

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0343

Norwich to Tilbury

Volume 8: Examination Documents

Document: 8.11 Approach to Scenarios - Tracked Changes Version

Final Issue C

June 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027

nationalgrid

Revision History

<u>Version</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Submitted at</u>
<u>A</u>	<u>07 April 2026</u>	<u>Deadline 3</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>12 May 2026</u>	<u>Deadline 4</u>
<u>C</u>	<u>10 June 2026</u>	<u>Deadline 5</u>

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Addressing Design Scenarios	32
2.1	Types of Design Scenarios	32
2.2	Overarching Principle	32
2.3	Resolving Scenarios (Securing Mechanisms)	43
2.4	Updating the DCO Application documents	54

Table 2.1	Norwich Main Substation (Section A)	87
Table 2.2	Anglian Water Sewage Works south of Tabernacle Lane (Section A)	9
Table 2.3	Silica sands mineral site west of the proposed new EACN Substation (Section C)	10
Table 2.4	Flying Trade Group and Crown Quarry east and west of the A12 (Sections C and D)	11
Table 2.5	Mineral extraction site north-west of Kelvedon (Section E)	4213
Table 2.6	Lions Hall Minerals Site east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F)	4314
Table 2.7	Chelmsford Bypass east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F)	4415
Table 2.8	Crest Nicholson housing development south of the A127 (Section G)	4516
Table 2.9	British Pipeline Agency (BPA) pipeline crossing west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H)	4617
Table 2.10	Southfields development south of the A1013 (Section H)	4718
Table 2.11	Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) south of the proposed new Tilbury North Substation (Section H)	4819
Table 2.12	River Stour crossing west of Stratford St Mary (Section C)	2021
Table 2.13	Black Brook north of Langham (Section C)	2122
Table 2.14	Great Horkesley south of School Lane (west of Great Horkesley) (Section D)	2223
Table 2.15	Tilbury North Access at the proposed new Tilbury North (Baseline conditions have been gathered from desk-based information (see Section 12.4) and presented with reference to the section of the Project within which they are located. (Section H)	2324
Table 2.16	Thurrock Airfield and Low Heights west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H)	2627
Table 2.17	Temporary construction compounds (Section G/H)	2728
Table 2.18	South of the new Tilbury North Substation (Section H)	2829
Table 2.19	The Walthams and Standard Heights to the south of the River Chelmer (Section F)	2931

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 Section 4.6 of [6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 \(- Project Description\)](#) ~~of the ES [APP-130]~~ summarises 19 elements of the Project design where different design options within the Order Limits are under consideration. These are referred to as “Scenarios”. Each Scenario contains two or more options.
- 1.1.2 In the case of each Scenario, a single design option was assessed from an [Environmental Impact Assessment \(EIA\)](#) perspective. The option assessed was the “most likely case” option (at the time the assessment was carried out), with sensitivity testing then applied for each topic or aspect chapter to ensure that the likely significant environmental effects arising from the flexibility represented by alternative design options within the Scenario were robustly considered and assessed. Both the assessment of effects arising from the single assessed option and the assessment of the flexibility afforded by the alternative options were reported in the [Environmental Statement \(ES\)](#).
- 1.1.3 There are no legal impediments or barriers to the inclusion of options or scenarios within a [Development Consent Order \(DCO\)](#) application, and the degree of flexibility in design terms afforded by the inclusion of those design options within the ES and DCO application is consistent with published EIA guidance and precedent.¹
- 1.1.4 This document (~~the “Applicant’s 8.11 Approach to Design Scenarios in the DCO Application” [Revision C]~~) outlines the process which the Applicant ~~intends to follow~~ [is following](#) during the DCO Examination ~~in order to~~ rationalise, where possible, the number of ~~remaining~~ design Scenarios and options within the Project design, ~~in order to limit the number of design Scenarios moving forward through~~ [remaining by the end of](#) the DCO Examination to those that are essential in terms of providing required and objectively justifiable engineering flexibility.
- 1.1.5 It is expected that this will necessarily be an iterative process, and the Applicant ~~would~~ [is](#) therefore ~~intend to submit further~~ [submitting](#) versions of this document to the Examining Authority (“ExA”) at Deadlines during the ~~remainder of the~~ Examination.
- 1.1.6 ~~The Design Scenarios Table summarises~~ [Table 2.1 to Table 2.19 summarise](#) the 19 design Scenarios which existed within the Project design at the point at which the DCO application was submitted. For each Scenario, the ~~table records~~ [tables record](#) the following information:
- the type or nature of the options in the Scenario (e.g. overhead line height or alignment (these are often combined with issues arising from land allocated or proposed to be allocated in Local or Minerals Plans), access options etc.);
 - a description of the options within the Scenario (including plan);
 - the relevant stakeholders;

¹ See, for example, “Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope” (March 2025).

- the current status of the Scenario and options in the Scenario, (e.g. the progress of negotiations to resolve the preferred option in the Scenario or whether flexibility needs to be retained (in which case the requirement for flexibility is explained))
- legal securing mechanism for preferred option (assuming there is one – see further below); and
- —the interim and/or final Project decision in respect of each Scenario.

