

AENC-TQST-LAN-REP-0008

# Norwich to Tilbury

**Volume 8: Examination Documents**

Document: 8.14 Schedule of affected persons objecting to CA or TP  
of their lands or rights

Final Issue B

May 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027

**nationalgrid**































































































Name of PIL	PIL ID	Nature of Interest(s)	Category of Interest(s)	Pilots Subject to CA of Land (NGET) (Class 1)	Pilots Subject to CA of Rights (NGET) (Classes 2 to 6)	Pilots Subject to TP (NGET) (Class 7)	Pilots Subject to CA of Land (UKPN) (Class 1)	Pilots Subject to CA of Rights (UKPN) (Classes 2 to 6)	Pilots Subject to TP (UKPN) (Class 7)	"White Land" Pilots (Class 8)	Relevant Representation	Written Representations and/or Any Other Examination Submissions (as at Deadline 2)	Summary of Objection	Applicant's Response to Issues Raised	Current Status	RAG Rating
Niky Jaswain	1546	Occupation, Freehold	Category 1		C1376, C1376, C1376, C1376			C1376, C1376, C1376			RR 2106		Objects due to inadequate consultation and serious health, environmental, residential, agricultural, and legal concerns. Engagement with landowners is described as insufficient, unclear, and poorly communicated, with misdirected or missing notices and feedback ignored. Health impacts, including stress and potential long-term EMF effects, are considered inadequately assessed. The project is said to cause irreversible landscape harm, biodiversity loss, and adverse effects on tourism and local businesses, with mitigation measures viewed as inadequate. Residential impacts include property devaluation, construction disruption, ongoing noise, visual intrusion, and insufficient EMF risk assessment. Agricultural concerns relate to risks to soil quality, drainage, farm stability, and lack of assurance on appropriate soil cover over cables. Legal issues include unclear construction rights, documentation errors, poor scheme design, and non-transparent or inadequate compensation. Criticism relates to overhead HVAC pylons rather than alternatives such as underground HVDC, offshore coordination, and modern grid upgrades that could reduce harm. Requires removal of the DCO and supports the Essex Suffolk Norfolk Pylons action group.		10/10/24 sent out prior to Deadline 3. Negotiations ongoing. Meeting held with agent on 18th May to discuss HDTs. Next meeting planned for 18th May.	Amber
Hugh Hamblin	1583	Freehold	Category 1		H-126, H-124	H-126, H-127, H-126, H-125, H-120			H-126		RR 1447		I object in principle to the project due to its impact on the use and condition of our fields off Lower Dunton Road, with specific concerns about Pylon T8233 and the proposed road. T8233 should be relocated adjacent to the existing hedge to preserve workable agricultural land and the temporary road should follow the hedge line—consistent with the permanent access easement—rather than cutting across the middle of multiple fields. These changes would reduce long-term disruption, minimise environmental works, and allow continued agricultural use of most of the land during construction.		10/10/24 sent out prior to Deadline 3. Negotiations ongoing.	Amber
Adgreen Energy/Arco Limited	1597	Easement Right or Prohibit. Freehold	Category 2, Category 1	A-126, A-12		A-123, A-127				A-17, A-17	RR 004		Adgreen's main objection is that the proposed Development Consent Order works—particularly new accessways, landscaping, construction compounds, pylons and overhead lines—may interfere with the construction, operation and maintenance of its operational solar project and associated cable route which are already secured by lease and easement and lie within the Order Land. Adgreen is concerned that these works could compromise the safety and stability of its solar project and the public interest as well as an electrician's general, and therefore asserts that NGET's requirements should be able to coexist with Adgreen's rights, subject to continued meaningful engagement and the negotiation of a formal agreement to protect Adgreen's interests, which has not yet been concluded.			Amber
Carol Ann Bree	1567	Freehold, Occupation	Category 1								C-12205, C-12205	RR 044			No rights required to be removed. Land-use class 8.	Amber
Delia Suzanne Leggett	1580	Occupation, Freehold	Category 1		C-2137, C-412, C-412, C-412, C-412, C-412	C-411, C-411, C-411, C-411		C-2137			RR 1243	RR 227, [note duplicate RPT: 443]	The objection argues that the Norwich to Tibury overhead pylons would cause serious and irreversible harm to the countryside, wildlife, hedgerows, and biodiversity, while also damaging the character of rural communities. It highlights inadequate transparency and consultation, alongside concerns about construction impacts such as heavy traffic, access roads, and disruption to rural life. The scheme is seen as a significant threat to small family farms, local businesses, and property values, and is being rushed and based on outdated thinking, with contracts wrongly awarded before proper scrutiny. Crucially, the objection stresses that less damaging and more future-proof alternatives—such as underground HVDC cables, offshore solutions, and modern grid upgrades—have been ignored, and urges the Planning Inspectorate to reject the DCO and require these options to be properly explored. General response from land agent on behalf of a variety of landowners. Applicants and their agents are said to have failed to provide meaningful feedback on landowner change requests (including pylon relocation or undergrounding proposals). Lack of two-way dialogue has left landowners feeling disenfranchised, with reported adverse impacts on wellbeing. Landowners are broadly accepting of the scheme in principle but expect transparency and justification where requests are rejected. Generic voluntary Heads of Terms issued in summer 2025 are criticised as inadequate. Despite feedback provided in autumn 2025 and further discussions in January 2026, no confirmed amendments have been received. Adgreen state they cannot recommend clients enter into voluntary agreements, which are considered inferior to statutory powers. Based on past experience, there is concern National Grid may ultimately rely on compulsory powers rather than securing timely voluntary agreements. Many landowners face additional impacts from the diversion or undergrounding of existing LUPN infrastructure. No engagement had occurred with UKPN in their agents at the time of writing, creating uncertainty over proposals, access, compensation and responsibility. Strong concerns are raised about fragmented negotiations, with land access and compensation handled separately by multiple undertakers. The applicants are said to have failed to engage constructively with affected landowners, has not sufficiently progressed voluntary agreements, and has not adequately coordinated with other statutory undertakers, risking significant delivery and landowner relationship issues.		12/10/24 sent out prior to Deadline 3. Negotiations ongoing. See comments in Richard Leggett (above - RR-2)	Amber

















