



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) - Day 2 - Part 2
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.

00:00:04:29 - 00:00:18:18

So it's 1150 and we're going to resume this compulsory acquisition hearing number two. And without further ado, we'll go straight into our next, uh, listed speakers, which is for National Highways, who I believe are all online.

00:00:20:03 - 00:00:50:11

Good morning panel. My name is Julie Russell. I'm a solicitor at Gowling w LG, and I'm here to represent National Highways. Um, just one matter to note, I'm here in the place of my colleague, Vicky Fowler. Um, who is noted on the agenda. Um, so if we could take, uh, items A and B of this item together, the current scope of National Highways. Objection and Strategic Highway Authority can be outlined as follows.

00:00:50:21 - 00:01:21:12

Uh, the book of reference includes approximately 154 plots of land owned or occupied by National Highways for the purpose of the purposes of this undertaking, in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought. The compulsory acquisition powers sought are described in the Book of Reference as the permanent acquisition of land and the acquisition of rights for the overhead line underground cable system, and separately for drainage and temporary use.

00:01:21:29 - 00:02:08:27

The land plots, which are operational land, constitute land acquired by National Highways for the purposes of maintaining its statutory undertaking. These plots are therefore subject to section 127 of the Planning Act 2008, which provides that an order granting development consent may include provisions authorizing the compulsory acquisition of statutory undertakers land only to the extent that the Secretary of State is satisfied that it can be purchased and not replaced without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking, or if purchased, it can be replaced by other land belonging to or available for acquisition by the undertakers, without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking.

00:02:09:22 - 00:02:41:20

National highways are subject to the compulsory acquisition of operational land, which is required by National Highways to ensure that the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network can be maintained. If such land were to be compulsorily acquired, it could cause serious detriment. National highways need to be in control of its highway and subsoil and, as will also be explained. Compulsory acquisition is, however, in this case not in fact necessary.

00:02:42:20 - 00:03:24:06

A detailed review of the plots has been undertaken by National Highways, and this review has been provided to National Grid. It's apparent from that review that the proposed permanent landscape plots fall into two categories. Firstly, land, which is currently National Highways managed highway and required for highway works to the SRN or widening works as part of the applicant's proposals. Such works are authorized by the GCA, subject to protective provisions which ensure that National Highways approve the details of those highway works, and that National Highways road space booking requirements are followed.

00:03:25:03 - 00:04:02:15

Second is land, which is not a highway but is owned by National Highways and is required for strategic road network widening as part of the applicant's proposals. This land does not need to be acquired, only to be transferred back to National Highways. Again, access to this land can be granted by National Highways through the protected provisions and by agreement. There's no need for the plots in these two categories of land to be compulsorily acquired there, either part of the SRN or land which national highways own that will become part of the new SRN.

00:04:02:27 - 00:04:33:11

The inclusion of these plots in the book of reference is not necessary or proportionate, as required by the Planning Act compulsory acquisition guidance. National highways will set out the particular plot numbers in its further written representations, so that the examining authority have these in terms of the acquisition of rights. National highways understand that there is a single plot relating to undergrounding, the undergrounding of cabling, and that the other rights of the overhead lines.

00:04:33:28 - 00:05:15:04

Again, the majority of the plots relate to operational highway which forms part of the SRN. Rights are not in fact required for the overhead lines over highway land or for the undergrounding of cabling. This national grid has statutory powers under section 50 of the New Roads and Street Works Act to install, maintain and repair apparatus in a public highway which includes carriageway, verge and footway. Section 105 of the New Roads and Street Works Act confirms that the references to in a highway include references to works, apparatus or other property under, over, across or along it.

00:05:16:08 - 00:05:46:22

National grid can undertake the overhead line works without compulsory acquisition, and so again the inclusion of these plots is not necessary or proportionate as required by the compulsory acquisition guidance. Depending on the depth of the single underground cable, that might require an easement. But again, national highways are prepared to grant that easement by consent and is willing to negotiate terms within the land over which rights are to be secured.

00:05:46:24 - 00:06:18:19

There are plots where national highways ownership is historic. The relevant roads have been trunked, which means that ownership has in fact passed to the local highway authority, but the transfer of that ownership has not been registered at the land registry. The applicant has agreed to update the book of reference accordingly as this land is non-operational land. National highways can agree to transfer any interest it does retain by agreement. Therefore, compulsory acquisition is not necessary when.

00:06:18:21 - 00:06:22:13

It comes to your five minutes. So if you could just start to summarize that, please. That'd be great.

00:06:22:15 - 00:07:12:29

Thank you. That's fine. When it comes to temporary possession. Possession. National highways would expect to permit access subject to its usual arrangements for permitting works on the highway. Having followed the procedures in its template, protective provisions in terms of the relief that National Highways is seeking about National Highways, would like to see the book of reference updated to remove land which is operational. Highway. The protective provisions included in the draft ACA for the benefit of National Highways, at least need to be revised so that the paragraph seven um, part,

which relates to prior approvals and security, requires National Highways consent before any powers of temporary of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession under the articles in the DCO are exercised.

00:07:13:07 - 00:07:44:16

National highways must have control over the operations being carried out on its network. This is critical from a safety perspective and to maintain the integrity of the asset. Therefore, the applicant should be required to obtain National Highways consent in the event that the activities affect the strategic road network or any land that National Highways has an interest in. As a public body, National Highways is under a duty to act reasonably in providing such consent, and this is expressly provided for in the protective provisions.