=

2. Addressing Design Scenarios

2.1 Types of Design Scenarios

- 2.1.1 There are two types of design Scenario included ~~with-in~~within the Project, albeit there is some overlap between them and certain Scenarios include elements of both types.
- 2.1.2 Firstly, there are Scenarios that are concerned with, and driven by, matters of technical Project design such as overhead line alignment and precise pylon location around sensitive environmental or social receptors, pylon heights, construction access route options and site access locations or bespoke mitigation proposals.
- 2.1.3 Secondly, there are Scenarios that have been incorporated within the DCO application in order to cater for “known unknowns” often related to third party developments. For example, an emerging Local or Mineral Plan allocation that would be prejudiced by the Applicant’s preferred routeing of the overhead line necessitating identification of an alternative alignment which addresses the prejudice. The alternative sits as the option for use in case the relevant allocation is confirmed or, for example, at the point of construction the allocation is unresolved and the compensation or other implications of routeing through the allocation means an alternative routeing is preferred.

2.2 Overarching Principle

- 2.2.1 The Applicant cannot seek to restrict or remove any option within a Scenario without first having absolute certainty that there is at least one other alternative option included within the Scenario which is capable of being implemented and delivered in a manner which facilitates the economic and efficient delivery of the Project.
- 2.2.2 Therefore, and to the extent that such certainty does not exist (and is not likely to exist) as the Examination reaches its concluding stages, the Applicant would expect to explain and justify the need to preserve the flexibility represented in each of the design Scenarios that remain relevant at that point in time to the ExA.
- 2.2.3 At the same time, the Applicant may need to submit to the ExA, on a “without prejudice” basis, suggested drafting – whether for inclusion in the draft ~~Development Consent Order~~DCO or otherwise in any of the supporting application control documents – which would enable the Secretary of State to grant development consent on terms which would balance the Applicant’s need for flexibility in delivery of the Project with the competing interests or concerns of stakeholders and other interested parties. The nature of that additional drafting would need to be considered on a case by case basis at the appropriate time.

2.3 Resolving Scenarios (Securing Mechanisms)

2.3.1 In addition to the overarching principle noted above, the following paragraphs outline the Applicant's approach to addressing and resolving the optionality which exists in the Scenarios.

- Active cross-disciplinary engagement with relevant stakeholders (i.e. [LPAs Local Planning Authorities](#), statutory consultees such as the [EA Environment Agency](#) or Historic England, land owners, local communities) will continue throughout the course of the Examination period, with a view to agreeing the preferred options to be developed and the circumstances for doing so. For example, precise pylon positioning ~~or~~ height or overhead line alignment if (i) a Local Plan allocation fails, or is confirmed in manner which removes the conflict between original ~~OHL~~[overhead line](#) alignment and the allocation, in which case the original ~~OHL~~[overhead line](#) routing is preferred and delivered or (ii) the Plan allocation is adopted and an alternative agreed overhead line alignment is delivered.
- Statements of Common Ground (“SoCGs”) will record progress of engagement, aspirations as regards [to](#) resolution of the technical matters relevant to the Scenario and/or commitments made as regard the likely interface between the Project and third party developments. Ultimately the aim is to achieve a SoCG that records an agreed way forward that enables the Scenario either (i) to be closed completely (i.e. one preferred option agreed and all others dismissed) or (ii) narrowed (as in the example above concerning the Local Plan allocation).
- Relevant SoCGs will, therefore, provide the ExA with an up-to-date overview of the likely direction of travel in respect of the corresponding design Scenarios to which they relate. The Applicant expects to submit updated SoCGs at regular intervals during the Examination in line with the Examination Timetable.
- One key element of the SoCG is recording the agreed legal delivery mechanism for the confirmed option outcome for the Scenario in question, whether that is a single option (e.g. specific pylon locations to avoid a sensitive receptor or community) or an “either/or option” against defined circumstances (e.g. the Local Plan allocation example again).
- The Applicant will seek to enter into [confidential](#) Asset Protection or Interface Agreements (or similar) with affected third parties where necessary in order to deliver the certainty that would enable a Scenario to be closed or reduced. This is particularly the case where delivery of the preferred option requires action on behalf of the Applicant and the third party acting collaboratively or in some form of co-ordinated manner (e.g. confirmed overhead line alignment to be submitted to landowner for approval and easement for approved design granted or compulsorily acquired with landowner agreement). In those circumstances completion of those Agreements must remain a fundamental pre-condition to restricting or ~~remeinge~~[removing](#) any aspect of a design Scenario. Whilst a helpful indicator, the agreement of Heads of Terms will not afford the Applicant or the relevant stakeholder sufficient contractual certainty from a Project delivery perspective.

- Where there is sufficient certainty regarding the delivery of a Scenario option (e.g. agreed overhead line alignment or pylon height or alternate options to address confirmed or rejected Local or Mineral Plan allocations), including where necessary a completed Asset Protection or Interface Agreement (or similar), the Applicant expects:
 - to make the ExA aware of its intention to remove the corresponding Scenario option from the Project proposals and/or confirm the agreed preferred option; and
 - to confirm to the ExA the agreed legal delivery mechanism for the delivery option that has been agreed.

