

The following table is a collection of responses from affected persons following the Examining Authority's (ExA) Rule 17 letter of 1 June 2026 [\[PD-024\]](#) requesting further information in relation to interference with land rights.

Some information has been redacted in line with the Planning Inspectorate redaction policy.

Some names and PIL references have been corrected subsequent to submission to ensure they are in accordance with the book of reference and the land rights tracker.

Submissions from people who are only category 3 persons, and duplicate submissions have not been included in the table.

The applicant has been asked by the ExA to respond to these submissions. In order for them to do this, the case team has provided an editable version of the table. The applicant will only add responses to the affected persons comments; they will not amend any other information.

NORWICH TO TILBURY PROJECT EN020027: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RULE 17 1 JUNE 2026

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Michael John & Christine Clews | 9917 10067 | Yes | Temporary possession;Compulsory Acquisition of rights; | All | Both | The proposed terms provide wide ranging rights and powers to NG, and impose significant restrictions on our use of our land, both during the option period and into perpetuity. When discussing the land use with Fisher German LLP, they indicated that NG does not intend to construct anything on our land and the proposed agreement is to enable temporary access to facilitate the construction of the proposed power line. They also indicated that this access probably would not be needed but is being sought as a precautionary measure. The area of our land is only one acre. NG seeks rights over two tranches of land, one in the middle and one at the Eastern end of our land, this would significantly reduce the useable area of our land. Granting NG such rights would be a blight on our land that renders it practically unusable and unsealable. We believe it would be more appropriate for the terms to reflect the intended purpose rather than grant wide ranging and unnecessary powers, just in case. In principle, we do not object to granting NG temporary access, if required, to facilitate construction but, we do not believe it appropriate to grant rights allowing towers to be permanently installed on our land, or oversail, when Fisher German LLP say this is not intended. We are prepared to consider terms that better reflect the intended use of our land. |
| Janet Lesley Masterson | 4757 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land ;Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | Because this is MY land, my property. |
| Frances Williams | 8663 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land | | Both | |
| Catherine Judith Chamaud (as director of Westlands Farm Developments Ltd) | 15364 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Failure of NG and UKPN to recognise the impact of their proposals on the proposed residential development at Lynton, and the lack of any meaningful engagement with the land owner and developer, to resolve technical and design issues in a way that is commercially viable to all parties. |
| Nicholas Dent | 5156 | Yes | Temporary possession;Compulsory Acquisition of rights;Compulsory Acquisition of land ;All of the above | All | Both | I don't want my land destroyed,hedges being removed and trees.dont want the disruption and I will have land impossible to farm and I don't want bullying by ng |
| Martin Baxter | 6777 | Yes | All of the above | My home address | Both | I object |
| David Robert Miles Sheila Miles | 2692 28376 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The Pylon Line goes through an area of the farm that has been in an Environmental Scheme for a number of years, and all the good things that we have achieved for the environment, bird numbers and wildlife in general, will be decimated |
| Gareth Pressley | 13564 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | My property is not your standard empty field or farm land. We are a small holding and we have animals for meat which we breed ourselves. We grow fruit and veg, make our own compost, We have bee's for honey and so much more. National grids project and use of our land will decimate it, we have cable towers and nets, haul roads and drainage, all spread out over the entirety of our 4 acres. Simply put they will destroy our families way to feed itself and much more. There is no regard for green space, nature, animals or peoples mental health. We have been threatened on our doorstep by representatives, and have had meetings with more people than we can count and every time is a different person, different plan amounting to the same thing, and different contradictory information, even the plans submitted to the authorities are different to what we received with basic heads of terms. Its farcical and purposefully mis directional. |
| Robert James Capps | 15838 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land ;Compulsory Acquisition of rights;All of the above;Temporary possession | All | Both | I own the house. No idea where you want to access as you haven't told me |
| Matthew Gementera | 15953 | No | | | | |
| Joel Woolf | 1918 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The proposed right take around the headlands and not the centre but remove access to the centre during works. This is unacceptable and sterilises the entirety to my land because the proposal is to take the only access into the remaining land |
| Antony Francis Goddard | 3302 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Trevor George Musk | 6377 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Linda Jane Goddard | 3980 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Ann Dent | 2652 | Yes | All of the above;Temporary possession;Compulsory Acquisition of rights;Compulsory Acquisition of land | All | Both | Sick of all of it,don't want my farmland ruined or hedges and trees removed |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Georgina Sally Green | 4862 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land ;Compulsory Acquisition of rights;Temporary possession;All of the above | All | Both | We farm this land and the construction of the pylons will make it much harder to farm with agricultural machinery. Once the pylons are installed there may be areas of land that are too small to be economically farmed. |
| Bernard William Green | 4679 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We farm this land and the construction of the pylons will make it much harder to farm with agricultural machinery. Once the pylons are installed there may be areas of land that are too small to be economically farmed. |
| Gillian Leeks /Malcolm Leeks | 2596 4478 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | We object to any compulsory purchase or any interference with our land on the basis it's our privately owned land and we do not want pylons buzzing interfering with the peace of the countryside. This is why we purchased the land. It's our right as landowners to protect the countryside. |
| Mark Ian Hoskin | 14202 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land ;Compulsory Acquisition of rights;Temporary possession;All of the above | B-1/13 B-1/14 | Both | We object to the proposed interference with our land because it would cause serious and long term harm to the operation and financial stability of our farm and holiday lodge business. The land identified is essential to how our business functions, and losing it would directly reduce our ability to farm effectively and damage the setting, appeal, and commercial performance of our holiday accommodation. This would result in a significant loss of income and restrict our ability to sustain or grow the business in the future. It is also not clear exactly what land they are looking to compulsory purchase and what it will be used for as there are multiple land areas and descriptions in the "Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051" that do not appear to align to our previously discussed areas with National Grid. The proposal would also negatively affect the value and saleability of our property. Any reduction in land, amenity, or operational capacity makes the property less attractive to future buyers and reduces its market value, creating long term financial uncertainty for us. In addition, alternative avenues have not yet been explored, including the possibility of an access agreement or other forms of cooperation that would allow the project to proceed without removing or permanently interfering with our land. Any such arrangement would also need to include appropriate compensation for any losses or disruption caused. These options should be fully considered before any permanent acquisition or interference is pursued. Overall, the level of harm to our business, property, and livelihood is substantial, avoidable, and disproportionate. The impact on us is severe, and reasonable alternatives have not been properly examined. |
| Helen Phillips | 6457 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the installation of 7 pylons in such a small village, encroaching on the landscape and wildlife, also on a personal level. There will be major disruption around this build and the landscape will never be the same |
| Jane Wendy Betts Jane Betts. Also as representative to the estate of John Gavin Betts (deceased) of same address. | 9143 28095 | No | | | | |
| Amy Frances Travell | 14201 | Yes | All of the above | B-1/13 B-1/14 | Both | We object to the proposed interference with our land because it would cause serious and long term harm to the operation and financial stability of our farm and holiday lodge business. The land identified is essential to how our business functions, and losing it would directly reduce our ability to farm effectively and damage the setting, appeal, and commercial performance of our holiday accommodation. This would result in a significant loss of income and restrict our ability to sustain or grow the business in the future. It is also not clear exactly what land they are looking to compulsory purchase and what it will be used for as there are multiple land areas and descriptions in the "Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051" that do not appear to align to our previously discussed areas with National Grid. The proposal would also negatively affect the value and saleability of our property. Any reduction in land, amenity, or operational capacity makes the property less attractive to future buyers and reduces its market value, creating long term financial uncertainty for us. In addition, alternative avenues have not yet been explored, including the possibility of an access agreement or other forms of cooperation that would allow the project to proceed without removing or permanently interfering with our land. Any such arrangement would also need to include appropriate compensation for any losses or disruption caused. These options should be fully considered before any permanent acquisition or interference is pursued. Overall, the level of harm to our business, property, and livelihood is substantial, avoidable, and disproportionate. The impact on us is severe, and reasonable alternatives have not been properly examined. |
| Oak Farm Lodges | 14201 14202 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land ;All of the above;Temporary possession;Compulsory Acquisition of rights | B-1/13 B-1/14 | Both | We object to the proposed interference with our land because it would cause serious and long term harm to the operation and financial stability of our farm and holiday lodge business. The land identified is essential to how our business functions, and losing it would directly reduce our ability to farm effectively and damage the setting, appeal, and commercial performance of our holiday accommodation. This would result in a significant loss of income and restrict our ability to sustain or grow the business in the future. It is also not clear exactly what land they are looking to compulsory purchase and what it will be used for as there are multiple land areas and descriptions in the "Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051" that do not appear to align to our previously discussed areas with National Grid. The proposal would also negatively affect the value and saleability of our property. Any reduction in land, amenity, or operational capacity makes the property less attractive to future buyers and reduces its market value, creating long term financial uncertainty for us. In addition, alternative avenues have not yet been explored, including the possibility of an access agreement or other forms of cooperation that would allow the project to proceed without removing or permanently interfering with our land. Any such arrangement would also need to include appropriate compensation for any losses or disruption caused. These options should be fully considered before any permanent acquisition or interference is pursued. Overall, the level of harm to our business, property, and livelihood is substantial, avoidable, and disproportionate. The impact on us is severe, and reasonable alternatives have not been properly examined. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Paul Edmund Baker (also representing the Estate of E Hudson Baker and Mabel Anne Baker) | 3085 rep 5262 14920 | Yes | All of the above | All plots in our freehold and occupation | Both | No direct consultation after planned route changed to impacting our interests |
