

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0345

# Norwich to Tilbury

**Volume 8: Examination Documents**

**Document: 8.5.6 Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions  
to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2**

**Final Issue A**

**May 2026**

**Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027**

**nationalgrid**

# Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>About this Document</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Attendees on Behalf of the Applicant	1
1.3	Structure of the Document	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>Applicant's Summary of Case (29 April 2026)</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction	3
2.2	Agenda Item 3 (Individual Site-Specific Representations)	3
<b>3.</b>	<b>Applicant's Summary of Case (30 April 2026)</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	Introduction	21
3.2	Item 3 (Individual Site-Specific Representations Continued)	21
3.3	Item 4 (Statutory Undertakers and Crown Land)	30
3.4	Item 5 (Any Other Matters)	31

---

Table 2.1	Item 3 (Individual site-specific representations)	3
Table 3.1	Item 3 (Individual site-specific representations continued)	21
Table 3.2	Item 4 (Statutory undertakers and Crown land)	30
Table 3.3	Item 5 (Any other matters)	31

# 1. About this Document

## 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document summarises the case put by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc ('the Applicant'), at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) on 29 and 30 April 2026 for the Norwich to Tilbury project (referred to as 'the Project') at the following times:

- CAH2 on 29 April opened at 10am and closed at 4.44pm
- CAH2 on 30 April opened at 10am and closed at 2:43pm.

1.1.2 The agenda for CAH2 was published on the Planning Inspectorate's website on 20 April 2026 [EV2-007].

1.1.3 In what follows, the Applicant's submissions on the points raised broadly follow the items set out in the Examining Authority's (ExA) agenda.

## 1.2 Attendees on Behalf of the Applicant

1.2.1 Ms Heather Sergent, who is of Counsel instructed by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP (BCLP) appeared on behalf of National Grid, the Applicant.

1.2.2 The following representatives were also present:

- Mr Tom White, BCLP
- Ms Abigail Walters, BCLP
- Mr Stephen Boughton, the Applicant
- Mr Josh Crawford, the Applicant
- Mr Paul Reaston, the Applicant
- Mr Michael McKee, the Applicant
- Mr John Weeks, the Applicant
- Ms Samantha Ireland, the Applicant
- Mr John Galloway, the Applicant
- Mr Adam Laurence, the Applicant
- Mr Daniel Kinslow, Fisher German
- Mr Nick Robinson, Fisher German
- Mr James Gowing, Fisher German.

## **1.3 Structure of the Document**

1.3.1 This document has two further chapters:

- Chapter 2 summarises the oral case made by the Applicant at CAH2 on 29 April 2026
- Chapter 3 summarises the oral case made by the Applicant at CAH2 on 30 April 2026.

## 2. Applicant’s Summary of Case (29 April 2026)

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This summarises the oral case made by the Applicant at CAH2 on 29 April 2026.

### 2.2 Agenda Item 3 (Individual Site-Specific Representations)

Table 2.1 Item 3 (Individual site-specific representations)