Name of P/L	P/L ID	Nature of Interest(s)	Category of Interest(s)	PLOTS Subject to CA of Land (NGCT) (Class 1)	PLOTS Subject to CA of Rights (NGCT) (Classes 2 to 6)	PLOTS Subject to TP (NGCT) (Class 7)	PLOTS Subject to CA of Land (UKPN) (Class 1)	PLOTS Subject to CA of Rights (UKPN) (Classes 2 to 6)	PLOTS Subject to TP (UKPN) (Class 7)	"White Land" PLOTS (Class 8)	Relevant Representation	Written Representations and/or Any Other Examination Submissions (as at Deadline 2)	Summary of Objection	Applicant's Responses to Issues Raised	Current Status	RAQ Rating
Rockspan Ltd	2050											99-0145	Object to the proposed scheme as National Grid has failed to demonstrate that a clear and compelling public need exists that outweighs the significant adverse impacts on affected landowners. The promoter has not adequately considered reasonable alternative routes, underpinning, or alternative technologies that could substantially reduce harm. There is a lack of sufficient and transparent information regarding the safe delivery of the proposed power operations, and a full environmental, ecological, biodiversity, soil and biosecurity impacts. The scheme fails to properly account for landscape and heritage effects, private and unaccommodated losses, and the cumulative impacts on farming operations and rural land management. National Grid has not sought to address the essential safety and wellbeing interests of affected parties, nor demonstrated that concerns raised during consultation have been meaningfully considered or resolved. Engagement with affected parties has been inadequate and unrepresentative, and the promoter has failed to fulfil its obligation to seek agreement or undertake a reliance on compulsory acquisition powers. For these reasons, I do not consider that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm, and I request that consent be refused or that the promoter be required to reconsider underpinning and alternative routing to significantly reduce adverse impacts.	As required by clause 4 of CA47 but did not attend most recent meeting with AP agent held on 20th April with NGCT in attendance to continue negotiation and V2 V2, further agent meeting planned on 13th May to continue negotiations.	Amber	
Stuart Gooding and Sarah Gooding	Partner in RL 6	Occupation	Category 1		D-147D D-147E D-147F D-147G D-148A D-148B D-148C D-148D D-148E D-148F D-148G D-148H D-148I D-148J D-148K D-148L D-148M D-148N D-148O D-148P D-148Q D-148R D-148S D-148T D-148U D-148V D-148W D-148X D-148Y D-148Z							99-0020	The applicants object to the proposed North-Tisbury 660KV transmission line on the grounds that it would cause unreasonable and disproportionate harm to their residential properties, rural business park, farming operations and future development opportunities. The close proximity of pylons T22-T26 would significantly damage residential amenity through noise, VLF, visual intrusion and long-term landscape change, leading to reduced quality of life and property values. The scheme would undermine the viability and attractiveness of a nearby rural business park, threaten farm income and operational efficiency during and after construction, and permanently restrict the land with clear potential for future residential, commercial and solar development - issues for which current compensation mechanisms make no adequate provision. National Grid has failed to properly consider reasonable mitigation, alternative siting, access routes or less harmful options such as underpinning. T- pylons, off-line solutions or sag-tales to existing infrastructure. More generally, the applicants contend that the need for the scheme has not been robustly demonstrated, alternatives have been inadequately assessed, and the project would cause unjustified harm to landscape, heritage, soils, biodiversity, biosecurity and landscape rights. Inadequate consultation, poor analysis, opaque compensation arrangements and persistent reliance on compulsory powers further undermine confidence in the scheme. Taken together, the applicants argue that the private and permanent losses clearly outweigh the unproven public benefits, and that the Development Consent Order should therefore be refused or fundamentally redesigned.	V2 V07H sent out prior to Deadline 2. Negotiations ongoing. Meeting to discuss V07H arranged for the 13th May.	Amber	