00:07:45:17 - 00:08:03:13

Just finally, in terms of item D on the agenda and issues of hardship or request. Request for non-statutory relief and item E. Human rights and the public sector. Equality. Duty. National highways do not raise any issues under these items. Thank you.

00:08:04:17 - 00:08:11:15

Thank you very much. So there was quite a number of things in there, but I will turn to the applicant to try and respond to those. Thank you.

00:08:16:04 - 00:09:00:13

Abigail, for the applicant. Um, I think that's a fair summary of the issues that we've been discussing with National Highways. Um, we have, um, a reasonably good level of agreement in relation to the protective provisions and are working with them to try and resolve the remaining outstanding issues on those, um, which includes the consent to powers clause, which um duties referred to in relation To the class one land, National grid and the applicant, and not seeking to take class one lands in a way for their own purposes.

00:09:00:15 - 00:09:36:15

If you like, they're seeking to take class one land, taking situations where they need to widen or extend the highway works, um, in relation to the strategic road network or the local authority, um, road network. And the concern there for the applicant is simply ensuring that they can um, and they have title to dedicate and adopt sufficient extent of the new or extended highway back to the relevant highway authority to ensure that it can become, um, adopted public highway in the future, once the completion of the work has been carried out.

00:09:36:17 - 00:10:08:00

Um, we've been having detailed discussions with National Highways on each of the plots that are identified and seeking to agree a way forwards in the side agreement. And, um, I think there is a high level of agreement between the parties as to how we're going to do that in a way which meets both parties requirements in relation to the class one landscape. We're just trying to sort of final out, finalize that position between ourselves, um, which is ongoing in relation to the acquisition of rights.

00:10:08:03 - 00:10:08:19

Um.

00:10:12:17 - 00:10:49:09

Obviously, um, as Julie has indicated, National Highways want control, um, over the consent to carry out clause. But there is an out point of around an outstanding easement for an underground crossing of the A12. And to that extent, the parties need to discuss further that easement, which National Highways have indicated today that they're willing to give. So we would need to just conclude those discussions in the context of the site agreement. Um, and also in addition to the Nerys were issue um and operating the crossings under the Nizwa legislation.

00:10:49:11 - 00:11:24:07

We've taken that point away. That national highways have raised and are looking at the position as between the respective parties historically. And we will we will be getting back to national highways in relation to that in in the context of our ongoing discussions with them. And we have had quite a lot of regular meetings with National Highways to progress both the side agreements, the protective provisions and also the plot by plot analysis of all the affected plots, which is ongoing. And we will be arranging further meetings with them to get to the bottom of all of those issues and resolve them, hopefully in due course.

00:11:25:00 - 00:11:25:15

Okay.

00:11:26:16 - 00:11:27:10

Thank you.

00:11:28:28 - 00:11:59:19

So, um, just just for my clarity, um, you said that you're you're doing a plot by plot review. Are we expecting to see changes to any of the land plans to show class eight? Um, in this respect, what I, what I'm trying to understand is you might have some side agreements, but if the plots don't change, there still could be potential outstanding issues that, um, National highways have in regard to compulsory purchase.

00:11:59:21 - 00:12:00:15

Um, powers.

00:12:00:17 - 00:12:31:03

I don't think that we would be anticipating class ating, um, the plots because that within the plot there could be different interests at different levels. So there'll be a subsoil interest and a road network interest, etc.. So I would imagine that the agreement with National Highways will be reflected in the side agreement between the parties, so that everybody's happy with how the powers are controlled and operated, rather than by amending the land plans. But obviously we will discuss that with National Highways in terms of what protection they're happy with.

00:12:31:05 - 00:12:44:17

Yes. And ultimately, um, from National Highways point of view, I presume that you're maintaining the objection. I'm making an assumption there until that side agreement and protective provisions are in place. And, um, is that is that correct?

00:12:44:22 - 00:12:46:25

Yes, yes. That's absolutely right. Yeah.

00:12:46:27 - 00:13:00:04

And in terms of the protective provisions, um, you mentioned that right at the beginning. They they are progressing to a point where, um, agreement is concluded is coming together.

00:13:00:22 - 00:13:11:23

Yeah. The the negotiations on the protective provisions are progressing well, but we need to conclude all matters together, if you like, with National Highways at one point in time. Okay.

00:13:11:25 - 00:13:16:06

Thank you very much. National highways, have you. Do you have any comments on what the applicant has said?

00:13:16:18 - 00:13:38:17

No, no, nothing at all for me, sir, other than just to note that, um, I would agree with, uh, what Mrs. Walters has said in terms of, uh, National Highways and the applicant working together. Um, protective provisions are progressing. Um, we're not we're not there yet, but, um, we're reasonably hopeful that, um, that that will come in due course.

00:13:39:04 - 00:14:00:04

Okay. Thank you. And, um, I believe this is within the statement of common ground are a matter within the statement of common ground, I believe. So when we see that, as well as any confirmation that we may seek about objections directly from you. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. Anything more from the applicant? No. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Walton. Mrs. Russell.

00:14:00:13 - 00:14:01:06

Thank you.

00:14:01:09 - 00:14:09:16

Thank you. Um, so we're going to move on to, um, Charles McLean, who I believe is in person today. Thank you.