2.4 Updating the DCO Application documents

- 2.4.1 In the event that ~~NGE~~the Applicant is satisfied that a particular design Scenario is capable of being rationalised or confirmed, careful consideration will need to be given to the DCO application documents which need to be updated or amended and the timing for doing so.
- 2.4.2 It is important that the relevant information placed before the ExA at the earliest possible time so as to avoid time and resources (for all parties) being spent on particular issues or matters which are no longer of relevance.
- 2.4.3 The working assumption is that legal delivery mechanisms for agreed options as described above will wherever possible be dealt with through mechanisms that avoid the need for formal change applications (e.g. updated Works Plans to reflect agreed options or commitment to specific options in ~~the~~7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice [Revision E]). Further it is equally important that confirmed options are not “drip-fed” into the Examination on a continuing basis. This may risk confusing the wider narrative for other interested parties – especially when regard is had to other iterative updates required to be made to certain application documents as a consequence of the ordinary course of the Examination.
- 2.4.4 Consequently to the extent possible, and subject to any particular instructions from the ExA to the contrary, confirmed options will be grouped and submitted into the Examination in batches at relevant Deadlines in the Examination timetable with this document being updated accordingly. As noted above, SoCGs will play an important role in signposting the likelihood of, and timings for, confirming a specific option or formal change.

Design Scenarios Table: As at Deadline ~~45~~ (~~12-May~~10 June 2026)

Summary of preferred design ~~scenario~~Scenario decisions:


Decision/Status	Design Scenarios
<p>The decision to progress with preferred scenario<u>Scenario</u> has already been confirmed to the ExA. Certain amended plans and documents are being<u>were</u> submitted at Deadline 4 in accordance with the Rule 17 Request of 17 April 2026 [PD-019]. All remaining plans and documents will be<u>have been</u> submitted for<u>at</u> Deadline 5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. 11 Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) south of the proposed new Tilbury North Substation (Section H) • 2.18 South of the new Tilbury North Substation (Section H) • 2.19 The Walthams and Standard Heights to the south of the River Chelmer (Section F)
<p>New confirmation<u>Confirmation</u> to ExA <u>at Deadline 4</u> of decision to progress with a preferred scenario (Deadline 4)<u>Scenario</u>. See individual tables. Relevant application documents will be submitted no later than Deadline 6.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.4 Flying Trade Group and Crown Quarry east and west of the A12 (Sections C and D) • 2.5 Mineral extraction site north-west of Kelvedon (Section E) • 2.6 Lions Hall Minerals Site east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F) • 2.16 Thurrock Airfield and Low Heights west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H) • 2.10 Southfields development south of the A1013 (Section H)
<p>Design scenario is<u>Scenario</u> being managed through a Change Application. <u>Change Application was accepted on 31 March 2026. Updated plans and documents were submitted at Deadline 3 and 4.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.9 British Pipeline Agency (BPA) pipeline crossing west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H)
<p>Preferred scenario<u>Scenario</u> decision pending due to ongoing stakeholder engagement and agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 Norwich Main Substation (Section A) • 2.2 Anglian Water Sewage Works south of Tabernacle Lane (Section A) • 2.3 Silica sands mineral site west of the proposed new EACN Substation (Section C)

Decision/Status	Design Scenarios
Need to preserve the flexibility represented in the design Scenarios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 Chelmsford Bypass east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F) • 2.8 Crest Nicholson housing development south of the A127 (Section G) • 2.12 River Stour crossing west of Stratford St Mary (Section C) • 2.13 Black Brook north of Langham (Section C) • 2.14 Great Horkesley south of School Lane (west of Great Horkesley) (Section D) • 2.15 Tilbury North Access at the proposed new Tilbury North (Section H) • 2.17 Temporary construction compounds (Section G/H)

List of abbreviations


OHL: Overhead Lines
 UGC: Underground Cables
 BESS: Battery Energy Storage Systems

Table 2.1 Norwich Main Substation (Section A)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) show an overhead line alignment exiting the Norwich Main Substation between RG001 and RG007. The Limits of Deviation (LoD) and Order Limits in this location have been widened to the east to allow flexibility to change</p>	<p>Innova Renewables Limited SSDE ProjCo Limited</p>	<p>Hall Farm BESS secured planning permission in July 2025. In the current SoCG (here), NGET has [APP-112], the Applicant expressed a preference for the eastern alignment if the Hall Farm BESS doesn't proceed. Detailed design Engagementengagement with Innova Renewables is ongoing to agree project interactions and define a project corridor and remove uncertainty for relevant stakeholders. SSDE ProjCo Limited have also expressed a preference for the Applicant to utilise the</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Code of Construction Practice Commitments Register • Statement of Common Ground 	<p>Decision pending further resolution of detailed design interactions between the different projects. Further positive detailed design engagement has since taken place between boththe projects, and both parties are cooperating to formalise a proposed solution.</p> <p>The Applicant seeks to have an agreed outcome by Deadline 7.</p>


