

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0248

Norwich to Tilbury

Volume 8: Examination Documents

Document: 8.3.32 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates (Lowleys Farm Mineral Site) - Tracked Changes Version

Final Issue B

June 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027

nationalgrid

Revision History

| <u>Version</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Submitted at</u> |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <u>A</u> | <u>12 May 2026</u> | <u>Deadline 4</u> |
| <u>B</u> | <u>10 June 2026</u> | <u>Deadline 5</u> |

Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates (Lowleys Farm Mineral Site) Draft Statement of Common Ground

1. Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground

This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared to outline the areas of agreement and any remaining points of discussion between National Grid and Tritton Farming Partnership LLP (TFP) and Brett Aggregates Limited (Brett) regarding specific issues arising during construction and/or operation from the interface between the proposed Norwich to Tilbury Project and Tritton Farming Partnership LLP and its members and Brett, known by National Grid as Lowleys Farm (Chelmsford, Essex, CM3 1PJ). The aim is to clarify the shared understanding of any issues and facilitate an efficient resolution process.

2. Parties to the SoCG

This SoCG is agreed between National Grid, and Tritton Farming Partnership LLP as landowner and Brett Aggregates Limited ~~as quarry developer~~. Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates will have regard to any points raised by statutory bodies and other relevant interested Parties in respect of the matters covered in the SoCG. Therefore, this version reflects the current position of Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates Limited but may be subject to change during the examination. A final position will be recorded in the final SoCG to be submitted close to the end examination.

3. Summary of matters under discussion

As requested by the Examining Authority, the below table provides an 'at a glance' summary of matters which are under discussion, together with a deadline by which such matters are expected to be resolved.

| SoCG ID | Summary of matter under discussion | Deadline for resolution |
|---------|---|-------------------------|
| 8.1 | Whether the pylon alignment will affect TFP's housing land and what mitigation will apply once final pylon positions are confirmed. | By deadline 7 |
| 8.2 | The comparative impacts of Routes <u>Scenarios</u> A and B on minerals and woodland, <u>farming and housing</u> , and the need for NG to provide detailed routing and tower plans for assessment. | By deadline 7 |

| SoCG ID | Summary of matter under discussion | Deadline for resolution |
|----------------------|---|--|
| 8.3 | How pylon positions and safety zones may restrict mineral extraction, requiring NG's final design details for accurate evaluation. | By deadline 7 |
| 8.4 | How temporary haul roads may affect minerals, farming, housing, and environmental features until tower locations are confirmed. | Likely to be discussed beyond deadline 7. |
| 8.5 | Why land beside the A131 is included in the project boundary and whether any permanent rights could affect TFP's access to the Chelmsford NE Bypass. | Likely to be discussed beyond deadline 7. |
| 8.6 | Whether shared access will be permitted across haul roads or construction zones, and any risk of farmland severance. | Likely to be discussed beyond deadline 7 |
| 8.7 | How NG will minimise commercial willow loss and outline compensation where losses are unavoidable. | By Likely to be discussed beyond deadline 7 |
| 8.8 | The potential impacts on ecological and heritage assets and the need for NG's formal response. | By deadline 7 |
| 8.9 | Visual and heritage effects across TFP land, including nearby settlements such as Little and Great Waltham. | By deadline 7 |
| 8.10 | The evaluation of using an alternative route outside the development boundary and not impacting the high value land. | By deadline 7 Unlikely to be resolved. |
| 8.11 | Confirmation on the extend extent of the ancient woodland | By deadline 7 |
| 8.12 | Site specific requirements will be agreed with TFP and Brett and added to the Landowner Interface for Requests and Actions Register and added to the draft Heads of Terms for Option to Easement. | By deadline 7 |
| 8.13 | Review combining and/or moving permanent access routes to mitigate impact | By deadline 7 |

4. Background

4.1 Description of the Project/Development

National Grid Electricity Transmission plc ('National Grid') owns and maintains the national high voltage electricity transmission network throughout England and Wales. The transmission

network connects the power from where it is generated to the regional Distribution Network Operators who then supply businesses and homes.

National Grid holds the Transmission Licence for England and Wales, and its statutory duty is to develop and maintain an efficient, coordinated and economical system of electricity transmission and to facilitate competition in the generation and supply of electricity, as set out in the Electricity Act 1989.