00:14:20:07 - 00:14:36:13

Charlie McLean, representing any land associated with the Langley's estate that's either owned by Charles Nicholas McLean. Alexander David McLean, D.R. McLean settlement. Sarah McLean, 2010. Trust or Henry James McLean Older Associates, known as Langley's estate.

00:14:36:29 - 00:14:41:05

Thank you very much. Um, you have five minutes to give us your summary of your position. Thank you.

00:14:41:10 - 00:15:12:12

And that's also from pylons. I think it's TB one three two to one four four. Um, it's just, um, everything seems to be a battle with National Grid with regards to their compulsory powers. The one thing I fundamentally disagree with, um, is I've got heads of terms here. Um, that, uh, I firstly, I just want to set the scene. Farming is in a dire straits at the moment. Fertilizer starved, fuels doubled.

00:15:12:14 - 00:15:47:18

Everything is getting very expensive. Received heads of terms here that are offering quite significant money for a compound and stuff. One of them is worth over £100,000, which some farmers will need to sign quite quickly to get that money. One of the clauses in it is clause 17. Planning the Grand Tour will not make any objection to respect to any planning, application or development consent order application which is submitted by the grantee so far as relates to the grantee's lab that is locking me in for a life commitment not to object to any national grid planning.

00:15:47:20 - 00:16:18:07

Not. That's not limiting me, just to the Norwich Tilbury one, which is unbelievable that they're trying to bully us and have their way with any other application. Uh, also means I couldn't be here to object today. It's just they're trying to bribe us to keep us quiet. Um, again, with the heads of terms. It doesn't even cover. Half the pylons are missing. TB 132213413914 1 to 1 four four.

00:16:18:18 - 00:16:51:20

It's incomplete. Everything is a battle. These guys get paid to do their job. I'm the one having to read everything, spend my time. I've spent the last two days at hearings and now I'm here again. It's just a battle with National Grid and everything is like with their development consent or temporary land rights, I don't believe they're going to follow what they do state. We had a license last year legal drawn up by them state of where the compound was. We had a meeting with them and everything. Everything was fully agreed, put in writing, all signed.

00:16:51:24 - 00:17:32:00

I turned up to the site and the compound was in a completely different place without agreement. It was legal document signed and then not even listened to. Their argument was it was too near an ancient woodland. Well, they saw maps. They went there in place. So not really a valid argument. Um, we're, um, and we're having other arguments with them. They're not very they don't really seem to listen to our feedback. Um, they did give one concession in the terms of, um, relating to Langley's that they have reduced the pylons, which I think, to be fair, make a horrible there's a horrible change.

00:17:32:02 - 00:18:04:03

Do you not agree to them? And even in the Essex. Eight 2025 target consultation. Even National Grid, in their own words, wrote the proposed change would not materially change the conclusions that were reported within the preliminary environmental impact assessment. Um, and they also wrote. And while the pylons would be shorter, they're also wider, potentially increasing the visual impact of properties in the immediate area. I don't know if you guys have looked at the Great Wolf and Little Wolf and Gap.

00:18:04:05 - 00:18:42:11

There is a significant number of historic properties there. We cannot understand the reasons why they have put the route there. There is other, other, much better alternatives, which, as I stated yesterday,

actually the one we're pushing for affects us as landowners greater and pushes the pylons further onto our land, not away. And they cannot seem to give a valid reason why that is not not fair. Um, I've also had problems in the past. Um, so last year I received a consultation document that asked me to consult on land that was just simply.

00:18:42:13 - 00:19:12:25

The land title was just unregistered. I don't know where that land was, I contacted. That letter was on the 10th of July. I contacted Fischer German on the 14th of July to clarify the land in question. That was a phone call followed by WhatsApp messages with the letter chased again on the 12th of August. The deadline for the consultation was the 22nd of August, and I still to this day do not know what that letter refers to with that land.

00:19:13:01 - 00:19:44:23

This is what we are dealing with as landowners. It's a constant battle, and if they cannot give me a simple answer to what land do they writing about? How can I trust they're going to follow their powers correctly? How can I trust with the documents they couldn't even follow? Where to put compound? How can I trust that these heads of times are going to be followed. It is. We've just lost faith. We're trying to engage with them, but we simply cannot. My current battle, well is with the licensing agreement.

00:19:44:25 - 00:20:18:15

We're talking about boreholes. I have come up with an argument with them that says we are not fairly compensated for the boreholes. Uh, this has been going on for two months now. Um, and given them all the information and there seems to be a conclusion, is they're trying to remove the boreholes from our land. Well, if they don't believe my information, if that means to me, they believe my information, well, if they're removing the boreholes from my land, shouldn't they do that for every route and compensate land landowners fairly? Not just pressure tactics.

00:20:19:01 - 00:20:51:08

Uh, and then my last point with regards to maps, uh, so as the, um, Northumbrian Water chap was talking about that little Wolfram Pumping station, I mentioned a water pipe across our across to the compound that crosses my land. That's the first time I've actually heard that. Putting a water pipe across our land. I have. We had a meeting on, I think it was 28th of February. At worlds or not, with Fish or German. I requested maps of everything going on our land.