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	the alignment should the Innova Renewables battery storage facility to the south of the substation not proceed.		western corridor which would result in less interactions between the two projects. <u>All parties are continuing to engage on this matter and the Applicant seeks to have an agreed outcome by Deadline 7.</u>		

Table 2.2 Anglian Water Sewage Works south of Tabernacle Lane (Section A)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Access	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) shows two haul roads within the Order Limits between RG40 and RG42.</p> <p>Two haul roads are presented to provide an alternative haul road that avoids crossing through an Anglian Water sewage works and potential land it has noted may be used for reed planting.</p> <p>The haul road scenario is subject to a wider Anglian Water/ National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) discussion on the utilisation of a parcel of land south of the Forncett End water treatment plant between RG41 and RG42. While the parcel of the land the proposed OHL alignment occupies isn't<u>is not</u> currently utilised by Anglian Water, it is in their future business plans and so a mutually agreeable solution is sought.</p> <p>National Grid have<u>The Applicant has,</u> within the DCO, proposed a land swap for Anglian Water to</p>	<p>Anglian Water Services Limited (AW)</p>	<p>No agreement with AW regarding impact on Forncett End Water Recycling Centre (WRC) and potential future land use.</p> <p>AW and National Grid<u>the Applicant</u> are progressing a number of potential solutions working to define an agreed outcome.</p> <p>Further detail is provided within-<u>Issue at ID 7.11 of the Applicant's draft SoCG with</u> Anglian Water SOCC-[REP4-101].<u>The Applicant seeks to have an agreed outcome by</u> Deadline 7.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground with AW • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>No change currently as the scenario<u>Scenario</u> is dependent on external factors and on-going third party engagement and agreement.</p> <p>We seek<u>The Applicant seeks</u> to make a decision prior to close of examination by<u>by</u> Deadline 7.</p>


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	instead utilise a parcel of land adjacent to the existing site. Conversations with Anglian Water are ongoing to agree a solution.				

Table 2.3 Silica sands mineral site west of the proposed new EACN Substation (Section C)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL, UGC & Minerals	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an overhead line alignment and underground cable alignment between TB1 and TB8.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened in this area to allow flexibility to facilitate a swap of the overhead line and underground cable north or south of Little Bromley Road, subject to the progression of the silica sands minerals site, i.e. locating the underground cables to the north of Little Bromley Road would reduce sterilisation of potential silica sands mineral site.</p> <p>Scenario A: Overhead line pylons TB5, TB6 and TB7 located to the south of the road with the underground cable located to the north of the road.</p> <p>Scenario B: The cable alignment and Overhead Lines are changed with cables swapped to the</p>	Suffolk County Council (SCC)	Feedback from the SCC's Mineral Planning team indicates there may be no decision on the site's inclusion until after the examination closes. We have <u>The Applicant has</u> also received further details of the potential impact of construction on the fruit farm. We are <u>The Applicant is</u> exploring adjustments to working practices, cable swathe requirements and potential mitigations (including the provision of other land). It seems unlikely that a full change to scenario <u>Scenario</u> B will be made but the need to develop a modified version of the current scenario <u>Scenario</u> A does seem to be	Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground • Code of Construction Practice 	Further design engagement necessary and need to retain both scenarios at this stage pending resolution of external factors and decisions. Engagement has been held with design being considered ahead of further on-going engagement to resolve.


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	south of the road and TB5 to TB7 to the north.		<p>required. Design options under development.</p> <p><u>The Applicant intends to provide an update by Deadline 7.</u></p>		

Table 2.4 Flying Trade Group and Crown Quarry east and west of the A12 (Sections C and D)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows widened Order Limits between TB18 and TB22.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened between TB18 and TB22 as there are a number of planning applications associated with the Flying Trade Group and Crown Quarry developments adjacent to the A12. Scenario B is an arrangement for the OHL to pass to the north of the FTG warehouse.</p>	<p>Flying Trade Group (FTG) Crown Quarry</p>	<p>Preference to progress with Scenario B – overhead line alignment to the North of the consented warehouse with access sharing main warehouse access. This would address concerns from FTG and landowners, and businesses south of Wick Lane. Now have sight of FTG access and through discussion have established that amended access arrangements meet traffic standards, Have <u>The Applicant has also agreed positioning of pylons with FTG. The Applicant has been advised by FTG that access concerns have been addressed. The Applicant's preference would be to</u></p>	<p>In principle agreement has been reached, we anticipate. <u>The Applicant anticipates the</u> securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground or Heads of Terms Agreement with Flying Trade Group • Code of Construction Practice • Crown Quarry have established a proposed way of working that maintains Applicant access and between Applicant and Quarry operator has minimised the extent of sterilisation. SOCG to be secured with operator. 	<p>Decision to proceed with Scenario B subject to final sight of Access <u>review of access</u> adjustments to confirm <u>they</u> meet highway safety. Change is the reposition within the Order Limits of the overhead line and access route to pass to the north of the FTG warehouse.</p>


