Warner has now joined us. So I know we're jumping about a little bit on on the agenda, and I hope it doesn't make things too difficult for your team reshuffling themselves. But given Mr. Warner has now joined us. Um, let's go back to Mr. Warner. Mr. Warner, if you are online, can you

00:40:02:18 - 00:40:18:21

put your camera on? Can I see you there? If you can, just introduce yourself. Tell us the, uh, the plot that you're engaged with and, uh, interested in. And, uh, if you make your presentation, you've got five minutes to make your initial comments. Thank you.

00:40:19:26 - 00:40:26:11

Thank you. So I'm representing Palmer and Klein. Uh, am I allowed to share on screen documents?

00:40:28:03 - 00:40:35:22

No. I'm afraid. I'm afraid if they haven't been entered into the examination, we can't see them. But you're very welcome to submit them afterwards in your summary.

00:40:36:06 - 00:41:07:15

Okay, so I will have to do this verbally then. So Palmer and Klein run a fuel recycling business, um, at their premises in Engle Hall Farm and surrounding the premises where they do that, uh, fuel recycling. They have, uh, land which is used for grazing and for growing grass. Now one of the outputs from the fuel recycling process is water. And Farmer and Klein use the land which is around the business, to spread that water.

00:41:07:18 - 00:41:38:21

And it's an essential part of the process. The water is a waste product and they have to spread it on licence from the Environment Agency. There is a defined spreading period which is in the growing season for the grass and the um, the theory is that the grass will take up the nutrient intake from the wastewater that's produced and the nutrients that are therein, and therefore you have a sustainable system.

00:41:39:04 - 00:42:25:26

Now, unfortunately, the the scheme is going to impact the amount of land which is available at Uncle Farm in order to do that spreading. Um, and will be effectively there will significantly impact the ability of the business to continue to operate because the alternative to spreading that, um, water on the land, because it's a waste product, is that it has to be tackled out at a significant expense. So the the main message that I have to convey is that we have not made the necessary progress in discussions with the applicant to be sure that the business will not be significantly affected and and negatively affected by the scheme.

00:42:25:28 - 00:42:59:15

And that's not through a lack of trying on our part. We made representations through the consultation process back in 2024 explaining what the, uh, the business is all about and how it's going to be affected, and pleading with the applicant to send decision makers to the farm so they could see what's going on. We do have an engagement process. Uh, it is not too late for us to agree mitigation measures and measures to protect the business, but that needs to be done very, very quickly to give the business the certainty that it needs.

00:42:59:21 - 00:43:35:25

And in summary, what we are looking for is the following is that the main impact is that there are two fields. There's effectively four fields where water is spread. And two of those fields are in the red line boundary and will be taken up for the the during the construction of the scheme. And we understand that there was a misunderstanding in the scheme that the water, it wouldn't be an issue if it was spread on in particular the whole road, which is going to link up, um, construction of the scheme.

00:43:35:27 - 00:44:18:03

But because it's a waste water supply and because it's the licence is contingent on it being applied to grass and, and the nutrients being taken out by the grass, that is not going to be possible and for all sorts of other reasons. So the scheme at a meeting last November. Proposed moving the Hall Road at Ongar Hall Farm to the edge of order limits, so as much of the two fields that were affected as possible could continue to have this water spread on them. And we understand that the applicant has taken that forward through the commitments process, but we do not have certainty that that is going to be agreed as a commitment or that commitments are going to be made on that.

00:44:18:12 - 00:44:48:16

The second thing that we are asking for is that where one of the towers is, it's a cable pulling zone. Now we understand, obviously that implies more land take during the construction period and means that the field which is affected will not be that Palmer and Klein won't be able to spread water on that field. So we have we understand that from a meeting last November that the applicant thinks that it is possible that they can use other sites to do the, um, the cable pulling that they need to do.