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd</b> Comments on the routeing and impacts on the blueberry plantation and loss of business</p>	<p>As the Project crosses the Affected Person’s (AP’s) land there is an overhead line and an underground cable where the route enters the proposed East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) substation. This requires a larger area within the Order Limits to deliver both of those elements of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered various routeing options. Options to the south would include either an oversail or pass underneath a scheduled monument followed by crossings of local wildlife sites, potential oversailing of commercial property and residential gardens, and then the challenges of crossing Arleigh Reservoir further to the west. The Applicant has made changes to the route based on feedback from landowners and other stakeholders in that the overhead line route has moved further south at TB5 to TB6 to reduce the effect of the overhead line on the plantation.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 6.5.43 to 6.5.47 (pages 88 to 90)</li><li>• Response to REP1-208 in Table 4.1 (pages 234 to 238) of <b>8.8.1 Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b>.</li></ul> <p>The Applicant is aware of the possible impacts on the blueberry plantation due to the extent of the Order Limits. The Applicant is engaging with the AP to see how any impacts on the plantation could be addressed</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	through mitigation measures and, further, whether there is any available replacement land which could be used to replant the crop if necessary.
<b>Boxford (Suffolk) Holdings Ltd,</b> Reservoir and risks to water quality	The Applicant proposed to respond in writing regarding water quality acknowledging that there are commitments within Section 6 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice [Revision D]</b> that will ensure that any sort of impacts in terms of water quality are avoided. The Applicant will respond to this point at Deadline 5 when it responds to the oral summaries from other parties.
<b>General comment on engagement with AP</b>	<p>The Applicant issued Heads of Terms (HoTs) in 2025 and then again in 2026. The Applicant also confirmed that an in-person meeting with the AP had taken place on 16 February 2026, with a further meeting held during the morning of 29 April 2026. The Applicant confirmed it is working through the matters raised with the AP.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledged the feedback from the ExA regarding the need for engagement to resolve matters rather than just relying on HoTs and also for <b>8.14 Schedule of Affected Persons Objecting to CA or TP of their Lands or Rights [Revision B]</b> to record all instances of engagement (rather than simply an exchange of written correspondence).</p>
<b>Cullum Agri Ltd, TA Cullum Contracting, D.N. Grady Ltd, Norwich Diocesan Board of Finance, Rosemary Lee, the executor of the late Michael Lee, and 2 Agricultural Growing Ltd.</b> Comments on engagement and outcomes not being settled Comments on routeing and siting at RG10 and RG11	<p>The Applicant confirmed that the most recent meeting with the AP’s agent was Thursday 23 April 2026, to discuss the HoTs. There were more specific landholding and landowner specific meetings held in March for DN Grady and Cullum Agri and on 15 April 2026 with ARU Writtle.</p> <p>In line with many other Development Consent Order (DCO) projects, the Applicant noted that the front-end engineering design that has been undertaken for the application has been responsive to landowner and stakeholder feedback, environmental and engineering surveys and assessments that have been developed extensively over the last four to five years.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that it would ordinarily wait until development consent is granted, before detailed design is undertaken by the delivery contractor, who would then undertake detailed engagement with landowners on site-specific elements of the design. Therefore, some of the precise details being sought by APs in the context of discussions regarding HoTs are not available at this stage in the Project. However, where possible, the Applicant is bringing some of these discussions forward by engaging with its contractors through the Great Grid Partnership.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that, since Ms Kenny was appearing at CAH2 on behalf of several APs, the Applicant was unable to comment on the routeing at any specific location. However, the Applicant agreed to ensure a response was provided in respect of routeing and siting for proposed pylons RG10 to RG11.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – a request to straighten the alignment and to position pylons to field boundaries between RG8 and RG12 was not taken forward. While potentially increasing consistency with Holford Rule 3 by being straighter, such a change would potentially have increased effects on an area of woodland (less consistent with Holford Rule 2), would position at least one pylon within the panel area of a consented solar farm (Bloy’s Grove) and present additional construction risk due to restrictions on conductor stringing positions around RG8 and RG12/RG13. Additionally, an alternative alignment west, closer to Mulbarton was ruled out due to it transferring effects to more properties including the edge of Mulbarton and encircling multiple properties between the existing 4YM overhead line and the proposed new RG overhead line.</p> <p>The Applicant also reviewed the access arrangements including alternative bellmouths. It considers that the existing crossover bellmouth located further east along Church Lane is most suitable, as construction traffic crosses the public highway only. From RG11 to RG15 the haul road is again dictated by the position of the crossover bellmouth on Brickkiln Lane, the existing and proposed solar farms and the requirement to maintain a direct route between the new pylons. Therefore, the Applicant retains its position that the haul road is suitable as designed.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 4.2.1 (page 39)</li> <li>• Response to REP1-338 (page 161) and REP1-223 (page 214) in Table 3.1 of <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cullum Agri Ltd, TA Cullum Contracting, D.N. Grady Ltd, Norwich Diocesan Board of Finance, Rosemary Lee, the executor of the late Michael Lee, and 2 Agricultural Growing Ltd.</b></p> <p>Please can the Applicant respond to comments regarding UKPN and the other statutory undertaker</p>	<p>The Project would need to cross existing overhead and underground services (third party utilities). These assets would need to be relocated in order to adhere to safety requirements and this would be done by undergrounding the relevant spans of overhead line assets affected. These would seek to follow field boundaries but keeping that route as short as possible, reducing the impact where possible on the landholdings.</p> <p>As noted by the AP, UK Power Networks (UKPN) has commenced its detailed design studies and started to engage with landowners directly, as it would be delivering those works on behalf of the Applicant for the DCO. The Applicant confirmed that UKPN is liaising directly with the landowners regarding its diversion works but the Applicant recognises that APs need to understand how both elements of the work interact and is therefore looking to facilitating joint meetings between National Grid, UKPN and APs to discuss how all the elements of the work interact and the timings.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>CJH Farming Ltd</b> Comments about engagement and impacts of the Project on its landholding.</p>	<p>The Applicant is providing further details on this in response to Action Point 1 (Status/role of UKPN) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that a meeting with the AP was held on 26 January 2026 to discuss the HoTs and practical matters. The most recent meeting was held with the AP's agent on 20 April 2026. The Applicant confirmed that it would be happy to arrange further meetings to discuss more detailed matters, specifically in relation to the point around the extent of the grantor's land and the impact on title, and the potential ability to restrict the extent of the same.</p> <p>In more general engagement terms, the Applicant explained that the Project route has been divided into sections, A through to H, and there has been a phased delivery of version 2 of the HoTs that commenced on 26 March 2026 and ran through to 9 April 2026. Since that time, the Applicant has offered in excess of 465 meetings to APs and has held meetings with representatives on behalf of 236 of those APs. The Applicant will continue to engage and to offer meetings to APs and their agents and is also engaging with both the National Farmers Union and the Country Land and Business Association.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 9.3.1 to 9.3.3 (pages 109–110)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.190 to 5.4.193 (page 82-83)</li> <li>• Response to REP1-219 in Table 3.1 (pages 158-159) of <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Essex Scout and Guide International Jamboree.</b> Raised comments on the engagement process and the impact on the Jamboree and its relocation. There were concerns about timescales as they are charity led and need to report to trustees. They need a clear decision</p>	<p>The Applicant agreed that progress has been made in the last few weeks and that there is a need to move quickly in terms of the planning for their 2028 event. The Applicant confirmed that HoTs had been issued and that the parties were hoping to speak during w/c 4 May 2026 in order to progress them. The Applicant also confirmed that it has sufficient resources to meet and resolve issues within the given timescales, upon response from the AP.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (1)</b> – since the hearing, the Applicant has received confirmation that the AP has reviewed the HoTs issued and will be meeting with Essex Scout and Guide International Jamboree trustees to discuss next steps before responding to the Applicant.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (2)</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p>imminently within the next month or so in order to then plan the event.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 9.3.1 to 9.3.3 (pages 109-111)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.190 to 5.4.193 (pages 82–83)</li> <li>• SET 1.14.2 in Table 16.1 (pages 653-655) of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b></li> <li>• ADDR-56 and ADDR-57 within Appendix D. Supplement 5 – ALT 1.8 – CA 1.21 Additional Detailed Design Requests (page 6) of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Daniel Bickford and Stephanie Bickford</b> Comments regarding engagement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has had extensive communication with the AP. The most recent was a telephone call with the AP and their professional representative on 20 February 2026. The AP had previously been issued HoTs for their subsoil interest in the highway but, subsequently, the Applicant has confirmed that it no longer needs to acquire the subsoil rights and is no longer seeking rights over the entire frontage of their plot. The Applicant confirmed that it would clarify to the AP the current position in terms of Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary powers in relation to this land parcel.