00:20:51:10 - 00:21:24:24

That is, drainage ponds, water pipes, electric pipes. Because we're not going to need to do soil surveys and stuff, so they'll make sure the land is reinstated correctly afterwards. I'm still waiting for those maps again. Uh, it's just National grid. Yes, or two days ago. We're arguing with the council about five days. We're talking about months, which are like things they I. I had a conversation and someone asked me how many pylons were on our land. We still don't know the answer to this question because they can't decide if they're doing tall or low pylons.

00:21:24:26 - 00:22:01:19

We're either going to have 12. I think it's like 13 or 12. We don't know where they're going. We don't know anything about them. They. I raised this point yesterday in their draft as a development order

document submitted in August. They stated that they could do the deviation, which later in one of your questions, they clarified that was because they need to know if it's tall or short. On page 5200 or something of their consultation document. Again in August, they did submit saying they were going to, uh, they were planned to revert back to the tall pylons.

00:22:02:11 - 00:22:05:20

Um, I just asked you to bring your statement to a conclusion, though, because.

00:22:06:14 - 00:22:38:01

I just finished that one. Uh, which, uh. Sorry. Yeah. And so in the response to your questions, I think it was the deadline. One cover letter. They confirmed they were going to revert back to two pylons, um, which they then said later in that thing, they will give the plans on the 10th of June. I can't would it gives us less time to consult? We had an issue specific hearing about the little wolf from the Great Wall from yesterday. How can I consult if we don't have the correct plans? What? They've got nine months.

00:22:38:03 - 00:22:43:19

They've obviously taken to get these plans. They know what they're doing. They just don't want us to argue. Thank you.

00:22:43:24 - 00:22:50:29

Thank you very much. Um, thank you very much for that statement. I'll ask the applicant to, um, to respond, please.

00:22:51:08 - 00:23:30:20

Thank you. Sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. So I hope it does go without saying that there's certainly no intention on grid's part to exert pressure tactics, or to bully or to bribe. We are just seeking in a line with the guidance to ensure that where we're seeking compulsory purchase powers, that is the last resort. And, you know, we've done what we can to try and acquire by agreement. Um, and again, as we explained yesterday, the context for the negotiations in relation to compulsory acquisition is that although we are trying to sort of expedite the detailed design process where we can, as is the ordinary course of events on these projects.

00:23:30:22 - 00:24:08:29

It's simply, you know, we won't have got to the end of that by the end of this examination. And so where perhaps understandably affected persons would like to see the detailed design, if that's the nature of their objection, we're just not going to get over the line with them because it it won't be available. Um, so that's I think all that I wanted to say, I'm not going to respond to some of that, I think relates to the issue specific hearing that I wasn't at. So I won't respond to that because that's been dealt with. And I will just go to Mr. Going in case there's anything that he wants to respond on in relation to the heads of terms or the points made on the negotiations.

00:24:09:01 - 00:24:09:24

Thank you.

00:24:10:27 - 00:24:41:06

Thank you. James, going for the applicant. Um, just to confirm, we are in ongoing dialogue with the agent Wellington, not who's acting on behalf of the AP. Um, I think I hear that there's obviously some concern around the nature of the shots that have been issued to date. As such, we do have a team from German here, and we can make sure that we can reprint and reissue the heads of terms to the AP before he leaves the venue today, if you would like. And he would also like to meet with one of our team who's responsible for that section of the heads of Terms negotiation.

00:24:41:08 - 00:24:42:26

We can facilitate that also.

00:24:44:02 - 00:25:08:25

I think that's a very kind offer. And just to confirm that, unfortunately, the examiner authority, as I said right at the beginning, um, have little opportunity to understand what's in the heads of terms and what the compensation is. It's not it's outside of our remit. But I think there's a potential offer here to to try and alleviate some of your concerns. And obviously that work is going to continue with with your agents as well. Is there anything you'd like to say in response to what you've heard?

00:25:09:03 - 00:25:29:25

Uh, no. I'm happy if I can get the heads of terms printed. Um, just for further clarification, like you did with Angus Upton earlier, is there any chance they can justify their, um, their routes? Because it was quite helpful listening to their one with Angus and it will highlight all the listed buildings. grade one parkland or two parkland and heritage sites.

00:25:29:27 - 00:25:46:20

Yes. And forgive me in your introduction because you didn't make a comment about the routing that the applicant wasn't responding to you. But we probably do have one minute to to just bring up the the mapping so that we can we can do that for you, because that's a good opportunity for you to hear that firsthand.

00:25:49:14 - 00:25:55:00

But we'll ask for it to be brief, because we've nearly come to the end of our hour slot here. But if you could do that, that'd be great. Thank you.

00:25:55:13 - 00:26:26:07

Thank you. Josh Crawford, on behalf of the applicant. Um, okay. So yeah, I'm fairly familiar with the maps now, but we've got the effective parties land in kind of the center center ish area of the screen. Now you've got the dark green just off to the right, which is ancient woodland. I think the effective part is land starts kind of around there just and then continues down to where you've got the conservation area shown, great Waltham towards the bottom. I think it's at the road crossing, isn't it? Pretty much.

00:26:26:09 - 00:26:43:24

The affected parties land runs to um. Various options were looked at through routing and citing that all the details are in the various reports. You just want to pan out a little bit, just to give context of the the Western diversion that was that was assessed and has been referred to on numerous occasions.

00:26:45:22 - 00:26:46:08

Okay.