00:44:48:18 - 00:45:19:06

Which would obviate the need to do it on Palmer and Klein. And we are still waiting for confirmation on that point, which, again, is something that is being taken through the commitments process, but we don't have certainty on. So those are the mitigation measures which we are hoping will be put in place in order that loss is not suffered and that the the client can well or that loss is minimized. So the client can continue with their business as far as it's possible to do. So if the. And we really hope the applicant will respond positively on those.

00:45:19:08 - 00:45:54:18

If that is not possible, then the cash flow implications of having to tank tanker this water out are very significant. We're talking about potentially 135,000l of water a week, and it has to be taken in a tanker and taken to another waste processing facility. And that's going to cost thousands of thousands of pounds a week. And that will have a very significant impact on the business's cash flow. So we are seeking as a third mechanism that in the event that loss cannot be mitigated, that the applicant agrees a compensation procedure.

00:45:54:20 - 00:46:26:10

So either the claimant is put in funds so the cash flow isn't impacted, that we agree that the mechanism is fair and reasonable, and we agree that that is the correct basis of compensation in the circumstances. And so we don't have a situation where under the compensation code, we have to submit a compensation claim. The basis of that compensation claim might be disputed or negotiated, and it might not be paid for weeks, months, years. The cumulative impact of the business on that would be unsustainable in terms of cash flow. So we have put forward a mechanism.

00:46:26:12 - 00:46:59:12

We understand that the applicant, we think we infer that the applicant seems to be open minded and seems to think that that is a reasonable basis to go forward, but we do not yet have that commitment. And so we are seeking those three commitments very, very quickly from the applicant. And we are seeking an on site meeting with a decision. Somebody in a decision making capacity. I'm waiting to

hear back on a date. Next Thursday, 6th of May, which I not had confirmed yet. So that is the synopsis of our of my client, Palmer and client Palmer and Klein's case.

00:47:00:13 - 00:47:07:07

Thank you very much. I'll turn to the applicant and ask for any comments that they may have.

00:47:09:03 - 00:47:14:07

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. I'm going to turn to Mr.. Going to respond, please.

00:47:16:07 - 00:47:39:22

Thank you James. Going on behalf of the applicant, um, recognizing the positive engagement that has been today and the position of the AP, um, I can confirm the meeting for the 6th of May, which I believe is a Wednesday, just for as a point of clarity. And we will make sure that the right people are in attendance to progress the decision making process aligned with the points made by Mr. Warner.

00:47:46:09 - 00:47:49:17

Mr. Warner, if you could any comment on what you've heard?

00:47:51:11 - 00:48:24:02

I mean, there's nothing more that I can say other than that we want to work constructively with the applicant. We have been asking for meetings with on site meetings with decision makers for the last two years, because we don't think that necessarily the design team understand all of the nuances on the of this. Um, the people that we are engaging with are very reasonable and we have no issues with that. But we just we didn't need to be in this position. We are where we are. We can be positive, we can constructively engage and we can come up with solutions.

00:48:24:04 - 00:48:41:12

We just need, uh, the basically that we have tangible outcomes from this and not just warm words. So I would just urge everybody on the applicant side to please come and see us and get those commitments sorted so we can have an agreement and they can proceed with the scheme without impacting unduly on the business.

00:48:42:20 - 00:48:52:22

Thank you very much. I think it goes back again to what we were saying yesterday about getting things to conclusions and things of that nature. But does the applicant of any final comment?

00:48:54:28 - 00:49:10:19

Um. No, sir. Only to say that, I mean, I hope particularly from Mr. Goings evidence yesterday and today, you've got some impression of the amount of resource that we are now committing to engagement, and we've understood the message from the affected persons and from yourselves. Thank you.

00:49:10:21 - 00:49:14:13

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Warner.

00:49:15:18 - 00:49:16:12

Thank you.

00:49:19:13 - 00:49:26:16

So we shall return back to agenda item four, where we were. I think we've concluded all the other bits.