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning the impact of the works on the land parcel (namely vegetation clearance for sight lines) and also the works proposed in the vicinity of the AP's property can be found in <b>8.4.9 Applicants Comments on any Further Information or Submissions Received by Deadline 3 [Revision A]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Daniel Bickford and Stephanie Bickford</b> Comment on the noise disturbance and traffic impacts that arise from the construction and the associated road traffic noise and the location of the haul road.</p>	<p>In terms of noise, the ambient noise levels at that property are determined by traffic on the A129, as shown on page 22 of <b>6.14.F1 Environmental Statement Figure 14.1 - Baseline Noise Data [APP-262]</b>. The assessment outputs shown on page 22 of <b>6.14.F2 Environmental Statement Figure 14.2 - Construction Noise Assessment Outputs [APP-263]</b> have shown that for construction noise and vibration, the impacts are below the threshold for potential significant adverse effects, even without mitigation. Additionally, construction noise levels would be below the existing ambient noise level. As such, the assessment concludes that there are no adverse impacts at the property. The contractor would do a more detailed assessment, as per commitment NV05 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practise [Revision D]</b> and if an adverse effect was identified at this stage, mitigation would be put in place to minimise impacts, as per commitment NV01 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practise [Revision D]</b>.</p> <p>In terms of the road, the Applicant has two bellmouths proposed in the vicinity of this property, to the north and the south, on the A129. The locations have been chosen due to site constraints relating to vegetation and residential properties, and also the ability to achieve safe visibility splays and safe operation. Both bellmouths have also been subjected to a road safety audit.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Daniel Bickford and Stephanie Bickford</b> Comments on duties under the Act in terms of equalities informed case-specific assessment.</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware of the more individual application and consideration of the duties under the Equality Act 2010 in relation to the protected characteristics of this AP. There is also the duty applying at a higher level in terms of protected characteristics more generally, such as age. Whilst this is public, if there are parties who have protected characteristics that the Applicant is not yet aware of, then that is something that would need to be brought to its attention so this can be dealt with. The Applicant agreed to follow up further on this matter with the AP. The Applicant has been made aware of the protected characteristics in relation to this AP and is engaging with the AP to understand their nature.</p>
<p><b>Cullen family at Chase Farm</b> Comments on the impact on their airfield as the Project will result in the closure of the airstrip.</p>	<p>The Applicant has held detailed engagement with the AP about the impact on the Chase Farm airstrip. The Applicant’s current position is that it has been provided with a study from the AP, setting out multiple options which could possibly be feasible for the realignment of the airstrip. The Applicant has provided a draft legal agreement accepting the fact that it would be willing to cover the costs of works associated with realignment of the airstrip.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (1)</b> – the Applicant provided the draft legal agreement on the 17 April 2026. The Applicant is currently waiting for comments back on which of the alignment options the AP might prefer to pursue, if any of them, and is requesting a follow-up meeting to discuss the outcome.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (2)</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref No. 9-8.61, 9-8.71 and 9-8.87 in Table 9-8</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 10.3.1 to 10.3.5 (pages 115–117).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Parrish family at Oakleigh Farm</b> Comments about engagement including a request for joined-up engagement between UKPN and National Grid in relation to the Project and the HoTs.</p>	<p>The Applicant held a face-to-face meeting on 20 January 2026 to discuss the practical implications on the holding. Subsequent to that, there had been ongoing engagement directly with the AP’s agent and their planning advisor in order to understand how the Applicant could mitigate the impact and how it interacts with the existing equestrian business.</p> <p>The Applicant also recognised the interaction with UKPN and National Grid’s rights being sought on the holding and, as such, the Applicant has scheduled a meeting with the agent and the AP on 12 May 2026, with UKPN in attendance, to understand the full all-party interaction on the site.</p> <p>There is ongoing dialogue between the parties on the HoTs for the proposed works and the Applicant envisages that it will be in a position shortly to reissue these with certain updated terms reflecting recent engagement with appointed land agents. The Applicant also noted that there is not a ‘clock ticking’ on the</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>ability to reach agreement on the HoTs. The timescale only relates to the incentive that has been offered to APs that aligns with the Applicant’s policy.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed to provide a response in writing to the general point raised about working with UKPN. See the response to Action Point 1 (Status/role of UKPN) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-8.71 in Table 9-8</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 10.2.1 to 10.2.4 (pages 114–115)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report of the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.205 to 5.4.207 (page 87).</li> </ul>
<p><b>National Farmers Union</b></p>	<p>The Applicant sought to clarify the following points raised in the NFU’s oral submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of the timings and the suggested time pressure for reaching voluntary agreement: the Applicant clarified that the issue of version 3 of the HoTs will start a new incentive period. The Applicant agreed to undertake to write to those parties that it is currently negotiating with to clarify that it is still negotiating on version 2 HoTs. The Applicant also clarified that the ‘clock ticking’ is in relation to an incentive period for an additional payment to landowners. It is not about its attempts to reach voluntary agreement, and satisfaction of the guidance requiring compulsory powers to be used as a matter of last resort</li> <li>• In respect of the attempts of the Applicant to deal with land outside the Order Limits through voluntary agreement: there was a reference to the statutory tests, but, from a legal perspective, these do not apply to the acquisition of land through voluntary agreement. Part of the negotiations is reaching agreement in return for commercial payment for additional rights above and beyond. This is ongoing and is not part of the examination itself</li> <li>• It was said that some of the access routes proposed by the Applicant are random and some are not physically possible: the Applicant indicated that it would need more detail on these routes being referred to in order to respond. The Applicant will respond to this point at Deadline 5 following a review of the National Farmers Union’s response to Action Point 02 <b>[EV10-013]</b></li> <li>• It was said that there have not been any changes in response to engagement: the Applicant noted that this statement is not correct. The assessment of the potential change requests is detailed in various</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>documents, but again, the Applicant would need to know the specific persons or locations in order to provide a detailed response.</p> <p>The Applicant also set out its position as regards engagement with occupiers and the emphasis placed on reaching agreement for the acquisition of a permanent right with the superior interest holder, capable of granting such interests. This was set out in the preface of the <b>4.4 Land Rights Tracker [REP3-018]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant will respond as required at Deadline 5 when it responds on the oral summaries from other parties.</p>
<p>The ExA asked the Applicant if UKPN is going to potentially issue its own HoTs?</p>	<p>The Applicant confirmed that UKPN will issue its own HoTs as it is required to seek the private rights by voluntary agreement. It is the Applicant's understanding that UKPN is actively reaching out to have meetings and begin that process. The Applicant is providing further details on this in response to Action Point 1 (Status/role of UKPN) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>. The Applicant also confirmed that it would update the <b>4.4 Land Rights Tracker [REP3-018]</b> to show where APs are affected by negotiations with both the Applicant and UKPN.</p>
<p><b>Basildon BESS Ltd.</b> Comments about the impacts on the battery storage site but acknowledging that a draft agreement had been provided and that a plan was received yesterday and that this may move things towards a final agreement.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognised that the AP would need time to consider the latest documentation and plan, and the Applicant hopes that this draft agreement will now move matters forward to a conclusion which resolves the AP's representation.</p>
<p><b>Richard Long Group.</b> Comments of the routing and the impact of the overhead line oversailing the solar PV located on land southeast of Bracon</p>	<p>The section of overhead line is between RG18, which is an angle pylon, and RG19. There are two blocks of woodland (the one to the east is also Norton's Wood County Wildlife Site) adjacent to either side of span RG18 to RG19 which oversails the eastern edge of the solar farm, which fills the gap between the blocks of woodland. The Applicant considered alternatives that diverted slightly to the east and to the south, but these would go through the woodland with various ecology concerns. It also takes the alignment in a more southerly direction, directly towards the Grade II* listed Flordon Hall.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p>Ash which has been consented in 2025.</p>	<p>The Applicant also considered routeing further west but given the layout of the solar development in between the blocks of woodland, this would require a significant diversion routeing west and then directly south back to the alignment with additional angle pylons required. This was considered to be less compliant with the Holford Rules.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that no pylons are proposed within the site itself and it would be an oversail of the panels from the conductors in the operational phase, which is not uncommon across the network.</p> <p>In response to ALT 1.8 and CA 1.21 of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b>, the Applicant referenced an aspirational commitment register, which already contains an aspirational commitment for pylon RG18, where the Applicant would seek to avoid the pylon being moved further south into the solar site. It would also undertake further micro-siting of the haul road, to move this as close to the east as possible, keeping the relevant distances from the root protection zones from the woodland. There is a slight encroachment on that eastern side of the of the solar farm, but the Applicant has sought to keep the impact as far to the east of that development as possible.