| Alison Taylor | 6078 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| David Robert Miles | 2692 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | For many years we have been involved with environmental schemes to enhance wildlife in the area that the pylons will be removed and built. We have seen substantial benefit from this, especially with small birds. This scheme will undo all the good that has been achieved over the years |
| Andrew Bendall | 1625 7256 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession, Compulsory Acquisition of land, All of the above | N-T_LIQ_18289 | Both | The lane we use to access our property is used frequently and any loss of access is not acceptable. Disturbance by increased amount of traffic would adversely affect the quiet location and also upset our dogs who are reactive to traffic on the lane. |
| Rachel Perry James Perry | 7645 7033 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Paul Whittle | 2599 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | National Grid have not responded to any of our concerns. Why should we help them if they continue to not listen? |
| Jonathan Cole-Matthews / John Cole Farms Limited | 10187 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | It is an infringement of our private property rights. Compensation would not reflect the international loss of valuable land |
| Victoria Owen William John Gray | 561 1115 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Please refer to my agent, E. Havers at Clarke and Simpson Ltd. |
| Sam Taylor | 10337 | Yes | All of the above | All F-7/5 (Section F Sheet 7) | Both | The land in question is a former infilled quarry, our surface ownership is covered under EX834408. Holcim is referred to in the document as 'Lafarge International Holdings'. The former quarry was infilled with landfill and as such requires ongoing gas monitoring to comply with the EA landfill permit. To complicate matters, all access rights have been granted to 'Lafarge Aggregates Limited' (which is Tarmac) to infill, extract landfill gas and undertake any works necessary for landfill management under the EA permit. Therefore, we cannot agree to a unilateral arrangement or anything that will impede the rights granted to 'Lafarge Aggregates Limited' (Tarmac). |
| Ian James Colchester | 3229 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | |
| Nemone Braithwaite | 4830 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The land is a nature reserve |
| Brian James Floringer | 4865 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | All of our land is used for grazing by our horses and we cannot disrupt or reduce their food supply, or risk granting access |
| Martin Richard Mountfort | 3180 | Yes | | | Both | FP 105141-008 Seven Acre Field at Dunton (Sole Ownership) Also shown on your National Grid Drawing NG-NT-2025-06-GF-CON-R3-1481 N-T-LIQ-18833 OS Map Ref TQ 65 90 (part ownership with Justin Samuel Mountfort and Verity Collins) [REDACTED]. Presence of High Voltage Overhead Lines will devalue property. Construction work will damage Gateways and land surfaces(topsoil will be lost or mixed into deeper clay) |
| Jonathan James Nelson | 9614 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession, Compulsory Acquisition of land, All of the above | All | Both | This work will create a negative financial effect on house value, will cause disruption and environmental damage to where we live, and will cause inconvenience to our everyday lives and our ability to walk the surrounding area. |
| Katherine Ann Nelson | 6668 | Yes | All of the above | all | Both | this will cause severe inconvenience , have a negative effect on our house value, make it more difficult to be able to use the surrounding area for physical activity and for exercising dogs. It will scare away wildlife such as barn owls, bats and many more. |
| Andrew Donald Smith | 3398 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We have an agent working on our behalf to make an agreement with National Grid and UK Power Networks so that CA and TP should not be necessary. |
| Claire Tebbutt | 13638 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| KEVIN WILLIAM TEBBUTT | 13637 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Juliet Francis | 14957 | Yes | All of the above | | Both | I wholeheartedly oppose the entire scheme and object to the enormous loss of value the scheme has had on my property, as well as the huge detrimental environmental impact. I have been unable to sell the field a pylon will be sited on and this is causing me to have to sell my entire small farm and home of 30 years. My husband died in December 2025, hugely troubled by the prospect of us having to sell the farm because no one will buy a field which is due to have the enormous disruption of a pylon being constructed. We have previously sold land very successfully to maintain our life here on the farm and that field is the only one remaining to sell whilst keeping the heart of the farm intact. |
| Stephen March, Jane March and The Trustees of the Foljambe 1984 Settlement | 2550, 3717, 6103, 9438 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our objections to how this project would interfere with our land are twofold. There is the loss of use of the land and the impact on our business with a reduced acreage and the environmental damage that will be caused by the removal and stacking of soil for the haul roads and the trenching. The stacking of the topsoil will destroy the microbe and organic content of the soil as well as the drainage capability when returned to the field. As three parcels of land are permanent pasture, the effect will be greater as this will not return to what it is for many years. Especially the land in Fordham Valley where the land is ridge and furrow and provides Summer and Winter grazing. This land will lose its stock carrying capacity and productivity completely. The three areas of grassland will have a big impact on our competition horse breeding and beef rearing as we would have insufficient grass land to graze the animals and conserve winter forage. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Clive Bainbridge | 59 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | All | Both | Desecration old hedgerows and trees. Violation private land and loss of privacy. |
| Ellena Benton | 29427 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Compulsory Acquisition of land | All | | Object |
| Laura Lennox | 777 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | The Heads of Terms are not satisfactory and NG / UK Power Networks are not engaging with the relevant bodies /land agents in a constructive manner to resolve landowner issues. |
| Stuart Paris | 7304 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | The Heads of Terms are not satisfactory and NG / UK Power Networks are not engaging with the relevant bodies /land agents in a constructive manner to resolve landowner issues. |
| Brian John Faulkner | 9339 | Yes | All of the above | F-10/50 | Both | Pylon TB180 at Handley Green The proposed pylon TB180 will be alongside the access road from Handley Green to our property which is the only property on this road. It is a cul-de-sac, an unmade dirt road and is our only access in and out of our property. We therefore need access 24/7. We object to any change which affects our access. If National Grid or UKPN are to use this track they must ensure our access is freely available during any construction and maintenance work. The road into Handley Green and the dirt road to Marshalls Farm and Annexe are single track and unsuitable for large and/or heavy vehicles and National Grid will need to resurface and maintain the roads. |
| Usha Faulkner (nee Rao) | 7661 | Yes | All of the above | F-10/50 | Both | Pylon TB180 at Handley Green The proposed pylon TB180 will be alongside the access road from Handley Green to our property which is the only property on this road. It is a cul-de-sac, an unmade dirt road and is our only access in and out of our property. We therefore need access 24/7. We object to any change which affects our access. If National Grid or UKPN are to use this track they must ensure our access is freely available during any construction and maintenance work. The road into Handley Green and the dirt road to Marshalls Farm and Annexe are single track and unsuitable for large and/or heavy vehicles and National Grid will need to resurface and maintain the roads. |
| Elizabeth Xenakis | 7345 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Ruin the countryside |
| Stephen Paul Goulding | 3931 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the proposed interference with my land and private rights arising from the Development Consent Order. My land is approximately two acres of pasture forming part of my home known as [REDACTED]. The land is not a detached commercial holding; it forms part of the setting, amenity, enjoyment and ordinary use of my home. My objection is focused on the interference with my land and rights, including access during development, the impact of construction and operational works in close proximity to my property, the loss of the countryside setting visible from and enjoyed as part of my home, and potential interference with utilities and internet services on which I rely, including for working from home. I do not consent to the compulsory acquisition, temporary possession, acquisition of rights, creation of new rights, extinguishment, suspension, overriding or interference with any rights affecting my land unless the Applicant can demonstrate that the strict statutory tests are met. Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the land or rights are required for the development, are required to facilitate or are incidental to it, or are replacement land, and that there is a compelling case in the public interest. That is a demanding test. It is not enough for the Applicant to show that interference with my land or rights would be convenient, cheaper, administratively easier, or preferable from the Applicant's point of view. The Applicant must show that the interference is necessary, proportionate and no more than is reasonably required. I object because the Applicant has not demonstrated that interference with my land or rights is "required" within the meaning of section 122. My land is pasture forming part of a residential property and its setting. Any interference with access, services, occupation, quiet enjoyment, existing rights, amenity or use of that land would be a serious private burden. The Applicant must explain precisely what powers are sought over or affecting my land, why those powers are necessary, why less intrusive alternatives are not available, and why the same outcome cannot be achieved by design changes, routing changes, construction controls, protective provisions, voluntary agreement, or other mitigation. The Department for Communities and Local Government guidance, Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition, September 2013, makes clear that compulsory acquisition powers should only be sought where there is a compelling case in the public interest, and that applicants should be able to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition have been explored. I do not consider that this has been demonstrated in relation to my land. In particular, the Applicant has not shown that the impacts on my access, residential enjoyment, pasture use, services and property setting have been avoided or reduced to the minimum necessary. Access is a particular concern. [REDACTED] and its associated pasture require safe, practical and reliable access. Any construction traffic, temporary works, road closures, diversions, obstruction, narrowing, mud, noise, vibration, or restricted access could interfere with my ability to use and enjoy my property and land. These are not minor inconveniences. They affect the ordinary occupation of my home, the use and management of the pasture, visitors, deliveries, emergency access, and the general ability to live and work from the property. The Applicant has not provided sufficient certainty that access will be maintained at all times, or that any interference will be avoided, minimised, strictly controlled and enforceable. I also object because of the potential impact on utilities and internet services. I work from home and reliable internet and utility connections are essential to the ordinary use of my property. Any interruption, damage, diversi [COMMENT TRUNCATED AT THIS POINT] |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Stephen Roger Hart | 5305 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | As I have attempted to comply with all reasonable requests for access, intrusive and non intrusive surveys and other questions I don't feel there is a need under section 122 to acquire any of the rights over the land. For section 123, I will have a permanent land impairment that will impact my ability to farm, develop or enjoy rightful use and enjoyment of the entire land holding. The holding was purchased in 2019 for £400,000 and considerable input costs have been incurred to bring the holding into productive use. The current stated single payment is derisory in comparison to the productivity and amenity lost. |
| Heather Jane English | 37 | Yes | All of the above | A-1/23 | Both | A-1/23 NK67663 Following 2 on-site consultations alternative re-routing plans from the west of my front entrance and then to the south along the field boundary west of The Vale up to Church Road were acknowledged. Subsequently no up-dated plans have been received. The original plan still appears to be in place. |
| Coryn Gladys Hart | 15231 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | All | UK Power Networks | For section 123. The land is not strictly required as it is over 1mile away from the proposed works. It is not on any direct or indirect access routes and has had no infrastructure or access requests made upon it. |