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
			<p><u>take forward the amended access arrangements on the basis they meet traffic standards, however the potential to access by crossing Wick Lane must be maintained. The Applicant has received the proposed bellmouth arrangement from FTG and is currently reviewing the information.</u></p>		

Table 2.5 Mineral extraction site north-west of Kelvedon (Section E)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL & Minerals	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an overhead line alignment between TB84 and TB87.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened between TB84 and TB87 to allow flexibility to change the alignment to reduce effects on a potential mineral extraction site should it be identified as an allocation in a future mineral plan.</p> <p>Scenario B would reposition TB84 to the south west and TB85 and TB86 to the south so that pylons TB84 and TB85 were positioned at the northern and southern edges of the proposed extraction area, and TB86 moved outside of the extraction area to reduce the extent of sterilisation.</p> <p><u>After the DCO submission, the North West</u></p>	<p><u>Minerals Extraction Operator</u></p> <p><u>TBC North West Kelvedon Mixed Use Development Promoter</u></p>	<p>Taking into consideration the sterilisation of minerals potential leads to a likely change to progress with Scenario B.</p> <p>Engagement with landowner and the developer <u>and the developers of both potential projects</u> is on-going to establish the appropriate arrangements within the order limits <u>Order Limits.</u> <u>This is taking into consideration the potential effects on both projects from the different scenarios or a hybrid of the two scenarios.</u></p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>We are advised of further delay to conclusion of the minerals planning process, with no firm date identified. In order to provide clarity for detailed design, affected land owners, and in light of the substantially reduced sterilisation associated with scenario B, <u>the applicant confirms the change to scenario B potential effects, the Applicant is progressing design activities and engagement to establish an appropriate arrangement that</u> will be taken forward.</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	<u>Kelvedon Mixed Use site was identified as part of a Regulation 18 Consultation. Scenario B would increase the overlap between projects.</u>				

Table 2.6 Lions Hall Minerals Site east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL & Minerals	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an overhead line alignment between TB128 and TB133.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened between TB128 and TB133 to allow flexibility to change the alignment to reduce effects on the Lions Hall Minerals Site should it be progressed.</p> <p>Scenario B would realign the overhead line to route southwards from TB128 midway down the west side of Lyonshall Wood before turning to the southwest to reconnect at TB133. By doing so, this reduces the sterilisation of the mineral</p>	<p>Tritton Farming Partnership TBC Minerals Developer</p>	<p>Taking into consideration the sterilisation of minerals potential leads to a likely change to progress with Scenario B. Engagement with landowner / developer is on-going to establish the appropriate arrangements within the order limits is ongoing with the landowner and minerals developer to identify alignment and access arrangement details.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>We are The Applicant has been advised of further delay to conclusion of the minerals planning process, with no firm date identified. In order to provide clarity for detailed design, affected landowners landowners, and in light of the substantially reduced sterilisation associated with scenario Scenario B, the applicant Applicant confirms the change to scenario Scenario B will be taken forward. Engagement is ongoing with the landowner and minerals developer to identify alignment and access arrangement details.</p>

extraction area.

Table 2.7 Chelmsford Bypass east of the A131 and to the west of Lyonshall Wood Ancient Woodland (Section F)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Access	<p>As above for (6).</p> <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) shows a haul road between TB130 and TB131.</p> <p>The Order Limits have been widened to facilitate an alternative haul road off the proposed Chelmsford Bypass new roundabout, should the Chelmsford Bypass progress, which would sever the currently proposed construction haul road that follows the overhead line alignment.</p>	<p>TBC Essex County Council (Highways department)</p>	<p>Flexibility to be retained.</p> <p>Construction of the project will respond/adapt depending on the progress (or otherwise) of the Bypass at that point in time.</p> <p>Consider need for DCO Requirement related to future approvals.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>Flexibility needs to be retained as it is uncertain where the connection to highway from the project temporary and permanent access due to uncertainty over the programme for construction of the Chelmsford Bypass.</p>

Table 2.8 Crest Nicholson housing development south of the A127 (Section G)



Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Access	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) shows two haul roads/construction access arrangements within the Order Limits between TB225 and TB226. Two haul roads are presented to provide an alternative haul road should the Crest Nicholson housing development progress.</p>	Crest Nicholson	Northern scenario to be withdrawn upon submission of a planning application for the Crest Nicholson scheme. There is already an agreement in place with the housebuilder.	Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground • Code of Construction Practice 	Decision to be made once the third party planning application has been submitted. Outcome awaited.