00:49:26:18 - 00:49:53:07

Thank you very much. I think we've, um, we've allowed ourselves to catch up and know where we are again. So, um, I think we just concluded, uh, matters regarding statute. So thank you for confirmation about protected provision. I think we just concluded by saying that we know that protective provision discussion was happening over issue specific hearing two as well. So we'll consider that with our panel colleagues. The next matter was just whether there was any further update on Crown land. Um.

00:49:55:18 - 00:49:56:22

Uh, Stephen Bolton, on behalf.

00:49:56:24 - 00:49:57:18

Of the applicant.

00:49:57:20 - 00:50:28:28

Uh, yes. There has been some positive progress with the Crown. Excellent. Um, so obviously we're dealing with a few different crown entities in terms of the government legal department. Um, we have reached agreement with them. There's agreed heads of terms in place. And at the moment they were looking to have that, obviously, um, all concluded in line with the examination. So it was quite a positive, uh, with that at the moment. Uh, the Ministry of Defence as well. We're we've had some further communication.

00:50:29:00 - 00:51:11:20

Obviously there's um, I think there's five interactions we've got with, um, some parcels of lands that they hold rights on early indications. there's not going to be any issues specific to those rights. It appears most of them are historic rights or they've passed to other third parties. I'm hoping to communicate with them this week. I should get that kind of in written response for them in the next week or so. So hopefully we'll be able to conclude that as well. And obviously, the other parties that are listed in the book of reference there, um, from further communication with them, they're some of those entities are going to be moved to class eight, or that we found out that the Crown interest is no longer involved with that party.

00:51:11:22 - 00:51:16:17

So at the moment, it's just the two Crown entities that we'll be dealing with.

00:51:17:03 - 00:51:34:10

So those entities which you previously flagged up with us, where the Crown entity may either not be a crown, the interest held may not be a Crown entity or there are things. Are they going to be extracted from.

00:51:34:28 - 00:51:39:16

Yes, it would be they. Yeah it'd be. It'll be updated in the book of reference.

00:51:39:18 - 00:51:46:12

So that would be updated in the book of reference. Taken off the Crown land plans. Yes. And dealt with in that way as well.

00:51:46:14 - 00:51:47:16

Yes. That's correct. There will.

00:51:47:18 - 00:51:48:03

Be.

00:51:48:05 - 00:51:48:20

Yeah.

00:51:49:29 - 00:51:50:16

Sorry.

00:51:50:18 - 00:52:29:13

No, that's fine, thank you very much. Um, I think the last bullet point or, um, italics was about just clarification, other matters. And we said yesterday that there was nothing in particular that we were, um, were considering. We just wanted to put it in there in case matters came up during these last two days that had some sort of theme. And I think we've covered, um, themes reasonably well, and I think we've kind of all got action notes in terms of how you're going to respond to those. We did we did park one discussion, which was, um, about the approach to negotiation with tenants and just looking for a little bit of clarification on your statements about how you're dealing with that.

00:52:29:15 - 00:52:38:16

And I know that came up yesterday and we parked that until today. So, um, as you had a warning on that, I just anticipated, you know, some sort of response on that.

00:52:39:05 - 00:52:52:11

Thank you sir. Heather Sargeant for the applicant, I'm hoping that Mr. John Galloway from National Grid is joining us remotely. I can see a j.g., which I yeah. So I'll hand over to him, if I may. Thank you.

00:52:55:13 - 00:53:05:12

John Galloway, head of land, Technical and governance for National Grid, on behalf of the applicant. Um, thank you, sir, for permitting me to appear. I guess in a virtual sense.

00:53:05:23 - 00:53:10:17

Yes, I recognize you from yesterday, but I didn't expect to see you again on the online.