| Great Cowbridge Grange Farm Ltd | 10359 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Section 122. There is no need to gain additional access to the proposed sites other than via the access road for the Southern Water sewerage treatment works. Section 123. The potential loss to Great Cowbridge Grange Farm Ltd. is of an agreed option with Conrad Energy (Developments) Ltd. and respective planning permission to build a solar farm on or adjacent to the land in question The agreement is for a 40 year lease to Conrad Energy of the land unencumbered (As per clause 9 of the option) If the planned works impact or cause the option agreement not to be exercised there will be a loss of 40 years worth of rent and generation income to Great Cowbridge Grange Farm Ltd. |
| Richard John Allan | 6498 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Objection Summary: Interference with My Land/Rights via Compulsory Acquisition To the Secretary of State for National Infrastructure re: Norwich to Tilbury Project Development Consent Order I, Richard John Allan, owner of [REDACTED], object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of my land / rights over my land / temporary possession of my land EX835923, EX835920 in the draft DCO. Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 A DCO may include provision authorising compulsory acquisition of land only if the Secretary of State is satisfied that: (a) the land is required for the development (or to facilitate or be incidental to it, or is replacement land); and (b) there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition. 1. The land is not shown to be required (s.122(2)) The applicant has not demonstrated that my specific land/plots are required, or that the extent of interference (full acquisition / rights / temporary possession) is no more than reasonably necessary. Viable alternatives exist but have not been presented in a fully costed way for fair comparison. The DCLG Guidance (September 2013) states at paragraph 8 that applicants must show all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including scheme modifications) have been explored, and that the proposed interference is necessary and proportionate. This test is not met. The interference with my rights is not justified as the minimum required. 2. No compelling case in the public interest (s.122(3)) There is no compelling evidence that the public benefits of acquiring/interfering with my land outweigh the significant private loss I would suffer. The private loss includes permanent loss of farmland my severance of my remaining land; loss of access; disruption to my livelihood/quiet enjoyment; and financial impacts. These effects engage my rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol (peaceful enjoyment of possessions) and, where relevant, Article 8 ECHR. The Guidance (paragraphs 10, 13–16) requires the Secretary of State to balance public benefit against private loss and to be satisfied that the interference is legitimate, necessary, and proportionate. Parliament's view (Guidance para 13) is that land should only be taken compulsorily where there is clear evidence that public benefit outweighs private loss. The applicant has not provided this in relation to my land. The interference fails the test. Section 123 of the Planning Act 2008 A DCO may authorise compulsory acquisition only if one of the conditions in s.123(2)–(4) is met (e.g., the application included a request for CA of the land and proper procedures were followed, or all interested parties consent). I do not consent. I question whether the procedures were adequately followed in respect of my land. The Guidance emphasises seeking acquisition by agreement wherever practicable (paragraphs 21–26 on pre-application consultation and engagement). This has not been achieved. Further relevant Guidance points •Para 8: Failure to explore all reasonable alternatives and lack of proportionality. •Para 9: Inadequate demonstration of a reasonable prospect that funds will be available for the acquisition and related works. The Funding Statement does not sufficiently address my land. •Para 10: The proposal does not adequately justify the interference with my human rights. Conclusion The statutory tests in sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 are not satisfied in respect of my land/rights. The Secretary of State should refuse to authorise the compulsory acquisition or other interference with my interests, or modify the DCO to exclude or minimise it. I remain willing to negotiate a voluntary agreement on fair terms but oppose the use of compulsory powers. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Dominic William Petre | 1004 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | We are trying to engage in the granular planning process and accept that the project need to be done in general so there is no need for compulsory powers |
| Lord Petre (W H Norris and Sons) | 1406 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | | Both | we are trying to engage with the granular planning process. While there is no objection for the overall need of the project there are many fine details that need agreement but there is no need for compulsory powers |
| Lord Petre | 1406 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | | Both | We are engaging with the granular planning process. While we accept the overall nature of the project there are many details that still need addressing. However compulsory powers are un needed |
| Peter Albert Kelly | 24590 | Yes | All of the above | A-7/4 A-7/9 A-7/35 | Both | Any land taken from me would have a detrimental affect on the property value and marketability if I wished to move in the future. |
| Geoffrey Norman William Stevens | 2997 | Yes | Temporary possession, All of the above | A-6/51 | Both | I have completed this form in the way I have as the proposed discussion with National Grid and UK Power Networks has not yet taken place about the works involved and how it affects my property. |
| Ann Ruth Stevens | 8159 | Yes | Temporary possession, All of the above | A-6/51 | Both | I have completed this form in the way I have as the proposed discussion with National Grid and UK Power networks has not yet taken place about the works involved and how it affects my property. |
| Edward Marriage | 2500 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | F-6/62; F-6/63; F-7/10; F-7/13; F7-14; F7-20; F7/22 There are still important points outstanding and the Heads of Terms have not been sufficiently progressed for me to agree with them. |
| Andrew Soar | 3183 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Despite numerous meetings with project representatives many of our questions remain to be answered. Our suggestions over pylon positions have also been ignored. Our preference of underground routing appears to be not effectively considered and no project comparisons are available. Vast amounts of land are being taken for the construction and subsequent access easements with very little in the way of compensation particularly with land value effects. Remains of agricultural land adjacent to the project boundary will be uneconomical to operate farm equipment over due to awkward angles and reduced area within fields. Interference from the transmission of electricity is likely to affect phone internet and GPS equipment which is essential in the operation of modern farm equipment. Suggested per pylon rates of compensation do not account for land use during build or over sail compensation. Corner pylons will occupy a much greater area than the mid station pylons. Land that will be used for access but not actually have a pylon upon it will presumably be compensated over and above the pylon construction rate that claims to cover the whole build project. Engagement with land owners agents have been minimal. |
| Victoria Jordan | 2305 | No | | | | |
| Geraldine Alison Millhouse (As deputy of Court of Protection) for John Terence Millhouse | 28089 24303 24301 | Yes | All of the above | Page 901 - Section H Sheet 7 | Both | Objection raised under advisement of Land Agent (Whirledge and Nott) |
| Robert Pearce | 3752 | Yes | All of the above | E-3/66, E-4/1, E-4/6, E-4/7, E-4/8, E-4/9, E-4/11, E-4/14, E-4/18 | Both | The heads of terms are not in a suitable state and we strongly object to the routing. If it absolutely has to pass through our land then underground would be much preferred. |
| James Robert Pearce | 2988 | Yes | All of the above | E-3/66, E-4/1, E-4/6, E-4/7, E-4/8, E-4/9, E-4/11, E-4/14, E-4/18 | Both | The heads of terms are not in a suitable state and we strongly object to the routing. If it absolutely has to pass through our land then underground would be much preferred. |
| Heather Ann Pearce | 4403 | Yes | All of the above | E-3/66, E-4/1, E-4/6, E-4/7, E-4/8, E-4/9, E-4/11, E-4/14, E-4/18 | Both | The heads of terms are not in a suitable state and we strongly object to the routing. If it absolutely has to pass through our land then underground would be much preferred. |
| Harry James Pearce | 9985 | Yes | All of the above | E-3/66, E-4/1, E-4/6, E-4/7, E-4/8, E-4/9, E-4/11, E-4/14, E-4/18 | Both | The heads of terms are not in a suitable state and we strongly object to the routing. If it absolutely has to pass through our land then underground would be much preferred. |
| Lodge Lane Estates Ltd | 10205 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our agent has been discussing the Heads of Terms with National Grid but at the moment the current terms are not satisfactory and, therefore, we are not in a position to agree to them. |
| Michael Elwyn Hughes | 5723 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the compulsory acquisition of my land and rights. The scheme designed by the Applicant is not appropriate and not within the public interest, when there are reasonable alternatives available. The works will potentially affect development proposals on the land. We are yet to see the proposed heads of terms from UKPN, and until these are in a reasonable format, compulsory powers should not be granted. |
| Peter Blomfield Willows | 6506 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the compulsory acquisition of my land and rights. The scheme designed by the Applicant is not appropriate and not within the public interest, when there are reasonable alternatives available. The works will potentially affect development proposals on the land. We are yet to see the proposed heads of terms from UKPN, and until these are in a reasonable format, compulsory powers should not be granted. |
| Verity Louise Collins | 7035 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The works will interfere in the operation of the farming business plus effect the value of the land and any future use of the land, farming or otherwise. |
| Hayden Dixon | 3500 | Yes | All of the above | | Both | I do not want plant machinery passing close to my fence-line, nor workers overlooking my property |
| Louise Dixon | 9870 | Yes | All of the above | | Both | I do not want views and beautiful countryside developed. I do not want my sunset views removed and replaced by hideous pylons |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Darren Rice | 14524 | Yes | All of the above, Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | Both | Do we live under a dictatorship?? NO WE DONT!!! Our family purchased this land generations past to produce food for this country. Not to be ridden roughshod over by an organisation that does care about the Suffolk countryside. OFFSHORE: cheaper, faster, better. |
| Susanna Nunn | 28478 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our agent has been discussing the Heads of Terms with National Grid but at the moment the current terms are not satisfactory and, therefore, I am not in a position to agree to them. |
| Stuart Gooding | 28479 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our agent has been discussing the Heads of Terms with National Grid but at the moment the current terms are not satisfactory and, therefore, I am not in a position to agree to them. |
| Patricia Jane Gooding | 1936 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our agent has been discussing the Heads of Terms with National Grid but at the moment the current terms are not satisfactory and, therefore, I am not in a position to agree to them. |
| Personal representative to the estate of Robin John Lacey Gooding | 14961 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Our agent has been discussing the Heads of Terms with National Grid but at the moment the current terms are not satisfactory and, therefore, we are not in a position to agree to them. |
| Richard Percival Marriage | 7382 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession, All of the above | ALL | Both | The scope of the compulsory acquisition is beyond that required to facilitate the development. There is no compelling case for the land to be obtained compulsorily especially since National grid have made no serious attempts to obtain rights by negotiation and have merely resorted to threats of withdrawal of offers if not completed within a certain time. This is against the guidance where as all efforts should be made to encourage meaningful relationship between all parties. |
| Copy Hold Vermogens-Verwaltungsges | 4316 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not consider the compulsory acquisition of our land and rights to be in the public interest, particularly where reasonable alternatives are available. We do not consider that the Applicant has properly considered reasonable alternatives to reduce the impact on our holding. The Applicant has not listened to constructive feedback from landowners, or taken sufficient steps to reduce impacts and mitigate losses. The rights being sought may be wider than necessary for the scheme. The Heads of Terms are still not in a reasonable or acceptable format. The current Heads of Terms impose unfair and unreasonable restrictions on landowners. We do not consider that the Applicant has demonstrated that the interference with our land and rights is necessary, proportionate, or limited to what is reasonably required |