</p> <p>The Holford Rules guide the routeing and where possible, the Applicant seeks to avoid all woodland and given the oversail, this was considered to be the right balance at this location given the other factors considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has tried to reduce the impact of the haul road location, with positioning as far east as practicable. The Applicant is also looking at whether the conductor pulling area and the exclusion zone are required during construction or in maintenance. The Applicant is seeking further design information from its construction partners with the intention of providing further information to the AP by the end of this week. If the detailed designs are not available at this time, then the Applicant would seek to reach an agreement for the oversail to be in place at this stage. The Applicant is continuing to discuss the proposals as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and there have been regular meetings with the most recent one this week.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-3.148 in Table 9-3</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 4.2.4 (page 39) and Figure 4.2 on page 40</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.17 to 5.4.19 (page 40) and Figure 5.2 on page 41</li> <li>• ADDR-3 within Appendix D. Supplement 5 – ALT 1.8 – CA 1.21 Additional Detailed Design Requests (page 1) of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b>.</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Tritton Farming Partnership</b></p> <p>Comments regarding engagement, on the Great Waltham alternative route being a more suitable option and the impacts on its land including concerns about sterilisation and disproportionate rights over land due to the enlargement of the Order Limits to accommodate both scenarios.</p>	<p>The Applicant considered alternatives at this location, including one option that would have avoided this site altogether. This eastern option was constrained by a large block of ancient woodland, along with listed buildings, which were the reasons for this being discounted. The Applicant also considered a western alternative between Great Waltham and Pleshey. This would have involved a much longer diversion (approximately an extra 3 km and the addition of eight or nine additional pylons), which was the reason for this being discounted.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore included the widened Limits of Deviation (LoD) and as such widened Order Limits to enable Scenario B to minimise the impact on the quarry area and to allow flexibility in design to reduce the oversailing area on some of the quarry operations; this is explained within Table 2.6 in <b>8.11 Approach to Scenarios [Revision B]</b>. The Applicant is engaging with its delivery partners to seek further design details for Scenario B to aid negotiations with the AP, noting that the detailed designs would not normally commence until a consent was granted and there is a limit as to what can be expedited at this stage. The Applicant has been retaining the flexibility of both scenarios up to the current time but, with no date for resolution of the mineral plan status confirmed, has identified that it is appropriate to progress Scenario B given the cost implications of either additional sterilisation of minerals or future diversion.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussion with the AP with the intention of submitting an updated SoCG which sets out the position. As a general point, the Applicant noted that there may be APs where agreements cannot be reached, if the nature of the objection is entirely premised on detailed design which is not available at this stage.</p> <p>The Applicant also noted that as a general position, it would likely be considering the Class 8 route for updating the plans rather than changing the Order Limits.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b></li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 8.4.1 to 9.1.3 (pages 100–102)</li> <li>• <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b></li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.176 to 5.4.187 (pages 79–81)</li> <li>• Response to REP1-281 in Table 3.1(pages 127–144) of <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b></li> <li>• Table 2.6 (page 17) of <b>8.11 Approach to Scenarios [Revision B]</b>.</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Scottish Power Renewables UK Ltd and East Anglia Three Ltd.</b></p> <p>The AP summarised discussions and confirmed that it was reviewing the HoTs which it had received on 10 April and noted that it is working with the Applicant on the SoCG. The AP noted that it anticipated that issues are capable of being addressed.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirmed that it had nothing to add to this update.</p>
<p><b>Mr John Stacey</b></p> <p>Comments on alternative routes and request that pylons TB96, 97 and 96 are moved. There is also a UKPN line being repositioned on their land.</p>	<p>There is a large block of ancient woodland to the south of TB96. The Applicant considered alternative routes including to the south of the current alignment. However, it would need to deviate quite significantly south to avoid the ancient woodland. Further to the west, the alternative alignment to the south would pass in close proximity to the Grade I listed buildings and Registered Park and Garden associated with the Faulkbourne Estate before heading north-west to connect to the Cable Sealing End compound to the north of Fairstead.</p> <p>The Applicant also looked at options to the north of the current alignment. This would pass close to a Grade I listed buildings and a scheduled monument at Cressing Temple. It would then route close to properties in White Notley and would also be constrained by various properties along the road (Church Hill).</p> <p>In terms of more localised constraints, acknowledging the landowner’s feedback TB98 was previously moved approximately 80 m to try to position the pylon outside of the horse paddocks so it was an oversail only; there is limited scope on how much further the Applicant can move the pylon at this location. There are technical requirements on the electrical clearance and other technical and safety factors that the Applicant needs to adhere to, which affect the pylon spacing. It is not feasible to have significantly long span lengths one after another.</p> <p>In terms of the UKPN diversion works, the reason that it is going through the farmyard is the existing poles that the proposed 400 kV overhead line needs to cross and, as such, underground are located north of the property and the garden but the existing connection point to the existing network is located south of the</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>property. Therefore, the underground diversion needs to run along or adjacent to the track to connect south of the property.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 8.3.4 to 8.3.5 (page 100)</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraphs 6.4.113 to 6.4.117 (pages 98–99)</li> <li>• ADDR-50 and ADDR-51 within Appendix D Supplement 5 – ALT 1.8 – CA 1.21 Additional Detailed Design Requests (page 5) of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mr John Stacey</b> Comments on engagement</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that there is a meeting planned with the AP on 12 May 2026, where it hopes to address and agree many of the outstanding issues in terms of the relocation of the horses and practical matters around crossing points. The Applicant noted that UKPN will also be present at that meeting so all parties can discuss all works.</p>
<p><b>Mr John Stacey</b> Comments on the impacts to the footpath that would lie adjacent to the proposed pylon.</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks to avoid putting pylons on or immediately adjacent to Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) where practical but noted that there are many instances where PRoWs lie adjacent to pylons across the UK network.</p> <p>The Applicant will respond to this point at Deadline 5 when it responds on the oral summaries from other parties noting at TB97 a temporary diversion of an existing PRoW is required around the conductor stringing work area.</p>
<p><b>Richard Langton</b> Comments on alternatives and engagement</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that electronic copies of the HoTs have been forwarded to the AP's land agent and there have been meetings to discuss matters, principally the reduction of grantors' land. The Applicant has received a written response from the AP's agent in relation to site-specific impacts and the Applicant is reviewing this with the intention of providing an update at the next meeting with the AP's land agent on 6 May 2026 (which has now taken place), and a future meeting planned for the 13 May 2026.</p> <p>The Applicant clarified that it is standard practice that hard copies of the HoTs are sent to all AP and electronic copies are sent via email to the AP's agents where they are represented.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 6.1.4 to 6.1.6 (pages 67–68) and Figure 6.2 (page 69)</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraphs 6.4.64 to 6.4.68 (pages 86–87)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.104 to 5.4.114 (pages 62–64).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Richard Langton</b> Comments on impacts to land including to private water supplies and the choice of the permanent access routes.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a response to this in Action Point 3 (Response to Mr Langton) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p>
<p><b>H&amp;O Godbold Farming Partnership representatives</b> Comments on engagement and the HoTs, access to land parcels and areas of land that would now no longer be required and on the need for separate agreements with National Grid, UKPN and other third-party utilities.</p>	<p>The Applicant is working extremely hard with a very large team to progress an enormous number of negotiations as effectively as it can. The Applicant agreed to respond in writing regarding a detailed note in relation to UKPN works (see response to Action Point 1 (Status/role of UKPN) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>). The Applicant also noted that <b>4.4 Land Rights Tracker [REP2-011]</b> submitted at Deadline 2 included reference in Section 1.4 that UKPN is pursuing voluntary negotiations on its own terms and this provides an initial explanation of what the approach is.</p> <p>The Applicant did not accept the point raised that it is misleading the Examining Authority as regards third parties and undertakers such as UKPN. However, the Applicant will consider the extent that it can usefully add detail into the land rights trackers around what UKPN and other third parties are doing. From a practical perspective, because UKPN is a separate entity to National Grid, it will be pursuing engagement in the first instance in respect of the powers that it will need.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (1)</b> – the Applicant is providing further details regarding UKPN engagement in response to Action Point 1 (Status/role of UKPN) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note (2)</b> – further information concerning specific routing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraphs 6.1.1 to 6.1.3 (pages 66-67)</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraphs 6.4.61 to 6.4.63 (page 85) and Figure 6.14 (page 86)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.94 to 5.4.97 (pages 60–61).</li> </ul> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> –The Applicant has had a further meeting with the AP on 8 May 2026 as part of ongoing negotiations.</p>