National Grid has developed plans for Norwich to Tilbury (referred to as the 'Project'). The Project would support the UK's net zero target through the connection of new low carbon energy generation in East Anglia and by reinforcing the transmission network.

The Project comprises reinforcement of the transmission network between the existing Norwich Main Substation in Norfolk and Tilbury Substation in Essex, via Bramford Substation, the new East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation and the new Tilbury North Substation.

~~The reinforcement is needed because the existing transmission network, even with current upgrading, will not have sufficient capacity for the new renewable energy (a substantial proportion of which would be generated by offshore wind) that is expected to connect to the network over the next 10 years and beyond. Completion of the Project, together with other new reinforcements across the country, will meet this future energy transmission demand both in East Anglia and across the UK.~~

The Project is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), and National Grid is seeking development consent under statutory procedures set by government. NSIPs are projects of certain types, over a certain size, which are considered by the government to be of national importance, hence permission to build them needs to be given at a national level, by the relevant Secretary of State (in this case the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero). Instead of applying to the local authority for planning permission, the developer must apply to the Planning Inspectorate for a Development Consent Order (DCO) that would grant development consent.

National Grid has submitted an application for development consent to the Planning Inspectorate. The Examining Authority (consisting of five examining inspectors), after a period of public examination, will make their recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero, who in turn will decide on whether development consent should be granted for the Project.

The Project is identified as critical to delivering a network which supports the clean power pathways for 2030 delivery.

The Planning Act 2008 places duties on National Grid as the DCO applicant to consult with prescribed or affected persons as well as to take account of responses to consultation and publicity. In accordance with these statutory requirements, National Grid has undertaken two non-statutory and one statutory consultation to inform its proposals, with further targeted consultations.

The Project is identified as critical to delivering a network which supports the clean power pathways for 2030 delivery.

5. Stakeholder Role

Tritton Farming Partnership LLP and its members, have legal interests that have the potential to interact with the Norwich to Tilbury proposals. This has been identified as Lowleys Farm, Chelmsford, Essex, CM3 1PJ. Brett Aggregates Limited (Brett) has an interest in a mineral deposit (sand and gravel) at Lowleys Farm and has, with TFP's approval, established a quarry design for a significant extraction scheme at this location.

National Grid is seeking to ensure that the interests of all parties and how they may be affected by the interaction are understood. From this position the aim is for the parties to agree actions to avoid or reduce the implications and for any remedial measures to be agreed. On this basis we seek the input from Tritton Farming Partnership LLP to demonstrate how their interests may be affected, how Tritton Farming Partnership LLP or National Grid and its contractors can collectively reduce those effects and input to agree the implementation of such measures.

Brett Aggregates Limited states that there are no current or proposed planning applications for the land. The site continues to operate as an active mineral extraction site.

6. Engagement to date

Meeting Dates: ~~14th~~ 14th November 2025, 19th February 2026, [24th April 2026](#)

- The parties continue to engage through ~~regular~~ email correspondence in relation to the matters described in this Statement of Common Ground.

7. Matters Agreed

| ID | Issue | Agreement Reached | Date Agreed |
|-----|----------|---|--|
| 7.1 | Minerals | All Parties acknowledge the presence of a mineral deposit within the site, estimated to be approximately 10 metres deep. It is also recognised that the current design would materially constrain or prevent the full extraction of this resource. The Parties accept that it is not possible to fully avoid the mineral site within the DCO limits. | 20th February 2026 |