| Susan Standen & Kevin Standen | 8798 8336 | Yes | All of the above | E-581 | Both | The proposed haul road close to our property and the proposed traffic lights adjacent to our property will lead to lack of access and obstruction of our drive potentially making it inaccessible for the duration of the project. |
| Graham Moore | 624 5938 28355 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I am a small farm and it is going to slice through the middle of my business, home and main growing field making it unviable to farm and live. It makes it unable for the local airfields to fly killing local economy and I object on health reasons of the EMF magnetic waves affecting me running my farm safely and me and my families health. |
| Nicola Moore | 624 5938 28355 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I object to National grid ploughing straight through the middle of our farm financially ruining us. Straight through our main growing field and our him we will be ruined by the project. I object to the project stopping two local airfields from flying due to safety issues listened to and I object to the EMF waves given off as my family and I do not want to live in a house next to a pylon giving off electric waves that may affect our health and enjoyment of our home and have the danger of my husband safely farming. |
| Christopher John Thorogood | 9128 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | Heads of terms are not acceptable |
| Gillian Mather | 8424 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>We are hampered in making any arguments over any application by National Grid to acquire compulsory rights over our land since we don't know what exactly National Grid propose to do or how they propose to overcome any of the physical obstacles which the site presents since they do not engage with us and ignore representations we have made in responses to consultations etc.</p> <p>To be explicit, the site may ultimately require HDDing rather than trenching, but National Grid won't discuss this, although in one of their documents put out several years ago they did propose HDDing under the Blackbrook Stream at Langham and therefore under our land immediately to the south of the Blackbrook. However, they withdrew this plan without explanation or notice.</p> <p>We have attempted to query with National Grid at various stages including at an early stage how they plan to tackle the physical complications of laying cables under the undulating, hilly site including Blackbrook Hill, the Blackbrook Stream, our land and the high-pressure gas main to the south but without response.</p> <p>In view of the above, any attempt to seek compulsory rights would be premature until National Grid have made a final decision how to go about the laying of cables under our land, since it is assumed that rights to trench or alternatively HDD would have to be worded differently.</p> <p>We have already communicated to National Grid that we are willing to enter into a reasonable agreement to grant them necessary and reasonable rights therefore compulsory action should be unnecessary. Our land agents are in the process of attempting to agree Heads of Terms with National Grid though there is no agreement at the moment.</p> <p>Whether National Grid have taken all necessary prescribed steps before making any application(s) to compulsorily acquire rights over our land and considered all other options is a huge technical question given the size of the Norwich to Tilbury project and the amount of paperwork and information so far generated. I can't answer the point.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Stuart Philpot (SJR Farming Ltd) | 10273 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We do not want this on our land, thank you. |
| Richard Turner | 14378 | Yes | Temporary possession | All | Both | Boxed Airfield Museum. The erection of the pylons and the construction works before hand would seriously disrupt our openings in the following ways. The roadways on site date from WW2 and we take visitors on guided walks, these are single carriageway so there would be a risk to the walkers from construction vehicles. This WW2 Airfield site was the base for the Most important American Fighter Aircraft Group serving in Europe. Visitors and relatives of the men who served come to the Museum to get the feel of what their Grandfathers and fathers experienced. 12000 men were stationed here during the course of the second world war. The erection of the pylons would completely spoil the views and destroy the enjoyment for these families. We have then and now pictures on our website and within the Museum and to have those showing pylons I am sure would put visitors off and seriously affect our revenue. The National Lottery recognized this as a Heritage site helping us with financial grants over the years. In the summer months a grass airstrip is established behind the Airfield memorial off Park Lane and is used by a flying club, the pylons would seriously affect this activity. We also have visiting aircraft display on special open days. |
| Tamasyn Holland | 28603 20989 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I strongly object to the proposed pylons being located on or affecting my land due to the significant visual, environmental, and property impacts. This proposal would cause unacceptable harm to my property rights, amenity, and the surrounding landscape. |
| Rachel Bryan | 28943 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | There are still important points outstanding and the Heads of Terms have not yet been sufficiently progressed |
| Andrew David Upson | 4711 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| Janette Upson | 7032 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| F H Easton Limited | 10198 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I am not familiar with the various Acts, Sections etc listed above no more than NG are familiar with the growth stages of winter wheat. Without more detail it is difficult to articulate objections precisely on the consequences of what such interference to our land will have. At best compulsory rights will add or bring nothing to the farm and at worst blight and devalue the holding. Those acquiring temporary rights will have little to no interest in the long term effect they may have on the land and it will take a long time, possibly decades to recover from any works. This prediction is based upon more than one poor experience with civil contractors working on our farm. |
| British Pipeline Agency Limited ("BPA") as agents for and on behalf of United Kingdom Oil Pipelines Limited ("UKOP") | 21224 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | UKOP is the owner of the 14-inch Thames to Epping high pressure multi fuel pipeline (hereafter called the "Pipeline") and benefits from the associated land rights relating to the Pipeline. BPA is employed as agent by UKOP to operate and maintain the Pipeline and act on its behalf in this DCO process. The below summary is by way of update to the presentations and submissions made on behalf of BPA / UKOP to date including RR-0413, PDA-011, AS-086, REP1-235-238 (inclusive), REP3-121 and the oral submissions made by Fieldfisher on behalf of BPA / UKOP at CAH1. With reference to whether the purposes for which compulsory acquisition powers are sought comply with section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 and whether the compelling case in the public interest test under s122(3) of the Planning Act has been met, UKOP's position is as follows: 1.1The private loss which may be suffered by BPA and UKOP (as well as the consequential impacts to persons, the environment, and the key end users operating crucial national infrastructure) are of vital importance as to whether considering whether there is a compelling case for compulsory acquisition. 1.2BPA and UKOP remain of the view that, absent the Order being confirmed with the benefit of the change request as applied for, and further agreements being entered into with the Applicant, the proposed compulsory acquisition in the current form of the dDCO pose an unacceptable risk to the safety of the Pipeline and by extension the environment. 1.3UKOP requires the rights sought in the Change request which has now been accepted into the Examination to enable it to carry out the works proposed under Work [17A]. 1.4Section 127(5) Planning Act 2008 states that in the case of statutory undertakers the SoS should be satisfied that the rights can be purchased without any serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking and that any consequential detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking can be made good by the undertaker by the use of other land belonging to or available for acquisition by the undertaker. 1.5UKOP is not a Statutory Undertaker BUT it is the owner of Nationally Significant high pressure fuel infrastructure and as such it and the risks associated with its infrastructure, should be treated equivalently. There is a very real need to ensure robust protections (both practically and in terms of legal rights) to ensure the ongoing use and maintenance of the Pipeline given the reasons of national energy security. In addition to the legal rights sought via the change request UKOP require the Applicant to enter into an asset protection agreement to ensure appropriate protection for the UKOP apparatus. 1.6BPA/UKOP need to ensure that the necessary rights can be guaranteed to be obtained via the Order powers in accordance with the change request to ensure that that: (a)the Order can deliver the necessary powers to cross the Pipeline without serious detriment; or (b)it has or can acquire the necessary land to deliver such mitigation as may be necessary. While BPA / UKOP continue not to have objections to the Project in principle, they do require the Order, as amended by the change request, to be confirmed to ensure that their concerns are fully addressed and suitable protections are secured, preferably by private treaty. BPA / UKOP acknowledge the Applicant's constructive engagement, regular meetings and ongoing efforts to agree contractual protections for the Pipeline, with the aim of reaching a settlement by Deadline 6 so that the objection can be withdrawn. However, until adequate mitigation measures and long-term safeguards are guaranteed and formalised, BPA / UKOP maintain their objection in light of the significant risk of damage to the Pipeline, including accelerated corrosion, which could endanger the public, the environment, and the resilience of nationally significant fuel infrastructure until the Asset Protection Agreement is in place. Those risks and |
| Mr Toby Reeves | 15979 | Yes | All of the above | 2 moat farm barn ip68je & other properties for whom the development affects in respect of the above | Both | All myself and other parties on the site would like is a transparent view on what the project entails. I had a teams meeting with a chap based in bury st Edmunds named Toby who stated wooden pylons in the field adjacent would be removed and replaced with an underground system but this was some time ago. Has this changed since as the project moves forward at your end? The letters you send us tell us nothing at all in real terms. If we can be confident in your proposal then this moves forward along quite nicely but if you are not clear with us then naturally this will slow things down. Nobody wants this. It actually prevents us and others from listing our properties, should we wish to do so as well as being unsettling as to both current and future values of our homes. Homes we have worked our whole lives for. Please rectify this matter by contacting myself on either [REDACTED] |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Oliver Lukies | 10225 | Yes | All of the above | | Both | <p>We act on behalf of our client Seventyholds Ltd, whose freehold land is impacted by the proposed Norwich to Tilbury scheme. On behalf their behalf, we object to the proposed interference with their land and rights in relation to the Planning Act 2008. Seventyholds Ltd has been promoting, for over 10 years, a comprehensive scheme for the delivery of Southfields Village and Country Park in Thurrock. The current alignment of the proposed overhead line would have a fundamental and unacceptable impact on the deliverability of the scheme. The Southfields proposal comprises a residential-led development of approximately 800 dwellings and a Country Park, including the restoration and long-term public use of an approximately 80-acre former landfill site owned by Thurrock Council. The proposal has been subject to extensive technical work and engagement and represents a deliverable scheme bringing clear housing, environmental and community benefits. The Country Park forms part of an agreed regeneration approach involving Thurrock Council.</p> <p>As currently shown, the proposed 400kV overhead line crosses the southern part of the Southfields site and affects the adjacent landfill regeneration area through the location of new pylons. The effect would be to blight the site to the extent that the residential development would be commercially unviable. The impact is not limited to the land directly occupied, but extends across the wider site through visual intrusion and market perception. In addition, the proposed pylon positions would prejudice the agreed regeneration of the landfill site and restrict the delivery of the Country Park. Taken together, the current alignment would sterilise a well-developed scheme which would otherwise deliver substantial public benefits.