<p><b>Mr Jones</b></p> <p>Comments on a proposed alternative route provided to the Applicant, which would involve a minor realignment of the pylon line between the A1060 and the A414, or TB160 to 167, involving a straightening of the line that moves TB164 a little to the east.</p>	<p>There are existing and proposed residential properties along Roxwell Road which limit suitable crossing locations and also a gas compressor station just north of the road with an associated high pressure gas pipeline. Moving to the south, there is an angle pylon at the hedge in the middle of the field and the alignment is kinked slightly to avoid the gas pipeline which lies in a north–south direction and also an oil pipeline going in a north-west to south-east direction. There are also a number of listed buildings and residential properties on all sides around this area, and the Applicant has sought to align the route midway between these receptors. Further south, there are more listed buildings and the Writtle college campus and equine facility, which lies near a strip of woodland. The position of the angle pylon at this location is to oversail the corner of the Writtle college equine facility, minimising impact on the woodland and also keeping the next angle pylon as far east as possible from Newney Hall, listed building.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed to look at the AP’s plan showing an alternative route at this location and will respond to this point at Deadline 5 when it responds on the oral summaries from other parties. Noting that this alternative was reviewed post statutory consultation and was responded to in Ref Nos 9-7.236 and 9-7.333 in Table 9-3 of <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b>.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref Nos 9-7.236 and 9-7.333 in Table 9-3</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 9.3.5 (page 111)</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraphs 6.4.129 and 6.4.130 (page 102)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.194 to 5.4.196 (page 84).</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Mr Jones</b> Comments about the engagement and rights sought and access.</p>	<p>The Applicant had a meeting regarding the accommodation works to mitigate the impact on the agricultural operations in February. This was followed up by a further meeting to discuss version 2 of the HoTs with the agent on 16 April 2026. The Applicant took away some actions from that meeting to look at further mitigating the impacts on agricultural operations, and agreed to do so in as timely a fashion as is possible. The Applicant agreed to set up a further meeting with the AP on site to further discuss their concerns, and at present the Applicant is awaiting confirmation of suitable dates.</p> <p>The Applicant also clarified that in terms of access, the construction vehicles are restricted to the Primary Access Routes, so they would not be using the country lanes in the vicinity of these parcels of land.</p>
<p><b>Mr Fisher Faulkbourne Estate</b> Comments on engagement and in particular the lack of feedback on suggestions raised by the AP for alternatives or changes.</p>	<p>The Applicant held a meeting with the AP in February 2026 to discuss the accommodation work. There was also a meeting on 20 April 2026 with the agent to discuss the HoTs. The Applicant agreed to set up another meeting with the AP to discuss the matters raised today.</p> <p>The Applicant noted the distinction between the consultation and engagement that has happened on the Project as a whole (such as regarding alternative technology and routes) and the requests that are made by landowners and persons interested in land that are happening through the current negotiations.</p> <p>The general Project engagement occurred over many years and took into account site surveys and constraints and consultation feedback. The proposed Project, including routeing, went through many iterations in terms of the process and consultation. Given the amount of feedback, many responses were themed and these responses are set out in the Consultation Report (<b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b>). The assessment on the alternatives, and the reasons why certain routes were taken forward or discounted, are set out in the various Design Development Reports (<b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> and <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report [APP-359]</b>).</p> <p>This is distinctly different from the ongoing discussions with APs, which are usually more site specific. These are dealt with by the HoTs process because, in many cases, these are often quite commercial matters specific to individual landowners.</p> <p>All feedback, whether from a landowner, statutory body, internal, environmental teams, or engineering teams, all gets pulled together into the change control process, where each request is reviewed by all of the different disciplines – engineering, environmental, lands, consents, etc. There will often need to be a balance that is struck when considering the competing effects and different receptors. The change control panel will agree whether a proposed change should be taken forward or not, based on the inputs by the different disciplines. This process can take some time, especially when it involves the delivery partners, as the change may require further investigations or designs to refine or microsite proposals where relevant.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Mr Fisher Faulkbourne Estate</b></p> <p>Comments on a request to move pylon 100, 105 and 106 and also regarding the use of access tracks rather than a haul road to reduce impacts on land.</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that on a project of this size there are numerous responses but that it does look to respond back to all APs as part of the meetings arranged to discuss the HoTs.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that pylons TB100 to TB104 have been positioned midway between residential properties and also to avoid an oversail with the football pitches at White Notley football ground.</p> <p>In terms of the haul road, the Applicant has tweaked the alignment to pick up a section of the AP’s existing tracks. One of the key factors influencing the design is the bellmouth which needs to access the public highway and the location is governed by road safety audits, relevant safety standards, and visibility splays based on the vehicles using it.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref No. 9-6.96, 9-6.108, 9-6.109, 9-6.122 in Table 9-6</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraphs 6.4.117 to 6.4.122 (pages 99–100)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report [APP-359]</b> paragraphs 5.4.170 to 5.4.175 (pages 78–79)</li> <li>• ADDR-52 within Appendix D. Supplement 5 – ALT 1.8 – CA 1.21 Additional Detailed Design Requests (page 5) of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mr Fisher Faulkbourne Estate</b></p> <p>Comments on the appropriateness of Grid seeking to compulsorily acquire agricultural land for the creation of biodiversity net gain (BNG) credits. The AP would like to create the BNG units, which it would manage and sell to Grid at market rate.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this matter in response to Action Point 4 (Proposals for biodiversity net gain) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Mr and Mrs Lanham</b> Comments on the effects on their family home and business, particularly during construction</p>	<p>The access route that was raised by the AP is not an access route to be used for the construction of the Project.</p> <p>The construction haul road is accessed from further north down to the railway, where construction traffic would have to turn around and go back out again. The Applicant explained that the route noted is intended as a permanent access route, where rights are sought for the permanent access for ad hoc surveys, route inspection and maintenance. This route would only be used by foot patrols to inspect the assets potentially once a year or every few years depending on the condition and age of the assets. It would also include light goods vehicles (for example a 4x4 potentially with a trailer) if there was a need for any maintenance activities such as replacements of fittings. Repairs are typically undertaken by climbing the pylons, which is a benefit of using lattice pylons that can be climbed without the need for a crane. As this would be maintenance and repairs, it would be irregular and infrequent. It could be one or two times a year or may not be needed for 20 years.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed to respond in writing to the alternative route that was suggested by the AP at Deadline 5 when it responds on the oral summaries from other parties received at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant also said it would provide clarity on the access track and why the AP has received paperwork suggesting that the route is to be used for construction access too.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – the Applicant acknowledges that the proposed permanent access route(s) described by the APs are also identified as an access for UKPN to undertake the removal of existing electricity distribution network apparatus as part of the Project. However, subject to further engagement between the AP, UKPN and the Applicant, there is a potential opportunity for access to the existing UKPN pylons to be taken using the proposed Project haul route, thus removing this potential interaction with the AP’s land.</p>
<p><b>Mr Paul Lanham</b> Comments that the heads of term only cover half of the AP’s land</p>	<p>The Applicant clarified that the reason that the plans accompanying the HoTs are separated is because the plots are under two separate titles (even though they are owned by the same person), therefore, there are two separate heads of term packs.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to this matter in response to Action Point 5 (Map Clarification) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant’s Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Mr Paul Lanham</b> Comments on the cattle grazing and the loss of the field that will occur including for exploration pits in a few</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciated that the Project would impact on agricultural operations and is looking at how these impacts could be reduced, which could include compensatory feeding, temporary fencing or temporary rehoming. The Applicant has set up a meeting on 11 May 2026 to discuss the potential mitigation for cattle and alternative access further.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p>months. There has been no response to their questions.</p>	
<p><b>Mr Paul Lanham</b> Comments regarding the impacts on the fishing lake.</p>	<p>The Dunton Hills Garden Village proposal lies to the west of the alignment at this location. There is also the dual carriageway (A127) to the north and other adjacent sites for housing in Basildon which are subject to consultation for inclusion in the Local Plan. As the alignment crosses the road, it then routes adjacent to the existing National Gas Transmission pipeline and the relevant residential offset buffer to this asset. There is a minimum offset required with the gas pipeline easement, which restricts moving TB227 further to the west. There is also the housing development to the east as well on the Basildon side. The Applicant confirmed that with these constraints, it is unable to avoid the fishing lake and that this may become unusable, in which case the AP would be compensated in line with the Compensation Code.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-7.284 in Table 9-7</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 10.4.1 to 10.4.5 (pages 117–118)</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraph 6.4.145 to 6.4.148 (page 106)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraph 5.4.211 to 5.4.214 (pages 88–89)</li> <li>• Response to REP1-435 in Table 3.1 (pages 148–151) of <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b>.</li> </ul>