00:26:48:08 - 00:27:19:25

A little bit more, a little bit more. Apologies, just to give the full context of that Western option, just the magnitude of it. So just from the top of the screen now the western option would have commenced, roughly speaking, at the top of the screen and heading in pretty much a directly west direction to then traversed around the kind of northern edges of the conservation area to then enable a kind of southwesterly route that would then pass between Great Waltham and the plushie and its associated schedule, monuments, etc., and then tie back in with the route.

00:27:20:06 - 00:27:55:28

Kind of. You can see the angled pylon at the bottom of the route of the screen there, just above all the icons on the mapping, it would tie back in. Now it's a significantly longer route, about an additional three kilometers subject to. Final routing and an additional 8 to 9 pylons, which also then transferred effects to similar receptors, residential, cultural heritage, etc., etc.. So that's why we essentially remained on the alignment as we are. And I think the detail, as you said, was discussed yesterday on the cultural heritage grounds.

00:27:56:00 - 00:27:58:08

So I'm not going to press that.

00:27:59:01 - 00:28:07:13

And I believe there is a version of this mapping on the National Grid website that you refer to earlier. So you can see some of this. Is that correct?

00:28:10:21 - 00:28:15:01

Josh Crawford, on behalf of the applicant, I believe the interactive map still on the website.

00:28:16:20 - 00:28:17:27

Yes. Check that one. Yes.

00:28:18:22 - 00:28:45:19

Well, I just add one thing to that map. It currently actually doesn't show all the detail because it's got not got the Wolf and conservation area on there, which is again, and the great wolf and conservation area is not shown, which is two fundamental parts. And I think there are two to conservation areas that are most affected by the routes. So missing them off a map is quite a fundamental part to show that it's a good route.

00:28:45:25 - 00:28:47:06

Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:28:47:12 - 00:28:58:00

Sorry. Just on. And they're not. It's just that, um, the interactive layer for conservation areas isn't activated. So they're not they haven't we have we know they're there. We're not listing them off. But yeah.

00:28:58:16 - 00:28:59:01

That's right.

00:28:59:03 - 00:29:03:27

Just to let the planning people know as well then. So then they know that they're there. Thank you.

00:29:03:29 - 00:29:05:19

Thank you very much indeed. Thank you for your.

00:29:05:21 - 00:29:15:24

Just one more from Josh Crawford about the applicant. When the lands team meet afterwards, if need to be myself and my colleague. I'm from a routine perspective and I'm happy to join as well and explain a few more bits if necessary.

00:29:15:26 - 00:29:18:02

Hopefully that would help. Thank you very much indeed.

00:29:18:04 - 00:29:18:21

I'd hope greatly.

00:29:18:23 - 00:29:20:14

Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:29:24:20 - 00:29:32:12

So next will be the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Extensions Pro Co Limited, which I believe are in the room.

00:29:39:04 - 00:29:42:19

Or not? Do we have you online?

00:29:48:16 - 00:29:52:22

So our understanding is actually that this affected party might not be attending this afternoon.

00:29:53:06 - 00:30:12:12

I was waiting for any message to tell me that, but, um, what we're going to do is we're going to assume that they're they're not because they haven't turned they haven't put their camera on or, um, come forward. So I will move on to the next person on the list, which is James French, Hugh French and Rob Braun Limited.

00:30:16:25 - 00:30:18:18

Are they present or online?

00:30:26:28 - 00:30:27:21

Okay.

00:30:30:15 - 00:30:34:03

That's fine. Thank you. Um, do we have Bianca Muller?

00:30:36:22 - 00:30:38:18

We do have Bianca Muller online.

00:30:43:18 - 00:30:48:24

I think you're on mute at the moment, which is fantastic. Up until the moment you need you to speak.

00:30:49:10 - 00:30:50:19

All right. Can you hear me now?

00:30:50:22 - 00:30:52:00

Yes, we can hear you now.

00:30:52:04 - 00:31:22:13

Hello. My name is Darren Kamala. I represent myself and seem to be husband Robert Moore. Um. The proposed pylon route is set to run through our family farm, an outdoor wedding venue. We are situated in one of the most rural parts of South Norfolk, and are one of only a handful of outdoor wedding venues in the whole of Norfolk. Um, our unique selling point. It's a remote rural location and panoramic views. On a clear day, you can clearly see the chimneys at Cantley sugar beet factory, which is 17 miles away.

00:31:22:21 - 00:32:04:03

And so you can only imagine the impact of 50 meter pylon would have on this location. The new pylon route is set to run alongside the picturesque east and south side of the farm. Due to the nature of the area being mostly rolling hills, open fields and a completely unobstructed landscape with not another property in sight is rare and makes for a beautiful backdrop for some wedding photos also, and the addition of steel pylons across this landscape destroys the unique selling point of our venue and the beauty of the surrounding area, where the new pylon route is proposed to run part of our farm near pylon RG 31 will also become inaccessible due to there being no road access to the field immediately to the east.

00:32:04:05 - 00:32:44:19

I've already requested on numerous occasions, alongside other local landowners, that the pylons between RG 28 and RG 33 be placed further down the hill into the valley to the east, allowing us more use of the field and complying with far better with the whole field rules three, four and five siting the route much more neatly in the valley between two hills. By doing this, you would lose approximately 15m of height from the pylons. It would also improve the views greatly from our wedding venue, and as the proposed pylon line would not wrap around the south so much, and it would also affect far less properties in the local area of fund and hall.