</p> <p>A reasonable alternative alignment is available. The line could continue further south along the east side of Buckingham Hill Road, crossing just south of the Holford Road junction. This would remove the blighting effect upon the proposed village site, and the regenerated for recreation purposes Buckingham Hill Road Council-owned refuse tip, while occupying land which is presently vacant and unlikely to ever be considered for residential development. There is no evident reason why this alternative would result in any material increase in construction cost or complexity. Again, the current positioning of the pylons and overhead lines cannot be regarded as the least harmful option. The proposal fails to be considered under the Planning Act 2008. Section 122 provides that compulsory acquisition may only be authorised where the land is required for the development and there is a compelling case in the public interest. The requirement that land is "required" is a substantive test. Where a reasonable alternative exists which avoids significant harm, it is difficult to conclude that land in this location meets that test. The public interest test requires the benefits of the scheme to be weighed against the harm. Here, that harm includes the loss of a viable housing and regeneration scheme, which weighs heavily against the current alignment. Section 123 further requires that compulsory acquisition is properly justified. Given the availability of a less harmful alternative, the inclusion of the Southfields land within the Order limits cannot be regarded as justified or proportionate. Government guidance reinforces these principles, requiring a clear justification for all land included and a proper balance between public benefit and private loss, taking account of alternatives. The availability of a reasonable alternative alignment significantly weakens any case that the current land take is necessary. The Southfields scheme would deliver substantial housing and environmental benefits. The current alignment would prevent this, whereas the alternative alignment would allow both schemes to proceed.</p> <p>Seventyholds therefore requests that the alignment be amended to follow the alternative route.</p> |
| Henrietta Mary Guest | 2386 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>The acquisition of rights over our land materially interferes with our ability to farm and the enjoyment that an owner should rightfully have over their land.</p> <p>We believe that as per section 123 subsection 4 we do believe that the prescribed procedure has been followed in relation to the land.</p> |
| Rex Webster and G Webster and Son Ltd | 5622 7360 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession, All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>I object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of land and rights affecting Flordon Hall and Farm on the basis that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 and the relevant guidance contained in the Department for Communities and Local Government's Planning Act 2008. The proposed acquisition of rights over Flordon Hall, Farm and tenanted properties would permanently interfere with established property rights, agricultural operations, estate management, and future use of the land. Such interference engages fundamental property rights and should not be authorised unless the Applicant demonstrates that the acquisition is necessary and proportionate.</p> <p>ECHR: Under Article 1 of Protocol 1 and Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the acquisition of rights over private land and the imposition of permanent restrictions must be shown to be necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the rights sought over Flordon Hall and Farm have been reduced to the minimum necessary. Nor has it adequately explained why alternative routing, engineering solutions, reduced easement widths, or other less intrusive approaches could not be adopted. Without such evidence, the proposed acquisition cannot be regarded as the minimum interference necessary to deliver the project.</p> <p>Section 123 PA 08 permits the compulsory acquisition of rights rather than land itself but this does not reduce the Applicant's burden of justification. The rights proposed over Flordon Hall and Farm would impose significant and enduring restrictions on ownership and occupation. The Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that the rights sought have been carefully tailored to what is genuinely required for the project. For the purposes of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on compulsory acquisition, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •that the rights sought over Flordon Hall and Farm are strictly necessary; •that the extent of the proposed acquisition has been minimised; •that the interference with private property rights is proportionate; •that a fair balance has been struck between the public benefits of the project and the substantial prejudice suffered by the landowner. <p>The proposed works would interfere materially with the ownership, occupation, management, enjoyment, and future use of Flordon Hall, Farm and tenanted properties. The proposed route would result in significant adverse impacts on agricultural productivity, farm business operations, landscape character, biodiversity, heritage interests and future development opportunities associated with Flordon Hall and Farm.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Katharine Elizabeth Allan | 3432 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>I object to the proposed Compulsory Acquisition (CA), Compulsory Acquisition of rights, and Temporary Possession (TP) of my land and rights for the Norwich to Tilbury project. The Applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the statutory tests in Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor with the requirements of the DCLG Guidance (September 2013) on compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>1. Section 122(2): The land has not been shown to be "required" for the development Section 122(2) requires the Applicant to show that the land is required, necessary to facilitate, or incidental to the development. The DCLG Guidance (paras 11–13) stresses that the land take must be the minimum reasonably necessary and supported by clear evidence. The Applicant has not demonstrated why the full extent of the land and rights sought over my property are required. The scope of the proposed rights is excessive, insufficiently justified, and not supported by plot-specific evidence. No adequate explanation has been provided as to why less intrusive alternatives—such as micro-siting, design adjustments, or alternative access arrangements—cannot be used. Without clear justification, the statutory test of necessity is not met.</p> <p>2. Section 122(3): No "compelling case in the public interest" Section 122(3) requires the decision-maker to be satisfied that the public benefits clearly outweigh the private loss. The DCLG Guidance (paras 12–13, 17–19) emphasises that compulsory acquisition is a last resort and must be proportionate. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the interference with my land and rights is proportionate. The impacts on the use, enjoyment, and value of my land are significant, yet the Applicant has not provided sufficient detail on the nature, duration, or consequences of the proposed works. Without clear evidence that the public benefits outweigh the harm, the test of proportionality is not satisfied.</p> <p>3. Section 123: Failure to attempt acquisition by agreement Section 123 requires the Applicant to show that it has made genuine attempts to acquire the land by agreement. The DCLG Guidance (paras 25–28) requires early, meaningful, and ongoing engagement. The Applicant has not engaged constructively with me. Communications have been limited, generic, and lacking in detail. No reasonable offer or explanation of the rights sought has been provided, nor has the Applicant demonstrated that voluntary agreements or reduced-impact alternatives have been explored. The statutory requirement for negotiation has not been met.</p> <p>4. Lack of clarity and justification for the rights sought The Guidance (paras 13, 20–23) requires clear explanation of why each plot and each right is needed. The Applicant has not provided adequate detail on the extent, purpose, or duration of the rights sought, preventing proper assessment of their necessity or proportionality.</p> <p>5. Insufficient assessment of alternatives The Applicant has not demonstrated that reasonable alternatives—route adjustments, engineering solutions, reduced land take, or temporary rather than permanent rights—have been properly considered, contrary to the Guidance (paras 13, 18, 21).</p> <p>Conclusion - The Applicant has not shown that the land is required, that the interference is necessary or proportionate, that a compelling case in the public interest exists, or that reasonable efforts have been made to acquire the land by agreement. The statutory tests in Sections 122 and 123 are not met, and I therefore object to the CA, CA of rights, and TP of my land.</p> |
| John Mather | 5872 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>We are hampered in making any arguments over any application by National Grid to acquire compulsory rights over our land since we don't know what exactly National Grid propose to do or how they propose to overcome any of the physical obstacles which the site presents since they do not engage with us and ignore representations we have made in responses to consultations etc.</p> <p>To be explicit, the site may ultimately require HDDing rather than trenching, but National Grid won't discuss this, although in one of their documents put out several years ago they did propose HDDing under the Blackbrook Stream at Langham and therefore under our land immediately to the south of the Blackbrook. However, they withdrew this plan without explanation or notice.</p> <p>We have attempted to query with National Grid at various stages including at an early stage how they plan to tackle the physical complications of laying cables under the undulating, hilly site including Blackbrook Hill, the Blackbrook Stream, our land and the high-pressure gas main to the south but without response.</p> <p>In view of the above, any attempt to seek compulsory rights would be premature until National Grid have made a final decision how to go about the laying of cables under our land, since it is assumed that rights to trench or alternatively HDD would have to be worded differently.</p> <p>We have already communicated to National Grid that we are willing to enter into a reasonable agreement to grant them necessary and reasonable rights therefore compulsory action should be unnecessary. Our land agents are in the process of attempting to agree Heads of Terms with National Grid though there is no agreement at the moment.</p> <p>Whether National Grid have taken all necessary prescribed steps before making any application(s) to compulsorily acquire rights over our land and considered all other options is a huge technical question given the size of the Norwich to Tilbury project and the amount of paperwork and information so far generated. I can't answer the point.</p> |
| Shelly Eliza Cockrell | 3787 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land | All | Both | <p>The land in question is woodlands that forms part of our estate that has been in our family for over 60 years.</p> <p>The amount of money that was offered to acquire this land was ridiculously low and we feel that, with the talks about the new estate that will be built on the land behind our property, it should be worth much more.</p> <p>Alternatively, if access to the land is needed to perform maintenance on the oversail, we are happy if the relevant organisation wishes to rent the land.</p> |
| Colin Henry Smith (A H Smith & Sons) | 14506 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | High quality producing agricultural land which provides our main income to our farming business and has done for over 100 years. |
| Annabel Wood (JA Buntings and Sons) | 28603 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I strongly object to the proposed pylons being located on or affecting my land due to the significant visual, environmental, and property impacts. This proposal would cause unacceptable harm to my property rights, amenity, and the surrounding landscape. |
| Paul Charles Peter Wenden | 2022 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I see no reason why the project needs to infringe my property as it could be moved eastwards to avoid me completely |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Donna Wenden | 3080 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | No need to use the land |