## 3. Applicant's Summary of Case (30 April 2026)

### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This summarises the oral case made by the Applicant at CAH2 on 30 April 2026.

### 3.2 Item 3 (Individual Site-Specific Representations Continued)

Table 3.1 Item 3 (Individual site-specific representations continued)

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<b>SJ Upton Trustees No. 1 and 2 Ltd and also Simon James Upton</b> Comments on consultation with landowners.	The Applicant recognises the different advisors who are advising in respect of the different ownerships in regard to these APs and is engaging with both agents. The most recent meeting was held with Whirledge and Nott on 20 April 2026 to continue the ongoing dialogue regarding the HoTs engagement. The Applicant is also seeking to engage with the other agent acting on behalf of the 74 settlement trustees. The Applicant will be continuing to engage with the parties on the accommodation works and ways to mitigate the impact of the Project on the agricultural operations.
<b>SJ Upton Trustees No. 1 and 2 Ltd and also Simon James Upton</b> Comments on the routeing and concerns about dissection of the farm and loss of productive land.	<p>The affected land lies to the south of Little Oxney Green, with Hylands Park to the east and Edney Common to the north-west. The routeing in this area needed to avoid significant areas of ancient woodland. The Applicant considered a number of alternatives in this location, including routeing slightly to the west of the ancient woodland closer to Edney Common but this required the crossing of more ancient woodland further south towards Tilbury. There were also routeing and siting challenges associated with the gas pipeline which goes through some of the existing gaps in the woodland. Further west of the woodland there are two scheduled monuments, which constrained the route even further west.</p> <p>The Applicant also looked at various options to the east to avoid this land which would route the alternative to the south of the Grade II Hylands Park and Gardens and between further blocks of ancient woodland. This route would have needed to cross the Hylands Golf Complex and, just to the east there is also the railway, the A12 and the River Wade. There are also multiple Grade II* listed buildings and associated scheduled monuments in close proximity to the proposed alternative. Routeing further east would also transfer the effects</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>to residential and other listed buildings as the alignment routes back towards Ingatestone. The Applicant noted the AP’s comment that the Hylands Golf Complex is no longer fully operational as a golf course. However, the alternative would still remain less preferred given the likely impacts on the residential properties and multiple listed buildings and scheduled monuments already noted.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that there is ongoing dialogue that is seeking to mitigate the impacts of severance of the land during construction through the form of crossing points. Some small areas may be unavoidably severed at times during construction, but these would be dealt with as a compensatory item.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-7.284 in Table 9-7</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report [APP-358]</b> paragraph 5.5.127 to 5.5.132 (pages 59–60).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Innova Renewables</b> Clarification regarding position of two corridors within the DCO and constraints regarding the flood attenuation pond</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree with the assertion that the Applicant’s position has been entrenched and that it has not made any concessions in relation to Innova. As set out in paragraphs 5.4.13 and 5.4.14 of <b>7.21 2024 – Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b>, the eastern corridor route was preferred by the Applicant. The western corridor, which is now being proposed by the Applicant, is something that is proposed to enable Innova’s development at Hall Farm to come forward, so there has been a shift from the Applicant’s position towards something that would accommodate Innova’s project alongside.</p> <p>The Applicant has been engaging substantially with Innova since late 2023. Although there does appear to be a disagreement in terms of what happened next, it is the Applicant’s position that the flood attenuation pond was an amendment that Innova made to its planning application without reconsulting the Applicant so that a solution could be found in order to avoid Innova having a planning permission that is not fully consistent with the western option, which would have enabled the two schemes to come forward together.</p> <p>As noted above, the Applicant has included two corridors within Table 2.1 in <b>8.11 Approach to Scenarios [Revision B]</b>: the Applicant’s preferred eastern corridor and a western corridor which was designed to accommodate Innova’s project. In December 2024, prior to Innova’s Town and Country Planning Application submission, the Applicant provided updated plans to Innova. The planning application was approved in July 2025 and within the delegated report, it reports a ‘no comment’ from National Grid. That ‘no comment’ was based on a now-outdated design and did not allow for the inclusion for consultation or comments on the inclusion of a drainage basin situated over assets such as permanent access, haul road and pylon RG4 of the Project. If the Applicant had been consulted, it would have commented on that inclusion.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>The Applicant has subsequently engaged further with Innova and further drawings have been provided. The Applicant's position is that a change application to move the Applicant's project including pylon RG4 fully out of the way of the attenuation pond was unduly onerous, when a solution between the parties resulting in a lesser land take (which remains within the current Order Limits) with cooperation between both parties and adjustments to accommodate both parties' infrastructure within the existing site was possible with a change to the size, location, orientation and position of the attenuation pond.</p> <p>The eastern Scenario B corridor is currently maintained within the DCO, along with the western Scenario A corridor to allow for further design options to be investigated. Removing either corridor when the parties do not currently have a mutually agreeable design would be premature.</p> <p>On the attenuation pond issue, the Applicant has proposed several solutions to Innova, one of which being Norwich to Tilbury would amend its apparatus within the constraints of the DCO. However, this will require cooperation from Innova on the size, location and position of the attenuation pond.</p> <p>The Applicant has had positive engagement on this matter, in that Innova has recently said it may be something they were willing to investigate further. So based on the historic context of this, the request is for both parties to take reasonable steps to address this in a fair and equitable manner.</p> <p>The Applicant is encouraged to hear that Innova's view is that, with design amendments, the issue around the pond in the western corridor could potentially be resolved. Until such a satisfactory resolution is reached, the Applicant considers it necessary for both corridors to remain in play.</p> <p>The Applicant also noted that there are other examples where it has moved land into Class 8, where it has reached the view that it does not need to seek compulsory or temporary possession powers over it.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that Innova was granted a generation licence by Ofgem on 2 April 2026, which post-dated Deadline 2 in this Examination, which was the 12 March 2026; see the Innova response to ExQ1 at Deadline 3 [REP3-115].</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further details on this in response to Action Point 6 (Status of Innova Renewables as a statutory undertaker) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b> and will update the statutory undertaker if appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Northumbrian Water (NWL)</b> Comments about the operation of Little Waltham pumping station and</p>	<p>It is the Applicant's understanding that there is a largely negotiated legal agreement which deals with Little Waltham pumping station. Whilst the documents are not in place yet, the principles are substantially agreed and can be put in place in due course, and that land within the operational boundary of Little Waltham pumping station is not required and can be moved to Class 8. In response to the clarification about the three plots of land and whether these would all be Class 8, the Applicant noted that this was not necessarily the</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p>potential connection to this asset</p>	<p>case but would check the position. The Applicant has provided further details on this in response to Action Point 7 (Little Waltham Pumping Station) in <b>8.5.9 Applicant's Response to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 Action Points [Revision A]</b>.</p> <p>In relation to the betterment/cost-sharing point, the Applicant noted that this has been discussed between NWL and National Grid in the context of the Sea Link project, but had not to date been raised by NWL directly to the Norwich to Tilbury lawyers., although they had been notified of the existence of the issue by the Sea Link team in the last few days. The Applicant needs to consider this new point but it still expects to include bespoke protective provisions for NWL in the draft DCO at Deadline 6, subject to concluding discussions. The Applicant does not need to come into the Little Waltham pumping station to do anything with temporary possession powers. However, there may still be the need for some temporary possession powers outside of the boundary of the pumping station. The Applicant also noted that there is an allowance within the DCO for a temporary water supply to the nearby compound, and there is also provision in the DCO for water to be tankered if an agreement was not reached.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that there has been a good level of engagement between the parties; it is optimistic about reaching an agreement shortly in terms of both the SoCG, the side agreement and protected provision agreements.</p>
<p><b>Northumbrian Water</b> In terms of the protective provisions, are the parties in negotiations to include specific protective provisions and how are discussions progressing?</p>	<p>The Applicant confirmed that it is in negotiations with NWL to conclude specific protective provisions. The negotiations have been going relatively well. One of the main outstanding points is that NWL has included recent drafting around standing off of all future NWL projects. The Applicant is waiting for some information on that matter to understand how any such obligation would interact with the Project. The draft side agreement and protected provisions have been with NWL since 30 March 2026, and the Applicant is waiting for comments from NWL on both documents before the next update.</p>
<p><b>National Highways, Lower Thames Crossing (LTC)</b> Request for further information on Scenario B</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to bring forward the submission of the Scenario B documents as far as it can. The design work for the Scenario B option has been completed. The Applicant shared the first draft of the GIS information with LTC on 27 April 2026 and these were discussed at a meeting between the parties on 28 April 2026.</p> <p>In response to the Rule 17 Request of 17 April 2026 <b>[PD-019]</b>, the Applicant has submitted the following documents at Deadline 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.3 Works Plans - Section H [Revision B]</b></li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.15.1 Proposed Project Design - Scenario 18 (Table 2.18) [Revision A]</li> <li>• 8.15.2 Proposed Project Design - Permanent Features - Scenario 18 (Table 2.18) [Revision A]</li> <li>• 8.15.3 Class of Rights Plans - Section H - Scenario 18 (Table 2.18) [Revision A].</li> </ul> <p>The latter shows the impact of the class of rights that are being proposed. The plans will not have the plot-by-plot information but will show all of the classes that are needed and where these would be required.</p> <p>The Applicant is working on the remaining documents, including the Lands Plans, the Statement of Reasons and the Book of Reference, and intends to submit these at Deadline 5.</p>
<p><b>National Highways, LTC</b> Would this be managed through a side agreement or through a separate commercial agreement between the parties?</p>	<p>The Applicant intends to progress HoTs for a Side Agreement in parallel to the Examination. The intention is to complete the Side Agreement by Deadline 7, albeit given the complexity of the issues, that may or may not be possible. The Applicant confirmed it will do its best to work to a timetable that achieves resolution of the issues satisfactorily before the end of the Examination.</p>