00:32:44:21 - 00:33:14:22

Thaxton Hampton flaunts it alongside many local businesses. Myself and other local farmers and landowners along this section of the pylon route have also made known in their feedback. They would

prefer the pylons to be routed through the valley as their preferred route, which actually weaves them through a plan to add in our feedback in the past. I think if you can see it, it's the yellow line on this map and you can probably look it up online. Um, we.

00:33:14:24 - 00:33:45:06

So each landowner has their own personal reasons for wanting to cite the pylons along our preferred yellow line. Our proposed route, and alongside just a general care and aesthetic for the local countryside. And in this instance, I feel the feedback we've provided during this time has not really been listened to, and I've outlined some of the main benefits of the route that we've put forward to National Grid. Um, as opposed to their route.

00:33:45:08 - 00:34:19:22

Um, so the farmer's kind of proposed route is a straighter, more direct route, and it uses less angled pylons or cabling. Um, it cites the pylons on field boundaries as opposed to open countryside. Um, it sets them on lower ground so it's less intrusive to the local views and landscape, losing possibly 15 plus meters of height of the pylons, um, therefore complying far better with the Holford rules as well. Um, in particular rules three, four and five. Um, we would not need to take out a whole hedge road between pylons RG 30 and 31.

00:34:19:27 - 00:34:41:20

And it also saves a veteran oak tree. Um, and it or the oak tree would not require intensive polishing. Um, we would have use of more of the field to the east of pylon RG 31. Um, and after pylon RG 33, the route would cross through a meadow instead of a belt of trees. Um, and that's my comment. Thank you.

00:34:44:06 - 00:34:52:00

Okay. Thank you very much. That's, uh, that's very kind of you. So I will, um, I'll first ask the applicant to respond on those matters. Thank you.

00:34:53:01 - 00:35:00:02

Have a sergeant for the applicant. Thank you. Sir. I'll turn to Mr. Crawford. Um, just to respond to the points made around the justification for the siting. Thank you.

00:35:00:04 - 00:35:01:00

Thank you.

00:35:02:18 - 00:35:38:00

Thank you. Josh Crawford, on behalf of the applicant, if you could pull the screen up. That's perfect. Thank you. Okay. So just to give a little bit of context. Um, the property, if I took depart in question, you say you can see the pink kind of dogleg shape just to the right of the odd limits in the middle of the screen. That's the county wildlife site that sits kind of at the bottom of the valley that the AP's mentioning, and the sort of the if you look directly west, pretty much from the bottom of that shape and go west of the odd limits. Um, that's approximately where the affected parties property, um, in question is.

00:35:38:13 - 00:35:47:01

Um, in terms of the routing and siting for this location. So if you just pop out a tiny bit again, sorry, on the mapping pop out a little bit. Sorry. Just for the valley.

00:35:48:21 - 00:36:27:24

Um, you'll see that just to the north of that area, we've got the angle where we're coming kind of in a southwesterly direction, and it starts to head a bit more in a southerly direction. Direction. There's a listed building and residential property on fontanel funding the whole road at that point there. So if we were to from that point and kind of Directly self to almost herself. Easterly direction to pick up the edge of the valley would be very close to that property, with multiple angled pylons to enable picking up an alignment that is further down in the valley towards that kind of pink shading there.

00:36:28:13 - 00:36:59:00

Um, additionally, um, yes, I think the rules were mentioned a few times in there then, um, whilst I, we agreed that going down into the valley would be more compliant with the route five, it does then conflict with the rule two and the supplementary notes, and the fact that it brings the impacts potentially onto that county wildlife staff, but also on the residential receptors of the other residential receptors that may be impacted. So of the alignment that we've got is trying to kind of balance those competing kind of constraints.

00:36:59:26 - 00:37:06:06

I'm looking to my colleague, if there's anything else to add. No, no, I think I think that's that's the summary.

00:37:06:22 - 00:37:07:07

Okay.

00:37:07:15 - 00:37:13:15

We'll double check that it's been responded to. I'm pretty sure there's response in the consultation feedback report as well. Yeah. Offline.

00:37:14:29 - 00:37:40:06

Thank you very much. Is there anything else the applicant would like to say? Um, Mr. Moller? Uh, I mean, you've you've had an explanation there briefly about why the routing, um, came through in the way that it had. Um, and I know that you've, you've, you've said you said you have you've submitted, um, an alternative. Yeah. Um, have you got any more any comments in response to what you've just heard?

00:37:41:10 - 00:38:14:00

Um, I mean, he he mentioned that they want to go round, uh, grade two listed property. The proposed route, um, that we've put forward, um, actually skims that property and isn't any closer to it. Um, if anything, the route that National Grid have put forward wraps around that property on two sides. So if you look at the map that you had at a moment ago, it wraps around to the north and to the west of that property. Um, whereas the proposed route that I've put forward actually just comes along the side of the property.

00:38:14:02 - 00:38:19:09

Um, so I feel it's far less intrusive. Um, the National Grid's proposal.

00:38:21:08 - 00:38:26:04

And, and any comments on the, on the county wildlife area?

00:38:28:04 - 00:38:51:02

Um, in terms of the county wildlife area that you're referring to, if you were to cross the correct place, you wouldn't be crossing through, um, that at all. You would just be crossing across a meadow. Um, which is only there because, you know, it's not farm able anyway, so why not use land that's not farming? Um, rather than land that is farmed and used and generates an income?