| Christopher Philpot (CJH Holdings Ltd) | 10457 | Yes | All of the above | 11120 | National Grid | <p>CJH Farming does not consider the compulsory acquisition of our land and rights to be in the public interest, particularly where reasonable alternatives are available. Compulsory acquisition is unnecessary.</p> <p>The company has engaged fully with National Grid (NG) and has never had any direct response to any questions raised and therefore can honestly say that we do not consider that the Applicant has properly considered reasonable alternatives to reduce the impact on our holding.</p> <p>One feels that every meeting I have held with Fisher German has just been a tick box exercise for National Grid so the affected land owner can explain the situation on the ground but then none of this information ACTUALLY gets back to NG and actioned, proof that the applicant has not listened to constructive feedback from landowners, or taken sufficient steps to reduce impacts and mitigate losses.</p> <p>CJH Farming is seriously concerned that the rights being sought may be wider than necessary for the scheme - NG want to have Rights over my affected EX number - this EX number for this 'project' covers over 1,000 acres - I can't have NG controlling what happens on the entire holding - that's not fair and needs to be conceded by NG in the draft Heads of Terms.</p> <p>The Heads of Terms are still not in a reasonable or acceptable format. Why can't NG be 'reasonable' rather than being so stubborn and never conceding anything - or agreeing to a practical solution. It's just wasting everyone's time and winding people up unnecessarily. In summary, the current Heads of Terms impose unfair and unreasonable restrictions on landowners.</p> <p>CJH Farming do not consider that the Applicant has demonstrated that the interference with our land and rights is necessary, proportionate, or limited to what is reasonably required.</p> <p>In summary I wish to make it clear that CJH Farming objects to the compulsory acquisition of our land and rights unless and until the Applicant can properly justify the powers sought, reduce the impact on our holding, and agree reasonable terms and protections.</p> |
| CJH Holdings Ltd | 10457 | Yes | All of the above | | Both | <p>CJH Holdings does not consider the compulsory acquisition of our land and rights to be in the public interest, particularly where reasonable alternatives are available. Compulsory acquisition is unnecessary.</p> <p>The company has engaged fully with National Grid (NG) and has never had any direct response to any questions raised and therefore can honestly say that we do not consider that the Applicant has properly considered reasonable alternatives to reduce the impact on our holding.</p> <p>One feels that every meeting I have held with Fisher German has just been a tick box exercise for National Grid so the affected land owner can explain the situation on the ground but then none of this information ACTUALLY gets back to NG and actioned, proof that the applicant has not listened to constructive feedback from landowners, or taken sufficient steps to reduce impacts and mitigate losses.</p> <p>CJH Holdings is seriously concerned that the rights being sought may be wider than necessary for the scheme - NG want to have Rights over my affected EX number - this EX number for this 'project' covers over 300 acres - I can't have NG controlling what happens on the entire holding - that's not fair and needs to be conceded by NG in the draft Heads of Terms.</p> <p>I am very concerned that NG are wanting access rights through the Essex YFC Show field. This is completely unacceptable and we have tried to tell NG this on a number of occasions. This must not be allowed to happen - there is a perfectly acceptable access directly off the A1060 which was proposed until very recently and I don't understand why the longer route was more recently proposed. We have been assured that this route will not be used or put in the final document - let's see what happens...</p> <p>The Heads of Terms are still not in a reasonable or acceptable format. Why can't NG be 'reasonable' rather than being so stubborn and never conceding anything - or agreeing to a practical solution. It's just wasting everyone's time and winding people up unnecessarily. In summary, the current Heads of Terms impose unfair and unreasonable restrictions on landowners.</p> <p>CJH Holdings do not consider that the Applicant has demonstrated that the interference with our land and rights is necessary, proportionate, or limited to what is reasonably required.</p> <p>In summary I wish to make it clear that CJH Holdings objects to the compulsory acquisition of our land and rights unless and until the Applicant can properly justify the powers sought, reduce the impact on our holding, and agree reasonable terms and protections.</p> |
| Abdul Azeem Dhillon | 24283 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>This proposal being part of a major infrastructure project conflicts with the major infrastructure project of LTC as the proposals by LTC will result in major changes around our land including new road layout as part of the scheme. It is my view that there has been no transparency in terms of looking at the link up between these two projects and the link up of the LTC project will conflict with the tasks being proposed that will impact as a result of the Norwich and Tilbury project. It is my view that if there is a requirement for even temporary disturbance then this should be based upon clear transparency and evaluating the facts which sadly have not been forthcoming and I have had no explanations as to why there should be land utilisation/ disturbance upon our site. The last thing we need is a big hotchpotch of one project doing one thing, and the other project doing another. The previous plans were not to have any impact on or near our site and these have also been changed without due communication with us, therefore, I must object to this scheme and ask the planning inspectorate the redress the balance without the need for such services to require compulsory acquisition/ utilisation of our land.</p> |
| Abdul Aleem Dhillon | 24284 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>This proposal being part of a major infrastructure project conflicts with the major infrastructure project of LTC as the proposals by LTC will result in major changes around our land including new road layout as part of the scheme. It is my view that there has been no transparency in terms of looking at the link up between these two projects and the link up of the LTC project will conflict with the tasks being proposed that will impact as a result of the Norwich and Tilbury project. It is my view that if there is a requirement for even temporary disturbance then this should be based upon clear transparency and evaluating the facts which sadly have not been forthcoming and I have had no explanations as to why there should be land utilisation/ disturbance upon our site. The last thing we need is a big hotchpotch of one project doing one thing, and the other project doing another. The previous plans were not to have any impact on or near our site and these have also been changed without due communication with us, therefore, I must object to this scheme and ask the planning inspectorate the redress the balance without the need for such services to require compulsory acquisition/ utilisation of our land.</p> |
| Abdul Samad Dhillon | 24285 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>This proposal being part of a major infrastructure project conflicts with the major infrastructure project of LTC as the proposals by LTC will result in major changes around our land including new road layout as part of the scheme. It is my view that there has been no transparency in terms of looking at the link up between these two projects and the link up of the LTC project will conflict with the tasks being proposed that will impact as a result of the Norwich and Tilbury project. It is my view that if there is a requirement for even temporary disturbance then this should be based upon clear transparency and evaluating the facts which sadly have not been forthcoming and I have had no explanations as to why there should be land utilisation/ disturbance upon our site. The last thing we need is a big hotchpotch of one project doing one thing, and the other project doing another. The previous plans were not to have any impact on or near our site and these have also been changed without due communication with us, therefore, I must object to this scheme and ask the planning inspectorate the redress the balance without the need for such services to require compulsory acquisition/ utilisation of our land.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Nasim Akhtar Dhillon | 24286 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | This proposal being part of a major infrastructure project conflicts with the major infrastructure project of LTC as the proposals by LTC will result in major changes around our land including new road layout as part of the scheme. It is my view that there has been no transparency in terms of looking at the link up between these two projects and the link up of the LTC project will conflict with the tasks being proposed that will impact as a result of the Norwich and Tilbury project. It is my view that if there is a requirement for even temporary disturbance then this should be based upon clear transparency and evaluating the facts which sadly have not been forthcoming and I have had no explanations as to why there should be land utilisation/ disturbance upon our site. The last thing we need is a big hotchpotch of one project doing one thing, and the other project doing another. The previous plans were not to have any impact on or near our site and these have also been changed without due communication with us, therefore, I must object to this scheme and ask the planning inspectorate the redress the balance without the need for such services to require compulsory acquisition/ utilisation of our land. |
| Charles Tritton | 4814 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | All | Both | |
| Diana Tritton | 6852 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| MRS PRISCILLA VICTORIA LATHAM | 8638 | Yes | Temporary possession | All | Both | Plots (The land and roads around my house (Manor Farmhouse, Diss Road Tibenham, NR16 1QF) which fronts Diss Road and has Mill Road forming the boundary on the west. I have been unable to access the Book of Reference online to provide the plot numbers.) I object to the access proposals for the construction of the proposed route of the pylons which runs within 300 metres to the east of our land on several grounds: * The roads in front of and to the east of the house are far too narrow to cope with the size of the construction vehicles necessary for such a major development. They will inevitably damage the verges, ditches and hedgerows with potential irreversible damage to our hedgerow trees if they are damaged due to over sized vehicles pushing past them. Or being cut back by contractors to facilitate access without our permission which we are highly unlikely to grant. * Access to our home is will be seriously effected by road closures meaning circuitous routes greatly increasing the mileage incurred during the course of routine daily life. * Our house and garden will effectively on surrounded by construction access routes and the actual line of the pylons - our right of access will be infringed. * The noise and constant activity of heavy construction taking place over a period of months will be detrimental to the natural environment. The wildlife which is abundant here will be adversely effected - reptiles such as Great Crested Newts, Slow Worms and Grass Snakes all of which breed in our garden and the ditches/ponds immediately around us will undoubtedly be impacted by the construction. * In the lead up to construction work, and for its duration any possibility of selling our property with a view to downsizing which is planned in the relatively near future will be impossible without a major reduction in the value. |
| Alan Tritton (Lyons Hall Estate) | 8289 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | |
| James Morris | 7480 | Yes | All of the above, Temporary possession, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Compulsory Acquisition of land | All | Both | |
| Tritton Farming Partnership LLP | 14063 | Yes | All of the above, Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | All | Both | |
| David Lewis | 1997 | No | | | | |
| Stephen Knight, Stanfords LLP | 25434 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object on behalf of Gent Fairhead & Co Limited, and Blackwater Aggregates to the alignment of the proposed overhead cables and pylons. The Scheme is proposed to pass through Monks Farm, Kelvedon which is subject to the terms of an Option Agreement for mineral extraction in my clients favour. It is National Grids intention to locate pylons TB083 and TB084 in the centre of Monks Farm, which will sterilise significant mineral reserves. Whilst Monks Farm is not yet identified within the Minerals Local Plan, it was submitted to Essex County Council in July 2024 for the purposes of their Mineral Local Plan Review, which is currently under consultation. I have been in discussion with National Grid representatives regarding the route alignment, and we are yet to receive confirmation that the route will re-aligned to the south, closer to the red line application area to help mitigate the sterilisation. |