8. Matters Being Discussed

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| 8.1 | Sterilisation of Housing Development | The Applicant is actively assessing the extent to which the proposed Project alignment for Scenario B may interface with the proposed housing development and will issue a formal response once the impact has been fully | Despite providing the information in relation to the housing development, TFP has received no feedback from National Grid regarding mitigation of impacts on this proposed development. TFP has been working on this housing development since | Ongoing discussion |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|-----------------|--|--|----------------------|
| | | <p>evaluated. The stakeholder has provided details to the Applicant of the proposed development. Planning permission is yet to be granted for the proposed housing development.</p> <p>Scenario B, as shown by Figure 1, would move the Project alignment further to the south-east within the Limits of Deviation to minimise the interaction with the minerals site.</p> <p><u>This is reflected in 8.11 Approach to Scenarios (Revision B). The Applicant is working to accelerate the design in this location to be able to provide further detail to the stakeholder.</u></p> | <p>pre N-T and sterilisation will clearly occur.</p> <p>If Route B were to be adopted, less sterilisation, TFP would require the route to remain as far south as possible before heading west.</p> <p>TFP will provide further feedback once pylon locations have been presented.</p> <p>More information can be provided by TFP as to the impact.</p> | |
| 8.2 | Route Scenarios | <p>The Applicant acknowledges the presence of a mineral deposit within the site at Lowley’s Farm and that the design would potentially constrain or prevent the full extraction of this resource, and that as it currently stands the Project alignment would extend through the deepest point.</p> <p>It is considered not possible to fully avoid the mineral site within the DCO Limits of Deviation, however it is possible to allow flexibility in the alignment to reduce the impact on the effects on the mineral site, should it be</p> | <p>National Grid has proposed a “Route A” (current alignment) and a “Route B” within their proposed development boundary, but closer to Lyons Hall Wood to mitigate impact. However, we have received little detail on the exact routes, pylon locations, or pylon design for Route B.</p> <p>Without plans to review, we can not comment on the proposed moving of these pylons. No plan has been formally presented to TFP and Brett for comment. In addition, TFP will comment and seek adjustments on pylon locations outside of the mineral site.</p> | Ongoing Discussions. |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|----|-------|--|---|--------|
| | | <p>progressed. Widened Order Limits have been proposed in this location to allow for an alternative scenario that would reduce the impacts on the minerals site. This includes the potential relocations of towers TB128 to TB133 further to the South-East within the widened Order Limits.</p> <p>Brett Aggregates Ltd. have provided the Applicant with site plans and information on extractable depths. Detailed routing, tower locations and tower specifications for the Project have not yet been finalised, and the full extent of the impact cannot yet be determined. The Applicant will continue to work with Brett Aggregates Ltd. as the detailed design develops to fully understand the extent of any potential impact.</p> <p>Further detail of the proposed Scenario B option is included in Table 2.6 of document 8.11 Approach to Scenarios (Revision B), submitted at Deadline 4. A record of engagement with Brett Aggregates Ltd is included in 8.3.32 Statement of Common Ground (Revision A) additionally submitted at Deadline 4.</p> <p><u>The Applicant is working to accelerate the design in this location to be able to provide</u></p> | <p>TFP and Brett are unable to provide confirmation of loss of mineral reserves or other impacts set out below, until National Grid finalise their design and layout.</p> <p>Route B would be far preferable to Route A; however, TFP and Brett's preferred position remains the alternative routes set out at point 12 below.</p> <p>The development boundary cannot remain as wide as currently proposed through to the conclusion of the examination, as this would impact an excessive amount of land not required for the scheme.</p> <p><u>We have not been presented with access requests for additional non-intrusive and intrusive surveys to fully appraise Route B and require NG to carry out these surveys.</u></p> <p><u>We would like feedback from NG on combining and sharing any permanent rights to mitigate impact. Furthermore, any permanent rights need to be kept to a minimum.</u></p> | |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| further detail to the stakeholder. | | | | |
| 8.3 | Sterilisation of Minerals | <p>The Applicant acknowledges the presence of a mineral deposit within the site at Lowley’s Farm and that the design would potentially constrain or prevent the full extraction of this resource, and that as it currently stands the Project alignment would extend through the deepest point.</p> <p>It is considered not possible to fully avoid the mineral site within the DCO Limits of Deviation, however it is possible to allow flexibility in the alignment to reduce the impact on the effects on the mineral site, should it be progressed. Widened Order Limits have been proposed in this location to allow for an alternative scenario that would reduce the impacts on the minerals site. This includes the potential relocations of towers TB128 to TB133 further to the South-East within the widened Order Limits.</p> <p>Brett Aggregates Ltd. have provided the Applicant with site plans and information on extractable depths. Detailed routeing, tower locations and tower specifications for the Project have not yet been finalised, and the full extent of the impact cannot yet be determined. The Applicant will continue to</p> | <p>TFP and Bretts has made clear, through previous meetings with FG/NG and at the preliminary hearings of the potential significant mineral sterilisation and consequential financial compensation claim arising as the scheme will negatively impact extraction.</p> <p>Brett have provided extractable depths and site plans; however, no finalised realignment of the pylons has been presented by National Grid to comment on the impact.</p> <p>TFP and Brett are unclear on the ongoing permanent rights that are required and how much sterilisation this will result in. This is particularly relevant in the context of a working mineral extraction site and the compliance requirements associated with operating beneath cable lines or around pylon bases.</p> <p>TFP and Brett has requested details of the type, height, and sag levels of the pylons to understand the potential impacts.</p> <p>TFP and Brett has also requested a construction and completion timeline for the area, to understand the impacts and to identify opportunities to work with National Grid to minimise disruption to the mineral extraction operations.</p> | Ongoing Discussions, |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| | | <p>work with Brett Aggregates Ltd. as the detailed design develops to fully understand the extent of any potential impact.</p> <p>Further detail of the proposed Scenario B option is included in Table 2.6 of document 8.11 Approach to Scenarios (Revision B), submitted at Deadline 4. A record of engagement with Brett Aggregates Ltd is included in 8.3.32 Statement of Common Ground (Revision A) additionally submitted at Deadline 4. <u>The Applicant will work with the stakeholder to share detailed design information as the scheme design develops to understand any potential impacts on the minerals site.</u></p> | <p>The distance from Lyons Hall Wood that Brett and TFP have presented in their representation to outline the proposed mineral extraction is indicative and subject to ecological and environmental assessment. The mineral resources extends up to the wood so this area is likely to be worked as part of the mineral extraction with suitable mitigation measure being put in place.</p> <p><u>NG consider that fully avoiding the mineral site may not be possible; however, we have not seen evidence that changes to the route, pylon length, pylon size, etc. Would necessarily result in sterilisation becoming unavoidable.</u></p> | |