00:38:53:09 - 00:38:58:14

Thank you very much. I'd just ask the applicant to, um, if they have any. You can respond on those matters.

00:38:58:16 - 00:39:14:03

I have a sergeant for the applicant, sir. Um, my understanding is that actually, there is probably something already in the documentation on this alternative route. So, um, I suggested that we go away and look at that. But then if there's anything that we need to add in response, we'll do that in writing.

00:39:14:05 - 00:39:21:20

Yes. I, um, I don't know whether you've seen that response, Mrs. Moller, in the documentation.

00:39:25:04 - 00:39:32:21

What's possibly, um, what document? What, um, documentation is that that you're referring to? Sorry.

00:39:34:27 - 00:39:41:16

Uh, you won't see, but the applicant is just, um, taking some, um, some soundings from colleagues behind them. So just one moment, please.

00:39:41:18 - 00:39:42:08

Okay.

00:39:43:21 - 00:39:52:22

Yeah. Without looking into very much detail right now, I believe it's in the 2024 Design development design development report. That's up 359.

00:39:52:26 - 00:40:26:16

Okay. What I what I'm going to ask is, um, because obviously, um, Mrs. Muller, you've said that you put an alternative in and we've asked for some explanation here about about that alternative. If there has been something in writing, it might be worth just highlighting in response in the applicants for the applicant after this meeting. After this hearing, Will will make comments on the oral representations. That's what we call it. And I'm asking them now you won't see because I'm looking at them now to put in there where where you can reference their response to your alternatives.

00:40:26:18 - 00:40:27:24

And it would help us as well.

00:40:28:05 - 00:40:30:24

Yeah, I haven't seen anything yet. So thank you.

00:40:31:02 - 00:40:31:23

Okay.

00:40:32:04 - 00:40:46:16

Just just to provide a bit of clarity. Now I have found the reference. I did have it in my notes. It was a bit further down in the 5.1 consultation report at 066. And it's reference 1022 .46.

00:40:48:11 - 00:40:55:02

I can repeat that if you like. It's reference 1022 .46 as I appreciate. That's a very big document.

00:40:55:11 - 00:40:57:08

Okay. Right. Thank you.

00:40:57:12 - 00:41:15:09

And if you didn't match it there'll be a recording of this hearing. So if you didn't manage to write it down you'll be able to hear it. So that's really helpful. Thank you applicant. And then it might just close Close a discussion for you about about your alternative, but you've obviously got the opportunity to make any further written written representations anyway.

00:41:15:17 - 00:41:16:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:41:16:18 - 00:41:21:16

Thank you. I'll ask the applicant if I got any more comments. Have you got any more comments, Mrs. Miller?

00:41:21:29 - 00:41:23:12

No, no, thank you for your time.

00:41:23:14 - 00:41:26:02

Okay. Thank you for your time as well. Thank you very much indeed.

00:41:29:04 - 00:41:32:16

So the next item on our list is D and J Starling.

00:41:51:02 - 00:42:13:11

Just just for your information, there were a number of affected parties that initially asked to be heard at a hearing and, um subsequently didn't necessarily submit a hearing notification, so we have included them to ensure that they were available to be able to speak. Um,

00:42:14:29 - 00:42:40:04

but that's why we're we're asking for those to be represented if they are here. Um, but it does look like DNA styling aren't being represented at the moment. And it might be that it applies to a couple more coming up, but we will see. So I'm going to go on to the next people on the list. And although it means we're a bit further ahead of time than we would have otherwise been, do we have Bricklin so Farm Solar Limited?

00:42:49:10 - 00:42:52:15

To have Bricklin Farms sold or online or in the in the room.

00:42:59:10 - 00:43:06:05

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, So British pipeline agency.

00:43:12:04 - 00:43:13:17

To our field Fisher here.

00:43:15:18 - 00:43:19:09

So I have a sergeant for the applicant. Our understanding is that they're probably not attending.

00:43:19:18 - 00:43:20:21

Thank you very much.

00:43:22:15 - 00:43:23:03

Um,

00:43:24:29 - 00:43:27:21

do we have Parkers of Leicestershire Limited?

00:43:37:16 - 00:43:38:10

Okay.

00:43:42:15 - 00:43:44:12

So do we have Gary Sharpe?

00:43:52:15 - 00:43:53:29

Is Mr. Sharpe online?

00:44:09:03 - 00:44:15:21

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, do we have Bloor Homes available?

00:44:19:27 - 00:44:23:11

Good morning sir. Yes, I am here. So, um. And, uh. Yeah. And.

00:44:23:13 - 00:44:24:06

Hello. Well, welcome.

00:44:24:11 - 00:45:01:08

Proceed. Yes. I thought it was gonna be. It's going to be a very long day. So, um. Thank you, sir. So. So, uh, my name is Mrs., uh, Vicky Fowler. I'm a partner and solicitor at Gowling w lg, and I'm representing Bloor Homes Limited. Um, I am also joined by, um, Kat Mumby and Ben Tibbits, who are directors at RTS Property Consultancy, although I do not expect to need to call on them. So so in terms of, um, my five minute representations, um, effectively the objection relates to land parcels at Chadwell Saint Mary.