<p><b>National Highways</b> Comments about the compulsory acquisition powers sought over plots of land that National Highways own and the acquisition of rights.</p>	<p>The Applicant is not seeking to acquire Class 1 land for its own purposes. It is seeking to acquire Class 1 land in situations where it needs to widen or extend the highway works in relation to the Strategic Road Network or the local authority road network. The Applicant is ensuring that it can do this to ensure it has the necessary land rights and title to carry out the works and dedicate for adoption sufficient extent of the new or extended highway back to the relevant highway authority to ensure that it can become adopted public highway in the future once the completion of the works have been carried out. The parties are having detailed discussions on each of the plots that are identified as Class 1 land within National Highways' ownership and are seeking to agree a way forwards in the side agreement. The Applicant considers there to be a high level of agreement as to how it will do that in a way which meets both parties' requirements in relation to the Class 1 land plots.</p> <p>In relation to the acquisition of rights, National Highways want to control the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers of the Applicant (including the Compulsory Acquisition of Land and Rights where they interact with National Highways' land holdings). There are two issues here, firstly the Applicant would require certainty around National Highways' suggestion of the voluntary grant of an easement for an underground crossing of the A12 to ensure that it would be granted and on appropriate terms acceptable to the Applicant and to that extent, the parties need to discuss this matter further.</p> <p>In terms of National Highways' position that the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 should apply to overhead crossings, the Applicant has taken that point away to consider its position.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>The Applicant has had regular meetings with National Highways to progress both the side agreement, the protected provisions, and also the plot-by-plot analysis of all the affected lands and rights plots, which is ongoing, and it will be arranging further meetings to resolve them, hopefully, in due course.</p>
<p><b>National Highways</b> Is the Applicant expecting to show changes to any of the land plans to show class 8 in this respect? Is there an update on the Protective Provisions?</p>	<p>The Applicant is not anticipating changing the plots to Class 8, because, within the plot, there would be different interests at different levels, for example a subsoil interest and a road network interest. The Applicant assumes that the side agreement with National Highways will set out how the powers are controlled and operated, rather than by amending the Land Plans but will discuss this with National Highways in terms of what protection it requires.</p> <p>The negotiations on the protective provisions are progressing well, but all of the matters need to be concluded together, with National Highways, at one point in time.</p>
<p><b>Langleys Estate</b> Comments about engagement, changes to the designs without reasons given and gaps on the figures and concerns about the wording in the HoTs.</p>	<p>The Applicant noted the AP's concerns and noted that where it is seeking compulsory purchase powers, this would be a last resort after doing all it can to acquire land by agreement. The Applicant recognises that the AP would like to see the detailed design for the negotiations in relation to compulsory acquisition and although the Applicant is trying to expedite the detailed design process where it can, as is the ordinary course of events on projects of this nature, it simply is not possible to have that level of design completed by the end of this Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it is in open ongoing dialogue with the agent who is acting on behalf of the AP. The Applicant noted that it can reprint and reissue the HoTs today (29 April 2026) and can also provide a representative of the team to talk through the concerns.</p>
<p><b>Langleys Estate</b> Clarification of the routing decision at this location</p>	<p>In terms of the AP's land, there is ancient woodland to the east and a conservation area to the south. Various routes were considered at this location as set out in document references detailed below. The western option would have traversed around the northern edges of Chatham Green and the conservation area to then enable a south-westerly route that would then pass between Great Waltham and Pleshey and its associated scheduled monuments, before tying back in with the Project route near Roxwell Road. This is a significantly longer route (approximately an additional 3 km and an additional eight or nine pylons). This would have transferred effects to similar residential and culture and heritage receptors.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the designations and features are shown on its interactive map on the Project website (<a href="https://norwichtotilburymap.nationalgrid.com/2025">https://norwichtotilburymap.nationalgrid.com/2025</a>), including the conservation areas, where the layer was not activated during the hearing.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>The Applicant offered the AP a meeting after the hearing in order to provide further details from a routing perspective and why the design is as shown.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-7.327 and 9-7.152 in Table 9-7</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 9.2.4 (page 104)</li> <li>• Response to REP1-386 in Table 5.1 (page 315) of <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-029]</b></li> <li>• Table 2.19 (page 37) of <b>8.11 Approach to Scenarios [Revision B]</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bianca Moller</b> Comments about the overhead line route through their family farm and outdoor wedding venue, including a proposed alternative route.</p>	<p>To the east of the property in question, to the east of the Order Limits there is Hapton Common County Wildlife Site which sits at the bottom of the valley. There is an angle pylon to the north of the area to change the overhead line route to a more southerly direction. There is a listed building and residential properties on Fundenhall Road at that point and if the route was to move to the edge of the valley, it would lie very close to that property and would require multiple angle pylons to route it back to the alignment proposed further down in the valley.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant does agree that going into the valley would be more compliant with Holford Rule 5, it would conflict with Holford Rule 2 and the supplementary notes, and that it brings impacts potentially on to that county wildlife site and on other residential receptors and the listed building.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 10-22.46 in Table 10-22</li> <li>• <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> paragraph 4.3.1 to 4.3.5 (pages 40–41)</li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 – Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b> paragraph 5.5.13 (page 36)</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 – Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraph 5.4.20 to 5.4.22 (page 41) and Figure 5.3 (page 42).</li> </ul>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<p><b>Bloor Homes</b> Bloor Homes is promoting a planning application on land that the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition powers for.</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that there are LoDs and land proposed for acquisition in this area which reflect the fact that the detailed design has not been finalised at this stage. Notwithstanding that and, therefore, that the extent of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers need to be maintained at this current time, the parties are in negotiation 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' programme constraints and their timetables, and the extent of the areas that they respectively need. That side agreement should govern how the parties are going to be able to work in this area. The Applicant is hoping to conclude that agreement, which should resolve Bloor Homes' concerns about the extent and nature of the compulsory acquisition powers over this area of land.</p>
<p><b>Mr and Mrs Sharp</b> Comments on consultation with landowners.</p>	<p>The Applicant has made attempts at engagement, including having written to, and sought meetings with, the AP. There are now discussions with their representatives, and a meeting has been arranged for the 18 May. The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to meet with the AP to understand fully the impact that the Project may have on the agricultural operations, and to further discuss the HoTs.</p> <p>The various iterations of the HoTs that have been issued to the AP to date, have all included the offer of a meeting.</p>
<p><b>Mr and Mrs Sharp</b> Comments on the options appraisal and impacts to their land.</p>	<p>The siting of the overhead line at this location is restricted by ancient woodland on the east side, just before the A12 crossing. There is then the railway to cross and also a gas pipeline before heading in a south-easterly direction away from Ingatestone. Various alternative alignments have been considered. The Applicant referred to its earlier submissions (in respect of matters raised on behalf of SJ Upton Trustees No. 1 and 2 Ltd) regarding a more eastern option that would have gone to the east of Margaretting and closer to Hylands Park. The Applicant also considered a corridor to the west of the current alignment which was moved based on feedback and further assessments at Grade I Listed Ingatestone Hall and the Grade II* Listed Church of St Giles, which is located just to the west and south-west of the AP's land. The angle pylon at the southern end of the AP's land is dictated by those linked receptors. The Applicant also considered an option to the west following the railway alongside Ingatestone. That had its own challenges with various scattered properties at the edge of Ingatestone before having to turn back in to route through the Haverings Grove pinch point and was discounted on the fact that it was longer, less direct and would transfer effect onto other residential and listed buildings.</p> <p>The part of the Order Limits that is closest to Margaretting Hall cottages is for a permanent right of access and is not proposed for the construction period. The compound is a material laydown area associated with the haul</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>road and a compound for the installation of the bellmouth, so is not a main or a satellite overhead line compound.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – further information concerning specific routeing and siting considerations relevant to the land interest(s) of this AP may be found in the following documents within the Examination Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> Ref no. 9-7.151 in Table 9-7</li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> paragraph 5.4.197 (pages 84–85)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Little Wenham Hall Farm Partnership</b> (Camilla MacAdam and Andrew Buxton).</p> <p>Comments on the impacts to their property and the eight historic buildings, also that an alternative route has been suggested by Savills</p>	<p>Little Wenham Hall comprises a cluster of listed buildings and the castle, a scheduled monument, which was also discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (28 April 2026). The castle has views to the north and has lower level screening vegetation. The proposed Cable Sealing End compound lies just to the north of Wenham Grove, where the route rotates initially heading to the south-east, then south, and then south-west. The alternative routes are shown in Figure 6.2 and paragraph 6.1.6 of the 2025 <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is sympathetic to the AP’s proposals, but is not aware that a planning application has been submitted. The Applicant has to work within the current context and not speculation regarding development potential.</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed the cable swathe with the AP for this part of the route, and that is subject to detailed design as to exactly where that cable would be. This would be the element that would restrict development above it or the planting of trees. The cable swathe is shown on the plans with a central haul road and cables either side, but subject to detailed design and bending radius coming from the Grove, that has some potential to be moved.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – There is a further meeting planned with the AP and agent on 25 May 2026 to continue the negotiations.</p>
<p><b>Palmer &amp; Klein</b></p> <p>There is a need for discussions on how the project will affect operations at Ongar Hall Farm.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledged the positive engagement with the AP and confirmed that the relevant representatives would be present at the planned meeting on 6 May 2026.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> –The Applicant can confirm it met with the AP on 6 May 2026 as part of the ongoing negotiations.</p>