Suzanna Nunn and Gary Nunn	Partner in RL 6	Occupation	Category 1		D-147D D-147E D-147F D-147G D-148A D-148B D-148C D-148D D-148E D-148F D-148G D-148H D-148I D-148J D-148K D-148L D-148M D-148N D-148O D-148P D-148Q D-148R D-148S D-148T D-148U D-148V D-148W D-148X D-148Y D-148Z							99-0012	The applicants object to the proposed North-Tisbury 660KV transmission line on the grounds that it would cause unreasonable and disproportionate harm to their residential properties, rural business park, farming operations and future development opportunities. The close proximity of pylons T22-T26 would significantly damage residential amenity through noise, VLF, visual intrusion and long-term landscape change, leading to reduced quality of life and property values. The scheme would undermine the viability and attractiveness of a nearby rural business park, threaten farm income and operational efficiency during and after construction, and permanently restrict the land with clear potential for future residential, commercial and solar development - issues for which current compensation mechanisms make no adequate provision. National Grid has failed to properly consider reasonable mitigation, alternative siting, access routes or less harmful options such as underpinning. T- pylons, off-line solutions or sag-tales to existing infrastructure. More generally, the applicants contend that the need for the scheme has not been robustly demonstrated, alternatives have been inadequately assessed, and the project would cause unjustified harm to landscape, heritage, soils, biodiversity, biosecurity and landscape rights. Inadequate consultation, poor analysis, opaque compensation arrangements and persistent reliance on compulsory powers further undermine confidence in the scheme. Taken together, the applicants argue that the private and permanent losses clearly outweigh the unproven public benefits, and that the Development Consent Order should therefore be refused or fundamentally redesigned.	V2 V07H sent out prior to Deadline 2. Negotiations ongoing. Meeting to discuss V07H arranged for the 13th May.	Amber	
The Trustees of the Newbery Settlement	381 - George Nicholas Jones 2023 - Carl Jane Jones 2024 - Gerald 7955 - Mark Archibald Mingyi Chen Mistard	Freehold, Occupation	Category 1		F-402B, F-402C, F-402D, F-402E, F-402F, F-402G, F-402H, F-402I, F-402J, F-402K, F-402L, F-402M, F-402N, F-402O, F-402P, F-402Q, F-402R, F-402S, F-402T, F-402U, F-402V, F-402W, F-402X, F-402Y, F-402Z							99-0040	Object to the proposed development on the basis that National Grid have failed to properly assess, justify, or mitigate its significant impacts. In particular, they have not adequately addressed site-specific impacts on heritage and residential assets, Green Belt policy, landscape character, ecology, biodiversity, soils, biosecurity, or mental health. There has been a lack of meaningful engagement with affected parties, especially in relation to pylons 50-53A-50-53B and insufficient consideration of alternative routes, underpinning, or alternative technologies. National Grid have not demonstrated a public need that clearly outweighs the serious and enduring harm to private interests, nor have they fully accounted for private losses or provided adequate information on safe project delivery. Overall, the promoter has failed to engage professionally, address concerns raised, or fulfil their obligation to seek agreement as an alternative to compulsory powers, meaning the public benefit does not outweigh the adverse impacts of the scheme.	Siteplan consultation meeting held 23rd February 2024. Initial heads of terms sent October 2023. Chair to agree for HcH meeting 8th December 2023. HcH meeting confirmed with agent 15th January 2024. HcH discussion held 13th February 2024. HcH V2 issued on 2nd April 2024. HcH V2 meeting requested on agent 13th April 2024. Further HcH meetings proposed for 19th, 26th or 31st May 2024. The Applicant	Amber	