00:45:01:10 - 00:45:34:20

So that's plot. 671. 671 A and 671 B. Effectively, Blore has an option over this land and is promoting a planning application for the development. Development of up to 1500 homes, education, health and retail uses. And so it's a strategic site for being part of a growth area that will deliver up to 4000 homes. The scheme will come forward in phases and start on site is anticipated in 2029.

00:45:35:10 - 00:46:11:17

So in terms of the three parcels, um, so the the first parcel is a strip of land adjacent to Brentford Road. Uh, coloured brown. So for compulsory acquisition. Um, and this strip effectively is being acquired for, uh, National Grid's, um, temporary and permanent access. Now, that strip is fundamental to the blue scheme as it contains the proposed access to residential development parcels off Brentford Road, and overlaps with the first development area adjacent to the entrance.

00:46:12:20 - 00:46:50:00

Um. The other parcels, um, are also compulsory acquisition and again overlap with Blau law scheme. And the understanding is that, um Blau understand that National Grid, uh, don't require all the land required, and in fact, only a relatively small proportion of the brown land will be required. So for all three parcels, it is Blair's view that compulsory acquisition is not necessary. So instead, Blau or the landowner ahead of Blau acquisition, could retain the land and grant national Grid the rights as necessary.

00:46:50:17 - 00:47:07:12

And moreover, the permanent access um to NGS apparatus in the future is capable of being run over the estate road. Negotiations with the applicant have been positive and the dropping of option A was extremely helpful to Blore.

00:47:12:22 - 00:47:48:13

On several key matters. Um um, in particular, that National Grid will only implement land and property rights to the extent actually required. Um, before can get on and construct its permanent access route. And the idea that the permanent access will switch on to the estate road. Um, so currently objects to the compulsory acquisition powers sort to the extent these are not reduced in size change to temporary or regulated by a binding agreement to reflect those commitments in the statement of Common Ground.

00:47:49:23 - 00:48:26:03

So would like to see the land plans amended, and a commitment to locate the permanent overhead lines as far north in the site as possible. But importantly, we do need the commitments in the

Statement of Common Ground to be secured in a legal agreement. Law have received heads of terms for such an agreement, and understand that the negotiation of that agreement will progress, with the aim of completing the same during the examination, but currently taken at face value. The land plan suggests a fundamental constraint to the broader scheme, which, if viewed by prospective purchaser purchasers, would cause alarm and the ability to secure finance.

00:48:26:18 - 00:48:42:06

Moreover, if those permanent acquisition powers were exercised without regard to the commitments, then that would scupper the scheme removing that strategic access to this strategic housing site. That's all I have to say, sir. Thank you.

00:48:43:04 - 00:48:58:16

Thank you very much, Mr. Fowler. You broke up ever so slightly in the middle. I don't think it detracted from what you were saying, but if the applicant does need a bit of clarification, they are shaking their head, so hopefully that won't matter. So I'll pass over to the applicant now. Thank you.

00:49:00:07 - 00:49:32:07

Abigail Walters, for the applicant. Um, I think that reflects, um, the position of negotiations between the parties. Obviously, um, there's, um, LODs and, um, land take in this area, um, which need to reflect the fact that the detailed design has not been finished. In fact, none of the parties which intersect in this area have a detailed design. Um, notwithstanding that and therefore that, um, compulsory acquisition powers are needed.

00:49:32:12 - 00:50:09:21

Um, at the time, at this current time, the parties are, um, in negotiation with Blau in order to put in place an appropriate agreement which will resolve how the parties interact on this land, how the extent of temporary and permanent land rights are taken in future in light of the parties. Um, And sort of, um. Program constraints and their timetables and the extent of the areas that they respectively need and, um, that that side agreement should govern how the parties are going to be able to work in this area.

00:50:09:23 - 00:50:19:17

And if we can conclude that agreement that should resolve Bloor Homes, um, concerns about the extent and nature of the compulsory acquisition powers over this area of land.

00:50:21:00 - 00:50:23:23

Thank you. Is that is that your understanding, Mr. Fowler?

00:50:25:10 - 00:50:28:27

Um, Mrs. Fowler, on behalf of Bloor Homes. Yes, that is correct, sir.

00:50:29:27 - 00:50:40:22

Okay. Thank you very much. So, um, bearing bearing that in mind, is that is there anything else you'd like to comment on.

00:50:41:23 - 00:50:52:07

Mrs. Fowler? On behalf of Bloor Homes? Uh, no, sir. That's. That's all I have to say. Um, today, and obviously, we're just very keen to work with the applicant, um, to ensure that agreement is is concluded.

00:50:52:25 - 00:50:57:11

Okay. Thank you. The applicant reaching out for the button.

00:50:58:01 - 00:51:06:21

I have a sergeant for the applicant. Nothing substantive to add, sir. Very grateful to Mrs. Fowler for that indication, and we'll obviously progress matters with Blore. Thank you.

00:51:07:01 - 00:51:08:21

Fantastic. Thank you very much.

00:51:10:21 - 00:51:42:06

Um, what we're going to do now is we're going to break for lunch. Now we're going to the case team are going to contact, um, some people that, um, we had anticipated speaking over lunch. Um, and if we can bring them in after lunch, we will do. Um, and I believe the case team will let the applicant know as soon as they're aware who is or who isn't turning up. We will do that over the lunch break. So we're going to adjourn this hearing now, and we'll be resuming at 140.

00:51:42:08 - 00:51:46:19

So we'll be back at 140. Uh, to resume the hearing. Thank you very much.