00:53:10:25 - 00:53:41:26

Um, and thanks to the case team for allowing that to happen at short notice. I am conscious that the question came up yesterday by the National Farmers Union. Um, and of course, I do not think that Mr. Staples will be present here today to to hear the response, if you like. So I'm happy to talk in

generality what we've put in at deadline three. Um, a bit more on what National Grid's policy is around negotiating with freeholders and superior interests rather than with occupiers, but I don't know whether it's better to approach it in writing at the next deadline or what you what you wish to do as a panel.

00:53:42:27 - 00:54:09:15

Sorry, sorry, I didn't mean to talk over you. We were going to ask a question anyway. So although it came up from the National Farmers Union, obviously, as with everything, you're you're responding to us because we're the people that need to know the information. But obviously it will come in writing as well as a summary of your, um, the hearing. So the National Farmers Union will be able to see that and we'll be able to respond further. So if you could give us the information as if we've asked it, which we were going to do anyway, that would be great. Thank you.

00:54:10:14 - 00:54:51:19

No problem. Um, I guess to sort of keep things fairly brief, what I will just say is that the applicant did, um, address the question, which was raised, um, for deadline three, um, by way of updating the land rights tracker that was submitted. So that's document rep 3-018. Um, there is some new introductory sections to that, which set out in some more detail what the National Grid established policy is around voluntary agreements and heads of terms. I think I would just say in summary, um, that it's National Grid's established policy not to seek separate heads of terms with occupiers and tenants.

00:54:52:02 - 00:55:32:13

Uh, as we see those as derivative interests from those who are able to grant the necessary rights, which is in most cases, a permanent easement in perpetuity. Uh, we seek that from the freeholder or the superior title holder. And through voluntary agreements, we require the land owners to seek the consent of an occupier or a tenant or a mortgage company, as the case may be. And the reason I say that is established policy is that it has been the case in a number of different development consent orders which have been awarded, and indeed some which have been since implemented as well.

00:55:32:28 - 00:56:09:01

Um, I will just touch, if I may, on what the nephew's position is, and I don't want to sort of speak for them. Um, but I guess it sort of speaks to perhaps the position or the contrary position which which appears. Um, and really, it comes from a point from, from that point of view that the occupiers of the land, uh, are affected, of course, by the implication of, uh, temporary possession or imposition of, of permanent rights. But I would like to make it clear that they are engaged throughout the process, both from a statutory consultation point of view.

00:56:09:06 - 00:56:43:06

But but equally, from a practical point of view by land agents on the applicant's behalf. So it is not the case that we do not seek engagement or seek involvement of occupiers throughout the process. But it is national goods view that through the Planning Act regime it is not established that heads of terms must be evidenced as the only means by which a voluntary agreement to secure the rights required are the alternative to the last resort, which is the imposition of compulsory acquisition powers.

00:56:46:11 - 00:56:59:16

I don't know if that's any help, but I'm happy to provide, as I say, further detail in writing and happy to to give precedent examples from both National Grid CEOs. But but some others that have been awarded to other applicants in the past.

00:57:00:24 - 00:57:31:19

I think I think that would be helpful I think. Yeah. And and um, just referencing some other echoes that, um, uh, as you say, that have had this same approach, obviously the opportunity for the NFU and others to to respond when you say that you are not ignoring tenants is that is that you're practically talking to them about practicalities. And we we talked yesterday didn't we, about about the kind of the nuances of what's included in terms of accommodation, works, etc..

00:57:31:25 - 00:57:44:16

Is it in those discussions, your understanding how the needs of the tenants or the way the tenant may farm, or the way they may access things as well as the primary landowners?

00:57:46:07 - 00:58:39:13

John Galloway for the applicant, yes, that's correct. And I think it's it's crucial sort of to note, if I may say, that, not to conflate engagement with negotiation. Um, so, so in effect, um, the engagement, which of course, is a statutory process that is required for all persons with an interest in the land, um, that the applicant's submitted, of course, that it's complied with those requirements. Uh, in terms of the practicalities. Um, it's quite simply the case that when seeking an easement for a right in perpetuity over land in in almost all cases when it comes to agricultural land, uh, the tenant or occupier does not have the power to grant the necessary rights for the permanent cable or overhead line, as the case may be, and equally to some extent, they tend not to have the ability to grant further sublet.

