

Following my attendance at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 - day 1; I am now submitting the points I raised at that Hearing.

In summary I have cooperated from the start and got 'nothing' back from NG or FG.

1. Thank you for opportunity to speak – I have engaged with NG / FG and my agent from the start. I have friends just joining the conversation 'now' I can't see any benefit of engaging early. I've had nothing back since raising questions / pointing things out from the start.
2. I have 7, 50m high towers on my land holding on West of Chelmsford (between 154 and 161).
3. I have cooperated with survey work and proposed intrusive surveys which are taking place in near future.
4. I have attended the public displays in Ingatestone, Writtle and Witham over the years asking questions and giving my views.
5. I have attended at least three meetings with Fisher German in Whirlledge & Nott offices, the most recent was 26th February 2026.
6. I have had 292 emails in correspondence with W&N and survey companies on my responses, providing drainage maps, survey requests and my claim in 2024 for crop loss following poor quality intrusive survey works undertaken.
7. And what have I got back? Nothing.

This paper lists examples where I have asked site specific questions and have outstanding replies. As of 7th May 2026, I have still not heard back from NG or FG.

I'd like to use this opportunity to raise a few key points I have with this project as all the hours of preparation, emails and meetings to date seem to have changed nothing, clearly showing the complete lack of engagement from NG and FG to date.

Background

1. I still believe there has been insufficient consideration given to alternative methods of transmission and at a practical level, don't understand why this route is not being done out at sea. I have discussed the options with Professor ██████████ who I'm sure you will know has served as the independent chair of the National Grid Stakeholder Advisory Group since it was established in 2013 who you might be aware of is also involved in the Ofgem VIP project to remove pylons and replace with underground lines in various areas of the country. ██████████ was discussing with me the many advantages and natural place for this line to go is out at sea – with the potential for a new National Marine Park, potentially up to one mile either side of the cable route. This would be an amazing opportunity to protect the

fragile ecosystem of the North Sea and save blighting the countryside of the Eastern Counties. But no, [REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] So, we as British citizens suffer for the benefit of a foreign company – I might not feel so bad if the profits of running this infrastructure project were kept with in the UK.
3. I'm concerned that the route chosen is the 'least financial cost' in simple pound notes but that no value has been added for the human and environmental cost or you might call it, 'lifetime cost' of what is proposed.
4. I have got to look at these pylons from my home for the rest of my life, and probably my children too. This will introduce an 'urban' feel to our existing rural countryside. We can't move the farm. We are currently located in a wonderful landscape area which provides open views across the River Can valley. I cannot understand why the pylons haven't been located East of Chelmsford – where the route would be shorter and more importantly there would be up to 8 miles (yes 8 miles) less destruction of the Green Belt.

Site Specifics

- a. The plans provided for me were very confusing and have very little explanation of the various layers. You cannot tell by looking at plans I have received, what uses / requirements are for the various layers from the single red line boundary. There should have been separate detailed maps showing what each layer was for.
 - i. I have repeatedly said that there seems to be a demand for too much land take for delivery of the project and I am particularly concerned about the permanent easement NG are requesting which covers the entire EX number for all the land affected. Some of my EX numbers – for example with pylons 159 – 161 in it, extend to over 1,000 acres – why should I have to waste my time and money consulting NG in the future if I want to do something over one mile away, just because it's in the same EX number? This is wrong. Perhaps draw a line on a map 60m either side of the line of the pylons... I understand from my agent that NG are being stubborn on this point in the proposed Heads of Terms – why?
- b. I have discussed the access route for pylons 161, 160 and 159 with Fisher German and in the meeting their representative said that the access route was not practical and could see the sense of it being on the West of a hedge instead of ripping the hedge out... but indicated that what's on the map was what's happening...

- ██████████ FG said they would provide clarification on this point following their meeting of 26th February. I've heard nothing.
- c. Pylon location has not been undertaken to consider the practicality of farming the land afterwards – especially for high value row crops (potatoes) I grow. This is especially the case with pylon 155.
 - d. I am concerned that pylon 161 is not located in the most practical position for future farming. I believe it should be in the corner of the field. No reply / explanation.
 - e. Looking at the location of pylon 161 I don't think NG have considered the practical difficulties of delivering pylon 161 and dealing with the high-pressure gas line, the existing bridleway and the proposed access from the A1060. Again, FG said they would provide clarification on the proposed access off the A1060 in their meeting of 26th February. I've heard nothing.
 - f. FG were also going clarify what was meant by 'bell mouth stacking'... off the A1060... heard nothing.
 - g. The latest plans issued show a second haul road going deep into my property, and across the 'Essex Young Farmers Showground'. At the recent meeting FG said they would provide me with written confirmation as to when / if they would need this and that it was not part of their permanent access rights. I am very concerned about this being a permanent access as it cuts into the YFC Showground and my caravan site. ██████████, I've heard nothing back.
 - h. I have requested that there is no soil stabilisation on my ground, I had a very expensive experience of using this method on the farm for a yard and it has caused more problems than solutions. NG are very happy to come and see what has happened where I have tried this method before. I really don't want to see this exercised as an option. I am hoping NG will take this on board.
 - i. Some of the future FIXED Rights of Way are unfair to me as it sterilizes the land and prevents any future use or development, as well as affecting its future salability. For example, by pylon 155 the route goes directly behind a house and should instead follow the route of the pylons. National Grid can by law access the land for future maintenance within their easement area, and there is still ability to mutually agree on a route at the time that accommodates the growing crops and activities. The surplus permanent rights are unnecessary and impose unacceptable harm on me and my business. I have asked repeatedly for this to be changed, no reply.
 - j. Future cropping losses – I am concerned that NG haven't thought about the fact that farmers have to plan ahead (and don't plant crops on the spur of the moment) – we plan months ahead for a growing crop. I would like to see a set rule book laid down so that farmers get due notice of what's happening. Saying you'll get crop loss compensation is one thing - but I know from practical experience with my NG crop