| 8.4 | Temporary Construction Effects | <p>The Project detailed design is still under development, with haul road alignments and specifications yet to be finalised.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Brett Aggregates Ltd. as the detailed design develops on the associated temporary construction requirements to allow TFP and Brett to assess potential mineral, housing, farming, ecological, visual and environmental impacts.</p> | <p>Until pylon locations are confirmed, TFP and Brett are unable to comment on the proposed temporary construction haul roads.</p> <p>Their impact is relevant to the mineral, housing, farming, ecological, visual, environmental points referencing this SOCG- <u>and we would need them to located to minimise the impact.</u></p> | Ongoing discussion |
| 8.5 | “Construction” | The Applicant has included land adjoining the | TFP is unclear as to the use of the land adjoining | Ongoing |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| | Area Adjoining the A131 | <p>A131 within the development boundary for construction and access purposes, but no permanent rights will be imposed that prevent or restrict third-party access to this land.</p> <p><u>The Applicant is actively working on progressing the access design to provide further confirmation to the stakeholder.</u></p> | <p>the A131. National Grid has stated it will review this and provide information explaining why this land falls within the development boundary.</p> <p>This land is of strategic importance to TFP, as it has secured access via a roundabout to the planned Chelmsford North East Bypass.</p> <p><u>Although NG state there will be no permanent rights, our understanding is that there current plans do show a permanent maintenance access.</u></p> <p>National Grid will need to ensure that no permanent rights are imposed that would prevent, restrict, or require accommodation of thirdparty access. TFP would be willing to work with National Grid should this land be used for a compound, including agreement on appropriate accommodation works.</p> | discussion |
| 8.6 | Minimise Impact on Farming | <p>Shared access across temporary haul roads or construction areas will be considered by the Applicant where safe and feasible; however, this may not be possible at all times due to safety or construction requirements.</p> <p><u>Details of the proposed Temporary Traffic Regulation measures in the vicinity of Lowley's Farm are included in 2.4 Traffic Regulation Order Plans - Section F [APP-030] and 7.3 Outline Construction</u></p> | <p>National Grid has not provided clarity on any shared use or access across haul roads or working areas or length of closure of existing roads. This- <u>Specifically, we are not clear on the closure of Goodman's Road and can NG clarify what the planned closures of this road.</u> <u>Keeping access</u> is essential to ensure land is not severed<u>secured</u> during construction and that impacts on farming operations are kept to a minimum. At present TFP believes impact is</p> | Ongoing discussion |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| | | <u>Traffic Management Plan [REP3-028].</u> | <p>substantial <u>and approximately 95% of the land will be cut off from the main farm yard.</u></p> <p><u>We need details from NG on crossing areas and the protocol to cross to fully evaluate the impact and mitigation required.</u></p> <p><u>National grid has failed to reference Lyons Hall Shoot which provides income to the estate and the impact the scheme will have upon this.</u></p> | |
| 8.7 | Commercial Willow Tree Replanting | The Applicant will minimise any required removal of commercial willow trees and will provide appropriate compensation for any verified losses incurred because of the works. | Impacts on willow trees must be minimised, and any lost trees must be appropriately compensated. The cultivation of willow trees is a valuable source of income for TFP. | Ongoing discussion |
| 8.8 | Ecological and Environmental Impact | <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by Tritton Farming Partnership regarding ecological and environmental assets on their land and the location of the SSSI.</p> <p><u>An assessment of the ecological impacts is included in 6.8 Environmental Statement – Chapter 8 Ecology & Biodiversity.</u></p> | <p>TFP has not received feedback from National Grid following representations made regarding impacts on ecological and environmental assets located on TFP’s land.</p> <p><u>Although it is acknowledged that it is of geological interest there is also very high ecological interest.</u></p> <p>TFP is concerned on the pylons being too close to and impacting the SSSI and affects the shoot North of the River Ter and too close to the listed buildings of Hole Farm and Goodmans. The existing route should stay further North before</p> | Ongoing discussion |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|-----|-------|---|---|--------------------|
| 8.9 | | <p>The Applicant recognises that the Project will result in landscape and visual effects, including significant adverse effects within approximately 1.5 km of the route during construction and operation. These effects, including impacts on visual receptors in areas such as Fairstead, Great Leighs and along the Essex Way, as well as cumulative effects with other development to the north-east of Chelmsford, have been assessed and reported in the 6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Landscape and Visual in accordance with GLVIA methodology. The assessment includes consideration of views affecting heritage assets and historic settlements. Through routing and siting of the overhead line, the Applicant has sought to reduce impacts on landscape character and visual receptors as far as practicable, with mitigation measures proposed including the undergrounding of part of an existing overhead line and measures to mitigate effects on ancient woodland and important landscape features.</p> | <p>crossing Goodmans Lane within red corridor- to limit the impact. We have not seen evidence from NG if this is possible.</p> <p>There is significant concern regarding landscape and visual impacts at Little Waltham, Great Waltham where the route passes between two historic villages, and on TFP’s Property, where the route passes between two historic villages. TFP has not received feedback from National Grid following representations made regarding impacts on heritage and other assets located on TFP’s land. Namely, we feel this is too close to the listed buildings of Hole Farm and Goodmans Farm, which not only hold significant heritage value but also commercial value to the estate as an events venue. TFP is concerned on the significant impact to value on retained land and houses. The option to underground the route in this area has not been presented to TFP.</p> | Ongoing discussion |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|------|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| 8.10 | Alternative Routes | <p>The Applicant will evaluate the proposed alternative route options through its established internal processes. This will allow their feasibility to be understood without the need to provide detailed cost information.</p> <p><u>The Applicant is actively advancing the design of the alternative scenario and will work with the stakeholder to address their concerns.</u></p> | <p>TFP and Brett have not been satisfied that the alternative route (APP-127), namely West of Great Waltham Alternative Route, still utilising TFP land, has been fully appraised in light of the potential impacts on mineral land and the proposed housing development and other factors including significant economic and heritage issues concerning the existing proposed Great Waltham route.</p> <p>In TFP and Bretts opinion Holford Rules with Shetl clarifications 2003 suggest the alternative route should be preferred. These alternative routes are preferable to TFP and Brett, as they would minimise impacts on highvalue land.</p> <p>We also note that within the alternative route report (APP127), a proposed alternative route from Fairstead to Lyons Hall Wood, still utilising TFP Land has not been appraised. This route, similarly, to the West of Great Waltham alternative, could provide significant cost savings.</p> <p>TFP and Brett has requested that a full cost appraisal be undertaken, taking into account the cost and other implications of these alternative routes.</p> <p><u>TFP would like to have sight of the results from the internal review and feel that PINS should review the cost differences to evaluate the suitability of the route taken.</u></p> | Ongoing discussion |

| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|------|--|---|---|--------|
| 8.11 | Ancient Woodland | The Applicant notes the request for clarification on the extent of ancient woodland and will issue a formal response based on the environmental baseline and recognised datasets. | The “ancient” woodland at Lyons Hall Wood is not all ancient woodland and therefore its proximity to the woodland needs further review. We would request National Grid to respond formally on their understanding here. | |
| 8.12 | <u>Landowner interface for Requests and Actions Register and draft Heads of Terms for option to Easement to prevent the use of compulsory acquisition powers</u> | <u>The Applicant will continue to work with the stakeholder to advance the draft Heads of Terms with a view to reaching an agreement that suits both parties.</u> | <p><u>In conjunction with the points raised above, the landowner would like to see drafting of what will be added to teh Landowner Interface for Requests and Actions Register.</u></p> <p><u>The landowner requests that teh above concerns are added to teh draft Heads of Terms for an Option to Easement which is being discussed separately between the parties.</u></p> <p><u>It is noted that TFP’s appointed agents have provided comments to the generic elements of the Heads of Terms and have not received feedback. For the purpose of this SOCG, we will not go into the specific details on the proposed Option to Easement, but points worth noting are greater clarity on the Easement option terms so that a full appreciation of the requirements and consequent impact are understood. For example, bit not limited to, working rights/ownership of minerals under the easement strip; access arrangements; working restrictions/requirements in proximity to pylons/</u></p> | |