Table 2.9 British Pipeline Agency (BPA) pipeline crossing west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Pipeline	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an overhead line alignment between TB238 and TB240.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened between TB238 and TB240 to allow flexibility to enable an alternative alignment with more angles to facilitate a more perpendicular crossing at the BPA pipeline (if required).</p>	<p>BPA British Pipeline Agency Ltd (BPA) who act as the agent for the owner, United Kingdom Oil Pipelines Limited (UKOP)</p>	<p>Change application being progressed in order to facilitate works and land rights required for pipeline mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Applicant notified the Examining Authority of its intention to apply to make a change to the application for the Project (Change Application 1) on 12 December 2025 [AS-049]. As set out in [AS-049], the purpose of Change Application 1 is to increase the Order Limits in order to facilitate works and land rights required for pipeline mitigation measures. The Applicant formally submitted Change Application 1 on 27 March 2026 (see [CR1-001] to [CR1-017] (inclusive)) and it was accepted for examination on 31 March 2026 [PD-016].</p> <p>Expected that the proposed Protective Provisions and/or Side Agreement would</p>	Not relevant	<p>No further change required.</p> <p>Change Application 1 was accepted for examination on 30 April 2026 and we await the decision 31 March 2026 [PD-016].</p> <p>Consequently, the Applicant updated a number of documents at Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 to incorporate the proposed change at Bulphan. These documents are listed in Table 2.1 of the Schedule of changes to the DCO application documents submitted with Change Application 1 [CR1-013].</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
			<p>regulate the final design and routeing of the OHL and related mitigation.</p> <p>No expected change to be made —subject to proposed <u>following acceptance of</u> Change Application 1 —being accepted.</p>		

Table 2.10 Southfields development south of the A1013 (Section H)




Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an overhead alignment between TB255 and TB259.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened between TB255 and TB259 to allow flexibility to allow an alternative alignment if the Southfields housing development does not go ahead, as the alignment could then move to the west, removing two crossings of Buckingham Hill Road, a crossing of a historic landfill site and pylons situated within parkland and a quarry site.</p>	<p>TBC Southfields developer</p>	<p>Scenario A developed to reduce effects on a potential housing allocation with Scenario B a more direct route if site didn't<u>did not</u> progress. Southfields identified as a Housing Opportunity Area and progressing through EIA. Greater impact from scenarioScenario B with effect on development having been significantly reduced for Scenario A.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Plans – change area not required to Class 8 • Side Agreement with LTC regarding oversail of land within their DCO for different purposes. • Statement of Common Ground with Southfields developer 	<p>Progress with the Southfields Development (allocated as an opportunity area within the Local Plan) is such that a change to scenarioScenario B will not be taken forward.</p>

Table 2.11 Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) south of the proposed new Tilbury North Substation (Section H)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows temporary and permanent works to existing overhead line infrastructure (YYJ and ZB) to the south of the A13 and A1089 junction in the proximity of Heath Road.</p> <p>The LoD and Order Limits have been widened at this location to allow a change to the design should the ongoing coordination identify a change is required as a result of LTC. Should LTC not be progressed or an alternative design be progressed</p>	<p>LTC Thurrock Council Chapel Farm Development Proposals</p>	<p>As per the letter submitted to PINS on 9th the <u>Examining Authority on 9 February 2026</u>, amendments to LTC diversion requirements and adoption of scenario <u>Scenario B</u> for connecting Tilbury North Substation to the YYJ overhead cable line removes the need for flexibility covered by this scenario <u>Scenario</u>.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Consent Order Schedule 1 • Updated, Works and Lands Plans • Side Agreement with LTC 	<p>Adoption of Scenario B. The <u>3.1 Draft DCO</u> submitted as at <u>Deadline 2 [REP2-004]</u> includes necessary revisions to Schedule 1.</p> <p>2.3 Works Plan - Section H (Revision B) [REP4-016]; 8.15.1 Proposed Project Design - Scenario 18 (Table 2.18) (Revision A) [REP4-314]; 8.15.2 Proposed Project Design - Permanent Features - Scenario B (Table 2.18) (Revision A) [REP4-315]; and 8.15.3 Class of Rights - Plans Section H - Scenario B (Table 2.18) (Revision A) will be [REP4-316] were submitted at Deadline 4. All other documents relevant to Scenario B will be have been</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	<p>by LTC then land to the west of heath road may not be needed. There is an inter-relationship with scenario 18 which relates to alternative means of connection to the south of the substation where Scenario A is connecting to the existing line (referred to as the YYJ) as overhead line and Scenario B as underground cable.</p>				submitted at Deadline 5.

Table 2.12 River Stour crossing west of Stratford St Mary (Section C)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
UGC	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows two underground cable crossings of the River Stour. The LoD and Order Limits have been widened at the crossing of the River Stour to allow for a double eastern and western crossing or a single crossing (either an eastern only or western only crossing), subject to detailed design of the trenchless crossing methods and detailed ground investigation. The area is constrained by various water bodies, a high-pressure gas main and Source Protection Zone 1. The double eastern and western crossing would not interact with the Source Protections Zone 1. However, if a single western crossing was taken</p>	TBCN/A	<p>Base assumption that there may be a need for two corridors – design will be dictated by grounds conditions. Would be premature to reduce flexibility at this stage, even though NGET's the Applicant's aspiration is to proceed with one corridor only.</p> <p>Any interactions with the gas main would be regulated through existing Protective Provisions included in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Not relevant given reason for wider limits</p>	<p>Retaining flexibility into delivery is required to respond both to detailed ground condition investigations and the outcome of each trenchless crossing installation drive.</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	forwards following detailed design the Project would interact with a Source Protection Zone 1.				