00:58:39:15 - 00:59:06:17

Let's say for the purposes of temporary possession as well. So? So what? The approach we take is that we deal with those parties who would be capable to give us the rights which we seek and then leave. Leave the discussions and requirement to discuss the legal side of things to the landlord in the landlord tenant relationship, if that's the nature of of the interest with the occupier. And that's a requirement we put into the heads of terms and in the voluntary agreements as well.

00:59:07:20 - 00:59:33:02

Thank you very much. And you say that's in the in the head in terms of voluntary agreements. Have you had much response to that in a negative way apart from what we you know, obviously we heard from the the NFU yesterday, but are you getting pushed back on that from from others? Or is it, is it reasonably, um, uh, infrequent that you're, you're hearing issues about that particular thing?

00:59:34:15 - 01:00:08:09

John Galloway for the applicant, I think it might be unfair for me to give too much flavour of negotiations, which, as we've described over the two days, are ongoing and increasing in intensity, let's say. Um, but certainly from the meetings that I've attended in the last two weeks, which is well over the majority of represented, uh, persons with interest in land, their agents, um, I think there's a growing acceptance that that position is the standard policy of National Grid, and that the landowners will be expected to take the necessary steps to seek the consent of, of the occupiers.

01:00:08:11 - 01:00:26:06

Yeah. Thank you. That's the sort of statement that I was kind of driving for is if there is a growing understanding that that's the position, um, that, that and that understanding is there from from parties. Okay. Thank you. I just asked Mr. Stone if he's got any comments. No, thank you very much. And thanks for joining us again.

01:00:26:09 - 01:00:27:25

Thank you for having me. Thank you.

01:00:28:15 - 01:00:51:18

Not a problem. Okay. Thank you. Um, there was nothing in particular in addition to that, that Mr. Stone or I have concluded we'd like to ask about the deadline. Three submissions. But as I said, if there's an opportunity that you'd like to give any further clarifications that you feel may help us in the submission whilst we're here, then then, uh, here's an opportunity to do so.

01:00:56:19 - 01:01:04:04

I have a sergeant for the applicant, so it looks as though everyone on my side is satisfied that they've had their say and taken the opportunity for which thank you very much.

01:01:04:06 - 01:01:10:01

No problem at all. I'll, um. In which case I'll pass over Mr. Stone to, um, finish the hearing for us.

01:01:15:06 - 01:01:36:00

Thank you very much. I think that's concluded the substantive business for today and for this hearing. So this is a final call. Are there any other matters that anyone would wish to raise with us today, either in the room or online? Not seeing any hands anywhere? Um.

01:01:39:27 - 01:02:18:20

There will be an opportunity for the written statements of the written summaries from participants over the few days, and then for the applicant written statements at deadline four, and then obviously an opportunity to respond to those at deadline five. Um, in that context, we wouldn't normally identify those as action points, because that's part of the normal process. Um, but we will gather together and review the last couple of days and decide whether or not there are any specific action points that we would wish to indicate to you.

01:02:18:22 - 01:02:38:15

We will put those together with action points from the other hearings that have been conducted this week, and we will release those as soon as possible. And if there are any to be addressed, um, they would be published on the Norwich Tilbury project page for others to see.

01:02:41:11 - 01:02:56:22

So finally, just to close, then I'll remind everybody that any written summary of oral cases put at the hearings and any documents that have been proposed or requested should be submitted by deadline, for which is Tuesday, the 12th of May.

01:02:59:18 - 01:03:11:29

Can I just say thank you to everybody for attending and for your participation? And the compulsory acquisition hearing is now closed at 1443. Thank you very much.