| Matthew Bunting | 28603 15478 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | Because it would cut our land completely in half and would for ever cause obstruction. Would also create a blot on the landscape of the farm. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Derek Boreham | 27008 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | H-7/20 | National Grid | <p>1. Failure to Demonstrate Necessity – Section 122(2) Section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the rights sought are required for the development, are required to facilitate the development, or are incidental to it. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the full extent of the rights sought over my land is genuinely necessary. The powers sought appear wider than reasonably required and have not been sufficiently justified. In particular, it has not been demonstrated why more limited rights, reduced land take or temporary arrangements would be insufficient. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) states that applicants should seek no more land or rights than are reasonably required for the proposed development. I do not believe this requirement has been satisfied in relation to my land.</p> <p>2. Failure to Establish a Compelling Case in the Public Interest – Section 122(3) Section 122(3) requires there to be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. The Guidance makes clear that a fair balance must be struck between the public interest and the private loss suffered by affected landowners. In my case, I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated why the extent of the interference with my land rights is justified or proportionate.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on My Agricultural Holding The proposed rights and associated powers would adversely affect the efficient operation of my agricultural holding. Their exercise has the potential to disrupt farming activities, restrict access for agricultural machinery, interfere with field operations and reduce the flexibility with which the land can be managed. As an agricultural business, the cumulative effect of these restrictions extends beyond the area directly affected and has implications for the efficient and economic operation of the holding as a whole. I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that these impacts have been minimised or that the least intrusive solution has been adopted.</p> <p>4. Failure to Minimise Interference and Consider Alternatives The 2013 Guidance expects applicants to demonstrate that they have considered alternatives and have minimised the extent of compulsory powers wherever possible. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to alternative arrangements, revised working methods or narrower rights that could reduce the impact on my land and agricultural operations. The extent of the rights sought appears to provide operational flexibility to the Applicant rather than reflecting the minimum rights reasonably required.</p> <p>5. Insufficient Attempts to Reach Agreement The Guidance states that compulsory acquisition powers should be used only as a last resort and that applicants should make reasonable efforts to acquire land and rights by agreement. I do not consider that sufficient progress has been made through negotiation or that all reasonable steps have been exhausted before seeking compulsory powers over my land. In my view, the use of compulsory powers is being pursued prematurely.</p> <p>6. Human Rights Considerations The proposed acquisition of rights engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. A fair balance must be struck between the interests of the public and those whose rights are affected.</p> <p>Given the extent of the interference with my agricultural land and the lack of evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored, I do not consider that the necessary balance has been achieved.</p> |
| Mark Easton | 10198 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>Since the consultation period I believe there has been little or no consideration that given to alternative routes or design changes to lessen the impact to our area. Giving NG a blanket policy to obtain compulsory rights seems completely disproportionate and without regard to what they might actually need. They could put in place compulsory powers for their own convenience or just to keep flexibility to change things sometime in the future without consulting anyone.</p> |
| David and Heather Pearce | 7809 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights | F-1/10 | National Grid | <p>1. Failure to Demonstrate Necessity – Section 122(2) Section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the rights sought are required for the development, are required to facilitate the development, or are incidental to it. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the full extent of the rights sought over my property is genuinely necessary. The powers sought appear wider than reasonably required and have not been sufficiently justified. In particular, it has not been demonstrated why more limited rights, reduced land take or temporary arrangements would be insufficient. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) states that applicants should seek no more land or rights than are reasonably required for the proposed development. I do not believe this requirement has been satisfied in relation to my property.</p> <p>2. Failure to Establish a Compelling Case in the Public Interest – Section 122(3) Section 122(3) requires there to be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. The Guidance makes clear that a fair balance must be struck between the public interest and the private loss suffered by affected owners and occupiers. In my case, I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated why the extent of the interference with my property rights is justified or proportionate.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on My Property Rights The proposed rights and associated powers would adversely affect my use and enjoyment of my home and property. As the owner and occupier, I would be subject to ongoing restrictions and uncertainty arising from the exercise of these rights. I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that the impact on my property has been minimised or that the least intrusive solution has been adopted. The extent of the rights sought appears disproportionate to the purpose for which they are required.</p> <p>4. Failure to Minimise Interference and Consider Alternatives The 2013 Guidance expects applicants to demonstrate that they have considered alternatives and have minimised the extent of compulsory powers wherever possible. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to alternative arrangements, revised working methods or narrower rights that could reduce the impact on my property. The extent of the rights sought appears to provide operational flexibility to the Applicant rather than reflecting the minimum rights reasonably required.</p> <p>5. Insufficient Attempts to Reach Agreement The Guidance states that compulsory acquisition powers should be used only as a last resort and that applicants should make reasonable efforts to acquire land and rights by agreement. I do not consider that sufficient progress has been made through negotiation or that all reasonable steps have been exhausted before seeking compulsory powers over my property. In my view, the use of compulsory powers is being pursued prematurely.</p> <p>6. Human Rights Considerations The proposed acquisition of rights engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. The proposals also engage Article 8 rights relating to respect for private and family life and the home. A fair balance must be struck between the interests of the public and those whose rights are affected. Given the extent of the interference with my property rights and the lack of evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored, I do not consider that the necessary balance has been achieved.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Francis Wolton | 13769 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | G-2/32 | National Grid | <p>1. Failure to Demonstrate Necessity – Section 122(2) Section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the rights sought are required for the development, are required to facilitate the development, or are incidental to it. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the full extent of the rights sought over my property is genuinely necessary. The powers sought appear wider than reasonably required and have not been sufficiently justified. In particular, it has not been demonstrated why more limited rights, reduced land take or temporary arrangements would be insufficient. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) states that applicants should seek no more land or rights than are reasonably required for the proposed development. I do not believe this requirement has been satisfied in relation to my property.</p> <p>2. Failure to Establish a Compelling Case in the Public Interest – Section 122(3) Section 122(3) requires there to be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. The Guidance makes clear that a fair balance must be struck between the public interest and the private loss suffered by affected owners and occupiers. In my case, I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated why the extent of the interference with my property rights is justified or proportionate.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on My Property Rights The proposed rights and associated powers would adversely affect my use and enjoyment of my home and property. As the owner and occupier, I would be subject to ongoing restrictions and uncertainty arising from the exercise of these rights. I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that the impact on my property has been minimised or that the least intrusive solution has been adopted. The extent of the rights sought appears disproportionate to the purpose for which they are required.</p> <p>4. Failure to Minimise Interference and Consider Alternatives The 2013 Guidance expects applicants to demonstrate that they have considered alternatives and have minimised the extent of compulsory powers wherever possible. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to alternative arrangements, revised working methods or narrower rights that could reduce the impact on my property. The extent of the rights sought appears to provide operational flexibility to the Applicant rather than reflecting the minimum rights reasonably required.</p> <p>5. Insufficient Attempts to Reach Agreement The Guidance states that compulsory acquisition powers should be used only as a last resort and that applicants should make reasonable efforts to acquire land and rights by agreement. I do not consider that sufficient progress has been made through negotiation or that all reasonable steps have been exhausted before seeking compulsory powers over my property. In my view, the use of compulsory powers is being pursued prematurely.</p> <p>6. Human Rights Considerations The proposed acquisition of rights engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. The proposals also engage Article 8 rights relating to respect for private and family life and the home. A fair balance must be struck between the interests of the public and those whose rights are affected. Given the extent of the interference with my property rights and the lack of evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored, I do not consider that the necessary balance has been achieved.</p> |
| Christian Croll and Karl Croll (including representatives to the Estate of Derek Charles Croll) | 5249 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights | H-4/84 | National Grid | <p>1. Failure to Demonstrate Necessity – Section 122(2) Section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the rights sought are required for the development, are required to facilitate the development, or are incidental to it. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the full extent of the rights sought over my property is genuinely necessary. The powers sought appear wider than reasonably required and have not been sufficiently justified. In particular, it has not been demonstrated why more limited rights, reduced land take or temporary arrangements would be insufficient. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) states that applicants should seek no more land or rights than are reasonably required for the proposed development. I do not believe this requirement has been satisfied in relation to my property.</p> <p>2. Failure to Establish a Compelling Case in the Public Interest – Section 122(3) Section 122(3) requires there to be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. The Guidance makes clear that a fair balance must be struck between the public interest and the private loss suffered by affected owners and occupiers. In my case, I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated why the extent of the interference with my property rights is justified or proportionate.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on My Property Rights The proposed rights and associated powers would adversely affect my use and enjoyment of my home and property. As the owner and occupier, I would be subject to ongoing restrictions and uncertainty arising from the exercise of these rights. I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that the impact on my property has been minimised or that the least intrusive solution has been adopted. The extent of the rights sought appears disproportionate to the purpose for which they are required.</p> <p>4. Failure to Minimise Interference and Consider Alternatives The 2013 Guidance expects applicants to demonstrate that they have considered alternatives and have minimised the extent of compulsory powers wherever possible. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to alternative arrangements, revised working methods or narrower rights that could reduce the impact on my property. The extent of the rights sought appears to provide operational flexibility to the Applicant rather than reflecting the minimum rights reasonably required.</p> <p>5. Insufficient Attempts to Reach Agreement The Guidance states that compulsory acquisition powers should be used only as a last resort and that applicants should make reasonable efforts to acquire land and rights by agreement. I do not consider that sufficient progress has been made through negotiation or that all reasonable steps have been exhausted before seeking compulsory powers over my property. In my view, the use of compulsory powers is being pursued prematurely.