| ID | Issue | National Grid Position | Stakeholder Position | Status |
|------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| | | | <p><u>underneath cables; what retained rights TFP will have over the easement in general.</u> <u>The Heads of Terms are not acceptable as currently drafted.</u></p> | |
| 8.13 | <u>Permanent rights of Access</u> | <p><u>The Applicant acknowledges that the proposed permanent access would intersect TFP and Bretts land. An alternate route is being explored which would follow the new tower alignment. Once this has been finalised revised routing will be shared.</u></p> | <p><u>The permanent access rights sought by NG are excessive. There appears to have been limited consideration of their impact, with the proposals seemingly focused primarily on ease of access.</u></p> | |
| 8.14 | <u>Minerals</u> | <p><u>The Applicant acknowledges the presence of a mineral deposit within the site, estimated to be approximately 20 meters deep. It is also recognised that Scenario A would materially constrain or prevent the full extraction of this resource. The applicant is seeking an alternative scenario to mitigate the impact.</u></p> | <p><u>TFP and Brett accept that the proposed design would materially constrain or prevent the full extraction of this resource. TFP and Brett also accept that it is not possible to fully avoid the mineral site within the DCO limits unless a route change is adopted.</u> <u>Until the depth of the deposit is agreed we cannot agree this.</u></p> | |

Figure 1 Scenario A and Scenario B of the Project in the vicinity of Lowleys Farm

(Added)



(Added)



9. Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon by the undersigned parties:

For National Grid

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

For Tritton Farming Partnership LLP

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

For Brett Aggregate Limited

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

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

| | |
|--|------------|
| Summary report: Litera Compare for Word 11.16.0.74 Document comparison done on 6/8/2026 8:41:31 AM | |
| Style name: Default Style | |
| Intelligent Table Comparison: Active | |
| Original filename: 8.3.32 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates (Lowleys Farm Mineral Site).docx | |
| Modified filename: 8.3.32 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tritton Farming Partnership and Brett Aggregates (Lowleys Farm Mineral Site) Revision B Clean Version.docx | |
| Changes: | |
| <u>Add</u> | 52 |
| Delete | 62 |
| Move From | 0 |
| <u>Move To</u> | 0 |
| <u>Table Insert</u> | 7 |
| Table Delete | 2 |
| <u>Table moves to</u> | 0 |
| Table moves from | 0 |
| Embedded Graphics (Visio, ChemDraw, Images etc.) | 6 |
| Embedded Excel | 0 |
| Format changes | 0 |
| Total Changes: | 129 |