loss claim in 2024 for drilling test holes we never get FULL compensation for our true costs. As 'the professional' land agents and NG representatives do. We're seen as being in the way and confrontational but it's our livelihood they are affecting. Decent notice is what is needed – and ideally 12 months before any major physical works start on site.

- k. Talking of giving due notice, Essex Scouts and Guides hold their International Jamboree on land in my ownership. I honestly don't think NG had any idea of the damage and destruction of this international event they are proposing. I know the speaker after me will go into more detail but from my personal opinion it's disgusting how poor and slow NG have been to even acknowledge their situation, engage and support this charity find an alternative site. *Post Hearing note – I understand NG / FG have now started communicating with The Scouts – thank you.*
- l. I have a licence and operate a five caravan licensed site within 100m of the proposed route. Nothing has been clear as to what I'm supposed to do during the construction phase, or afterwards when I suspect nobody will want to come to see the rural views.
- m. NG must be made to take soil samples and detailed drone footage of all agricultural land and surrounding landscapes before any works are undertaken. And this information / soil analysis results must be shared with landowners so that an accurate – and far less contested agreement of soil condition / landscape condition can be made when works finish. Why should landowners suffer these costs when it's a very small cost of the scheme but will be very reassuring to all concerned to have accurate records before works begin and know what they will get back?
- n. Site security – I'm concerned and haven't heard anything from NG about site security. They are effectively building a 180km road from Norwich to London. NG may not come across crime on other projects, but I can tell you that in this part of Essex opportunist crime is very high and we have invested thousands of pounds in gate and CCTV security. I'm very worried that NG will make all these access roads which will cut across my land – opening it up to unwanted visitors – and crime on my farm will go up. They must match my current level of security with CCTV and ANPR cameras on this project 24 hours a day.
- o. I have an underground main in three fields – I've mentioned it every time I've seen FG but never had any acknowledgement that they have registered its existence. Another example of their poor communication which gives me less confidence that anybody involved with the project really cares about what they are planning to do when they force themselves onto my land.

- p. I have an irrigation abstraction licence point where the works are crossing the River Can – will NG be applying to the environment Agency on my behalf so I can abstract water during the building phase?
- q. I have, to date, had no correspondence with any third-party company; e.g. UKPN who I would have expected to hear from by now as there is work required near pylon 155.
- r. Several pylons are located on land where an existing option has been signed for a solar farm. The solar operator, or myself, have had no correspondence from NG or FG although I mention this at every meeting we attend.
- s. 4 pylons (154 – 157) are located in the Minerals Safeguarding Zone – nothing has been explained to us about what will happen with the pylons being located in this area.
- t. At my last meeting with FG I raised a query as to why they had proposed some badger mitigating in the middle of an arable field - FG said they would provide clarification on this point in their meeting of 26th Feb. I've still heard nothing.
- u. Tree and hedgerow removal and replacement – I have mentioned about the number of deer in the wild. I have had no acknowledgement that any area needing to be removed and replaced is planted with adequate deer protection. Without it, the local deer population will soon eat them. I hope NG will have a planning condition placed on them / or a restoration commitment to plant AND maintain any replacement hedges and trees for at least five years or longer if required to get established.
- v. I have been advised that site specific matters with reference to the draft Heads of Terms will be sorted out in due time, but I cannot understand for example why they have said some of my pylons are in 'arable' production and some 'pasture'. I'm an arable farm and ALL my land is arable. Some may be in countryside Stewardship or SFI, but it's all arable. To have to alter obvious 'mistakes' like this is annoying and does not help the communication and understanding between us.

After four years I have not had one direct communication specific to me when I've attended so many events, submitted written representations and attended so many personal meetings with FG. I'm disgusted by the way this project has been managed from day one – its' seems like NG are going to do whatever they want, how they want, where they want and when they want – and get the full backing of a government.

It's completely unacceptable, I and many thousands of others in the country have got to live with this line because I believe politicians of all parties and OFGEM haven't got the balls and

willingness to make the big decisions for the benefit of their population – and just hope a sticking plaster will do. It's not how anybody should be operating in a modern democracy.