Table 2.13 Black Brook north of Langham (Section C)


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
UGC	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) shows an underground cable alignment to the south of Black Brook. The LoD and Order Limits have been widened slightly to the west of the A12 and south of Black Brook to allow for flexibility of routeing individual cable trenches in the vicinity of existing United Kingdom Power Network (UKPN) underground cables.</p>	TBC/N/A	<p>No change required. Construction of the projectProject will respond to constraints posed by third party apparatus. Any interactions with existing apparatus would be regulated through existing Protective Provisions included in the draft DCO.</p>	Not relevant given reason for wider limits	Retaining flexibility into delivery to respond to detailed ground investigation results and their potential to modify 400kV cable trench alignment.

Table 2.14 Great Horkesley south of School Lane (west of Great Horkesley) (Section D)


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
UGC	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) shows widened LoD and Order Limits to the south of School Lane (west of Great Horkesley) to allow for a wider temporary construction area if required as the underground cable alignment to the west is heavily constrained.</p>	TBC/N/A	<p>No change required. Construction of the project will respond to constraints posed by third party apparatus. Any interactions with existing apparatus would be regulated through existing Protective Provisions included in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Not relevant given reason for wider limits</p>	<p>Retaining flexibility into delivery to potentially allow the adoption of different cable installation methods which may or may not require material to be temporarily stored along the construction corridor away from the area where construction width is heavily constrained.</p>

Table 2.15 Tilbury North Access at the proposed new Tilbury North (Baseline conditions have been gathered from desk-based information (see Section 12.4) and presented with reference to the section of the Project within which they are located. (Section H)


Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Access		<p>Essex County Council (Highways department) Clearserve Ltd / Statera LTC</p>	<p>Eastern and western options are being informed through engagement with local highways authority (Essex County Council) and other relevant parties including LTC.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Side Agreement • Statement of Common Ground • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>Need to maintain flexibility due to as yet unresolved programme interfaces with third party development and to ensure the coordination of concurrent works</p>

Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) present the temporary and permanent access options associated with the new Tilbury North Substation and associated works.

The two proposed temporary access options into the new Tilbury North Substation during construction comprise:

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Primary Access Route (PAR) via Stanford Road (east of the Orsett Cock junction), Buckingham Hill Road and Hoford Road leading to a temporary haul road with two alternative alignments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One running mainly along or alongside Hoford Road before crossing the south-western part of the Clearserve site • One running mainly through the Clearserve site from north-east to south-west • A PAR via Brentwood Road leading to a temporary haul road with alternative alignments with and without LTC in place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Without LTC: east to west between Brook Farm and Orsett Golf Club using the existing access to the south of High House Lane – With LTC: initially a temporary access road to the west of Brentwood Road, crossing Brentwood Rd and then running east to west between Brook Farm and Orsett Golf Club. On completion of the LTC, Brentwood Road bridge embankment works and new junction arrangements with High House Lane, access to the substation would be via Brentwood Road and the new junction with High House Lane and then east between Brook Farm and Orsett Golf Club. • The two proposed access options into the new 				

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	<p>Tilbury North Substation during operation (and maintenance) comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A permanent new widened access along Hoford Road leading to a permanent private access road with two alternative alignments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One running mainly along or alongside Hoford Road before crossing the south-western part of the Clearserve site – One running mainly through the Clearserve site from north-east to south-west • A permanent access running east to west between Brook Farm and Orsett Golf Club. <p>The new NMU<u>Non-Motorised User</u> route, if provided along Hoford Road during construction, would be removed after construction.</p>				

Table 2.16 Thurrock Airfield and Low Heights west of Langdon Hills Golf and Country Club (Section H)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL		TBC <u>Thurrock Airfield Operator and Users</u>	<p>Pylon height remains dependent on the status of Thurrock Airfield and a successful.</p> <p><u>As of April 2026,</u> the appeal against refusal of housing</p>	<p>Assuming dismissal of appeal and agreement being reached with the airfield, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOCG with 	<p>No change to preferred design following the dismissal of the appeal and the applicant<u>Applicant</u> is proceeding on the basis of the continued operation of the</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
------	---	-----------------------	----------------	--------------------	----------




Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) show an alignment between TB238 and TB243. Low height pylons are proposed between TB238 and TB243 to cater for Thurrock Airfield. However, should a housing development be brought forwards at Thurrock Airfield and/or the airfield be closed, low height pylons would not be required and standard lattice pylons would be installed instead.

proposals for the site. ~~As of April 2026, the appeal~~ was dismissed and the ~~applicant~~ Applicant assumes the airfield will continue to operate and therefore low height pylons retained as the design.

- airfield operator
- Permitted under Article 5 (1)(b)(i)
 - Work Plans (Table of Parameters)
 - Code of Construction Practice

airfield, which requires the design to include low ~~height~~ height pylons between TB238 and TB243.