Name of PIL	PIL ID	Nature of Interest(s)	Category of Interest(s)	Plots Subject to CA of Land (NGET) (Class 1)	Plots Subject to CA of Rights (NGET) (Classes 2 to 6)	Plots Subject to TP (NGET) (Class 7)	Plots Subject to CA of Land (UKPN) (Class 1)	Plots Subject to CA of Rights (UKPN) (Classes 2 to 6)	Plots Subject to TP (UKPN) (Class 7)	"White Land" Plots (Class 8)	Relevant Representation	Written Representations and/or Any Other Examination Submissions (as at Deadline 2)	Summary of Objection	Applicant's Response to Issues Raised	Current Status	RAQ Rating
Christopher William Courtenay Tregoning	1018	Freehold, Occupation	Category 1		A-11/42, A-11/42, A-11/43, A-11/43, A-11/44, A-11/44, A-11/45, A-11/45, A-11/46, A-11/46, A-11/47, A-11/47, A-11/48, A-11/48, A-11/50, A-11/50, A-11/52, A-11/52, A-11/56, A-11/56, A-11/60, A-11/60, A-11/61, A-11/61, A-11/69, A-11/69, A-11/51, A-11/51, A-11/54, A-11/54, A-11/55, A-11/55	A-11/39, A-11/39, A-11/53, A-11/53, A-11/57, A-11/57		A-11/42, A-11/42, A-11/43, A-11/43, A-11/44, A-11/44, A-11/45, A-11/45, A-11/46, A-11/46, A-11/47, A-11/47, A-11/48, A-11/48, A-11/50, A-11/50, A-11/52, A-11/52, A-11/56, A-11/56, A-11/52, A-11/52, A-11/56, A-11/56							V2 HOTS sent out prior to Deadline 3. Negotiations ongoing.	Amber

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)