### 3.3 Item 4 (Statutory Undertakers and Crown Land)

Table 3.2 Item 4 (Statutory undertakers and Crown land)

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
<b>i. Statutory undertakers (including progress and position on protective provisions)</b>	
<p>Have there been any further updates on any other statutory undertakers and how is the Applicant progressing with the protective provisions?</p>	<p><b>8.7 Statutory Undertaker Tracker [REP3-071]</b> submitted at Deadline 3 included a list of anticipated deadlines at which the relevant protective provisions will be included in the draft DCO, based on how negotiations are progressing. Some of these are anticipated to be included at Deadline 4 and the majority are likely to be agreed by Deadline 5, noting that the timescales depend on the other parties engaging and responding on these matters.</p> <p>If it is not possible to conclude negotiations with any particular statutory undertaker, then the Applicant would submit a version of protective provisions that is agreed as far as possible, but reflecting the Applicant’s position on any issues remaining in dispute at Deadline 6, and the Applicant would then make representations to the ExA in relation to sections 127 and 138 in terms of any outstanding parties, in order to provide the ExA with the reassurance as to how the statutory tests in that respect have been addressed for the relevant statutory undertakers.</p> <p>The Applicant is holding regular meetings with the relevant parties to make sure that protective provisions are progressed. The Applicant also has a SoCG in progress with most, if not all, of the statutory undertakers, and will add a line to these to set out the position and any outstanding matters in relation to protective provisions.</p> <p><b>Post-Hearing Note</b> – due to the timeframe between the close of CAH2 and Deadline 4, it has not been possible to draft this into the SoCGs and obtain comments from each affected statutory undertaker on these issues before Deadline 4. In the alternative, an indication of the outstanding matters has been provided in the <b>8.7 Statutory Undertaker Tracker [Revision C]</b> at Deadline 4 to assist the ExA and the SoCGs will be updated to reflect any outstanding matters in their next iteration between the parties.</p>
<b>ii. Crown land</b>	
<p>Please can the Applicant provide an update on Crown Land?</p>	<p>The Applicant confirmed that there has been positive progress with the Crown, noting that there are different Crown entities in terms of the government legal department. The Applicant has reached agreement with them and there are agreed HoTs in place. These matters are all expected to be concluded before the end of Examination.</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	The Applicant will update the Book of Reference to extract the Crown entities and will remove the Crown land from the plans at a future deadline.
<b>Ministry of Defence (MoD)</b> Updated position	The Applicant has also had further discussions with the MoD and there are five interactions with parts of land that it holds rights on. Early indications suggest that there are not going to be any issues specific to those rights. It appears most are historic rights or ones that it has passed to other third parties. The Applicant is expecting a written response on these matters from the MoD in the next couple of weeks.
<b>iii. Clarification of other matters following Deadline 3 and the ExA’s first written questions</b> – the Applicant made no statements under this Agenda item.	

### 3.4 Item 5 (Any Other Matters)

Table 3.3 Item 5 (Any other matters)

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
Please can the Applicant clarify the approach to negotiation with tenants?	<p>The Applicant has addressed this issue by way of updating <b>4.4 Land Rights Tracker [REP3-018]</b> at Deadline 3 with some new introductory sections that set out more detail about what National Grid’s established policy is around voluntary agreements and HoTs. Established policy is used as a term because it covers the process used on a number of different DCOs that have been consented.</p> <p>The established policy is not to seek separate HoTs with occupiers and tenants, as National Grid sees those as derivative interests from those who are able to grant the necessary rights, which is in most cases a permanent easement in perpetuity. National Grid seeks that from the freeholder or the superior title holder, and through voluntary agreements, and it requires the landowners to seek the consent of an occupier or a tenant or a mortgage company as the case may be.</p> <p>The Applicant made clear that it engages and involves other parties, such as tenants and occupiers throughout the process, to understand how the land is used from a practical point of view. However, it is crucial not to conflate engagement with negotiation. So, in effect, the Applicant undertakes engagement, which is a statutory process that is required for all persons with an interest in the land. But when seeking an easement for a right in perpetuity over the land, in almost all cases, the tenant or occupier does not have the power to grant the necessary rights. Therefore, National Grid negotiates with the parties who would be capable to give the rights which are sought and then relies on the landlord to discuss the legal side through its landlord–tenant</p>

Issue Discussed	Summary of Oral Case
	<p>relationship, and that is a requirement that National Grid put into both the HoTs and in the voluntary agreements. The Applicant has provided examples below of precedent cases from National Grid DCOs and other DCOs granted to other applicants in the past.</p> <p>National Grid’s approach to engagement and the use of HoTs reflects established practice across Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project examinations under the Planning Act 2008. It has been taken on a number of projects that have been through examination, award and implementation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Grid (Hinkley Point C Connection Project) Order 2016</li> <li>• The National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017</li> <li>• The Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018</li> <li>• The National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024</li> <li>• The National Grid (Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement) Order 2024</li> <li>• The National Grid (Sea Link) Order – in examination 2026</li> <li>• The H2 Teeside Order – in examination, application withdrawn 2026.</li> </ul> <p>Examining Authorities have consistently recognised that the regime does not require negotiated agreements with every person holding an interest in land and that it is appropriate for applicants to focus negotiations on those who can grant the rights required for the scheme, provided that all persons with an interest are properly identified, consulted and informed in accordance with the statutory framework.</p> <p>Within that context, the combination of diligent land referencing (sections 42 and 44), targeted negotiation with superior interests, comprehensive engagement with other AP (sections 47 and 48), and clear recording of decisions provides a proportionate evidential basis for demonstrating deliverability through voluntary agreements and, as a last resort, the exercise of compulsory powers.</p>
<p><b>HoTs and voluntary agreements</b></p> <p>Has the Applicant had much negative response to these discussions?</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that it would be inappropriate to comment on the current status of specific negotiations which, as explained as part of its submissions during CAH2, are ongoing and increasing in intensity. However, based on very recent meetings, including with well over the majority of represented persons with an interest in land and their agents, the Applicant considered there to be a growing acceptance of the current position, including of the fact that landowners would be expected to take the necessary steps to seek the consent of the occupiers.</p>

National Grid plc  
National Grid House,  
Warwick Technology Park,  
Gallows Hill, Warwick.  
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)