Table 2.17 Temporary construction compounds (Section G/H)




Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
Compound	 <p>There are two options for a satellite compound in Basildon, due to a planning application for Brentwood Housing Development (21/01525/OUT) which has yet to be determined. Only one satellite compound would be taken forward depending upon the outcome of the planning application. The two options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1) a compound off Brentwood Road, near TB223 (TB-Sate2A) • Option 2) a compound at Lower Dunton Road, near TB233, Basildon (TB-Sate2B). 	TBC Affected landowners	Next steps are dependent on the outcome of the planning application.	Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of Construction Practice 	Flexibility retained until such time as the planning application is determined and either defines the option or allows the options to be selected by the Applicant's Delivery Partner.

Table 2.18 South of the new Tilbury North Substation (Section H)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL or UGC	 <p>Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) show to the south of the proposed new Tilbury North Substation alterations to the existing ZB route that comprise amended pylon locations, two proposed new CSE compounds and a section of underground cable between the CSE compounds. In addition, the existing YYJ route is shown with alterations to the locations of existing pylons and new pylons to facilitate a connection into Tilbury North Substation and exiting the new substation to provide the onward connection to the existing Tilbury connection.</p> <p>The LoDs in this location around the underground cable, existing and proposed new locations of</p>	LTC Bloor Homes Landowners	<p>As per the letter submitted to PINS- on 9th <u>the Examining Authority on 9 February 2026</u>, adoption of scenario <u>Scenario B</u> for connecting Tilbury North Substation to the YYJ overhead cable line removes the need for flexibility covered by scenario <u>Scenario A</u>.</p> <p>Detailed arrangements are being finalised with both LTC and Bloor Homes.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Consent Order Schedule 1 • Updated, Works and Lands Plans • Side Agreement with LTC • SOCG / HoT with Bloor Homes 	<p>Decision to proceed with Scenario B, as per the update provided on 9th February <u>9 February 2026</u>, with ongoing engagement with LTC and Bloor Homes.</p> <p>2.3 Works Plan - Section H (Revision B) [REP4-016]; 8.15.1 Proposed Project Design - Scenario 18 (Table 2.18) (Revision A) [REP4-314]; 8.15.2 Proposed Project Design - Permanent Features - Scenario B (Table 2.18) (Revision A) [REP4-315]; and 8.15.3 Class of Rights - Plans Section H - Scenario B (Table 2.18) (Revision A) will- be [REP4-316] were</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
	<p>YYJ and ZB pylons and the two CSE compounds has been widened to allow flexibility to allow for design refinements due to uncertainties regarding other projects (including the LTC project, housing developments and aggregate facilities). There are different forms that this could take with overhead line or cable configurations for the turn in and out of the new Tilbury North Substation with variable positioning of necessary CSE compounds - for example changes may include a double CSE compound arrangement and undergrounding of the YYJ route into the proposed new Tilbury North Substation.</p>				<p>submitted at Deadline 4. All other documents relevant to Scenario B will <u>behave been</u> submitted at Deadline 5.</p>

Table 2.19 The Walthams and Standard Heights to the south of the River Chelmer (Section F)

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
OHL	<p>Low height pylons TB140 to TB142</p>  <p>Standard pylons and one pylon removed TB140 to TB142</p>	<p>TBC Affected landowners</p>	<p>Preference for Scenario B as it moves pylon away from residential property where the change back to standard height pylons does not change the wider heritage assessment, including on Langley's Grade I listing building or the Grade II registered park and garden. Responds to feedback regarding close views from the former Windmill Pub.</p>	<p>Assuming agreement reached, we anticipate securing mechanism will be through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted Under Article 5 (1)(b)(i) • Work Plans (Table of Parameters) • Code of Construction Practice 	<p>Decision to proceed with Scenario B, with standard height pylons to the south of the River Chelmer, as opposed to the low height pylons originally proposed. Application documents will be <u>relevant to Scenario B</u> have <u>been</u> submitted at Deadline 5.</p>

Type	Description (Text & Images from ES Chapter 4)	Relevant Stakeholders	Current Status	Securing Mechanism	Decision
------	---	-----------------------	----------------	--------------------	----------



Figure 4.1: Proposed Project Design (document reference 6.4.F1) and Figure 4.2: Proposed Project Design – Permanent Features (document reference 6.4.F2) show pylons TB140, TB141 and TB142 to the south of the River Chelmer as low height pylons. After consideration of feedback during consultations in 2025 certain technical details are being refined which may result in standard lattice pylons to the south of the River Chelmer being installed. Therefore, flexibility has been retained to revert to standard lattice pylons following further technical details being refined – this may also include removing the need for one of the three pylons and a slight change to the locations of the remaining two pylons within the LoD.

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 6/10/2026 2:14:42 PM	
Style name: Default Style	
Intelligent Table Comparison: Active	
Original filename: 8.11 Approach to Scenarios_Revision B.docx	
Modified filename: 8.11 Approach to Scenarios_Revision C_Clean Version.docx	
Changes:	
Add	223
Delete	139
Move From	0
Move To	0
Table Insert	1
Table Delete	0
Table moves to	0
Table moves from	0
Embedded Graphics (Visio, ChemDraw, Images etc.)	0
Embedded Excel	0
Format changes	0
Total Changes:	363