</p> <p>6. Human Rights Considerations The proposed acquisition of rights engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. The proposals also engage Article 8 rights relating to respect for private and family life and the home. A fair balance must be struck between the interests of the public and those whose rights are affected. Given the extent of the interference with my property rights and the lack of evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored, I do not consider that the necessary balance has been achieved.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Dick Lanham | 2823 | Yes | All of the above | All plots relating to Sheddings Farm, Church Road, Dunton, Brentwood, CM13 3SS | Both | <p>I object to the proposed interference with my land rights at Sheddings Farm, Church Road, Dunton, Brentwood.</p> <p>The proposed access arrangements would result in a severe and disproportionate interference with my property rights, farming operations, business activities, privacy, security and enjoyment of my home.</p> <p>My objection is not limited to construction access. I object to any proposed access through Sheddings Farm associated with the project, whether temporary, permanent, occasional, maintenance-related or otherwise. Any access through the property interferes with my land rights and has a direct impact on my home, family and farming business.</p> <p>The proposed access route passes immediately adjacent to my family home and would introduce third-party access within close proximity of the dwelling. This creates significant safeguarding, privacy and security concerns. The presence of project personnel, contractors, vehicles or other authorised users accessing the land through this route would fundamentally alter the character and security of our home environment.</p> <p>The land affected forms part of an actively farmed agricultural holding. Any access through the property has the potential to disrupt farming operations, interfere with the use of grazing land and create ongoing biosecurity risks associated with the movement of people, vehicles and equipment through agricultural land.</p> <p>I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the proposed interference with my land rights is necessary or proportionate as required by Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. An alternative access route exists via the public highway and neighbouring land which avoids the significant impacts on my home and farming business. This alternative route has been proposed to National Grid and Fisher German for a considerable period and would substantially reduce the interference with my rights whilst still enabling access to the relevant land.</p> <p>In addition, documents produced by National Grid appear to identify access to the same area of land from the direction of the alternative route, demonstrating that alternative means of access have been considered and are available.</p> <p>In these circumstances, I do not believe that National Grid has demonstrated a compelling case in the public interest for the interference proposed at Sheddings Farm. The availability of a less harmful alternative route means the proposed interference with my land rights is unnecessary and disproportionate.</p> <p>For these reasons, I object to the compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession of rights affecting Sheddings Farm and request that the Examining Authority gives full consideration to the alternative access arrangements which would significantly reduce the impact on my property, family and business.</p> |
| Paul Farrelly | 1289 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Serious ingress and egress issues to my property which is fairly isolated and only accessible by vehicle. Any road closure would completely cut off and isolate the property.</p> <p>Noise and light pollution / nuisance by the proposed works. Particularly relevant to myself with a [REDACTED].</p> <p>Potential vibration structural / foundation damage to my home which is close to the roadside. Dust, dirt and visual blight.</p> <p>Danger posed by large machinery working in such close proximity to property housing family members.</p> <p>Loss of value of my property. Saleability and mortgageability issues.</p> |
| Mr Philip Brown & Mrs G Brown | 17593 | Yes | All of the above | All regarding your map reference N-T_LIQ_18030. OS map reference TM 04 74 | Both | <p>We have major concerns regarding the impact heavy machinery would have on the integrity our listed dwelling, which is around 400 years old. We also have concerns about the effect the increased traffic would have on the footfall to our small butchery and farm shop and even more concerns about the noise and vibrations will have on our livestock. The B1113 is already of an insufficient width for the increased amount of heavy modern farm vehicles and lorries which regularly use it, you can already see where the bank at the front of our boundary has been eroded by large vehicles attempting to pass each other on the bend and there is nowhere that roadway widening or passing places could be introduced within the existing public highway.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Christopher Padfield | 14511 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | G-4/62 G-4/75 G-4/70 G-4/60 G-4/25 G-4/26 G-4/63 | Both | <p>1. Failure to Demonstrate Necessity – Section 122(2) Section 122(2) of the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that the rights sought are required for the development, are required to facilitate the development, or are incidental to it. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the full extent of the rights sought over my land is genuinely necessary. The powers sought appear wider than reasonably required and have not been sufficiently justified. In particular, it has not been demonstrated why more limited rights, reduced land take or temporary arrangements would be insufficient. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) states that applicants should seek no more land or rights than are reasonably required for the proposed development. I do not believe this requirement has been satisfied in relation to my land.</p> <p>2. Failure to Establish a Compelling Case in the Public Interest – Section 122(3) Section 122(3) requires there to be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. The Guidance makes clear that a fair balance must be struck between the public interest and the private loss suffered by affected landowners. In my case, I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated why the extent of the interference with my land rights is justified or proportionate.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on My Agricultural Holding The proposed rights and associated powers would adversely affect the efficient operation of my agricultural holding. Their exercise has the potential to disrupt farming activities, restrict access for agricultural machinery, interfere with field operations and reduce the flexibility with which the land can be managed. As an agricultural business, the cumulative effect of these restrictions extends beyond the area directly affected and has implications for the efficient and economic operation of the holding as a whole. I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that these impacts have been minimised or that the least intrusive solution has been adopted.</p> <p>4. Failure to Minimise Interference and Consider Alternatives The 2013 Guidance expects applicants to demonstrate that they have considered alternatives and have minimised the extent of compulsory powers wherever possible. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to alternative arrangements, revised working methods or narrower rights that could reduce the impact on my land and agricultural operations. The extent of the rights sought appears to provide operational flexibility to the Applicant rather than reflecting the minimum rights reasonably required.</p> <p>5. Insufficient Attempts to Reach Agreement The Guidance states that compulsory acquisition powers should be used only as a last resort and that applicants should make reasonable efforts to acquire land and rights by agreement. I do not consider that sufficient progress has been made through negotiation or that all reasonable steps have been exhausted before seeking compulsory powers over my land. In my view, the use of compulsory powers is being pursued prematurely.</p> <p>6. Human Rights Considerations The proposed acquisition of rights engages Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. A fair balance must be struck between the interests of the public and those whose rights are affected. Given the extent of the interference with my agricultural land and the lack of evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored, I do not consider that the necessary balance has been achieved.</p> |
| MARGARET STANCOMBE | 24824 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | There are still important points outstanding and the Heads of Terms have not yet been sufficiently progressed. |
| Jeremy Robin Sibson-Barnes | 1661 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I believe in the tenants of Common Law that a Freeholder should be the only entity that holds the various rights over their land |
| Kay Norman | 1755 | Yes | All of the above | all | Both | there has been a complete lack of engagement from National Grid and Fisher German with no consideration given to the affect on the life of people this affects |
| Andrew Harry Harbott Stevens | 9034 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The Consultations have been defective - see Legal opinion of Lord Charles Banner QC submitted by Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group who found numerous legal deficiencies in National Grid's approach to the consultations arguing it falls well short of adequate pre-application consultation sufficient to enable a Development Consent Order application to proceed to examination |
| Alcemi Storage Developments 1 Limited | 28327 | No | | | | <p>We have submitted the requested online form for the interests shown in the Land Rights Tracker, with the Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID 28327, confirming no objection in relation to these plots. This relates to land held under an Option with R Jackson (East Anglia) Limited dated 28 March 2024.</p> <p>However, Alcemi hold another Option, dated 18 March 2025 with Thornbush Energy Limited. This has been flagged in representations to date as not appearing in the Book of Reference and Alcemi's interest in these plots does not appear to be reflected in the Land Rights Tracker. We therefore cannot deal with these interests via the online form. I attach the previously submitted representations which set out these affected plots (all within Sheet 20).</p> <p>Discussions are continuing with the Promoter to resolve Alcemi's concerns around these plots, but until a suitable Framework Agreement is entered into, Alcemi must continue their objection to the compulsory acquisition of these plots</p> |
| ANITA MARGARETA OCTAVIA MOORE | 858 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | I have lived in Tibenham all my life and my family has farmed the land for generations. This will not only affect family farming land but will also alter the view of Tibenham and the countryside permanently. I believe it is not in the best interests for the countryside in anyway to be disrupted in such a manner. |
| Gavin Peter Moore | 624 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | My family has farmed this land for generations. This will not only affect my family farming land and business but will also alter the view of the land and the countryside permanently. I believe it is not in the best interests for the countryside in anyway to be disrupted in such a manner. |
| Sara Price | 2605 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>I have tried to engage with this project through my representative but they have had little to no success obtaining answers/solutions and to make real progress, progress is painfully slow, they seem unwilling to fully engage to resolve our issues and concerns.</p> <p>They wish to use my property to access another party's land, I have made recommendations and suggestions which would mean my property would not need to be used, also saving them time and money, this suggestion has been ignored.</p> <p>This is not simply a field issue, my property is a private residents with no connection to the land they wish to use, compulsory acquisition of land or rights or even temporary possession is completely wrong given our attempts to engage with the project and would have a massive negative impact of the use and freedoms with my property.</p> <p>Most concerning is the fact that they wish to use my property for 7-10 years, that is a massive restriction on my home and life considering the pipeline and future equipment is on someone else's land with its own access</p> <p>I feel that the lack of engagement from them is stopping solutions from being found, there are very few land owners involved in the pipe line side of the project and with some simple face to face meetings this could of been resolved weeks ago.</p> <p>I feel that direct individual contact I.E meetings with pipeline affected residents and their representatives could resolve issues and have contracts in place in a matter of weeks.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Alison Mary Hayward | 13768 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | All | UK Power Networks | We have been successful in persuading National Grid to relocate one pylon, but only because with the assistance of a NG engineer we were able to demonstrate a benefit to NG of relocating the pylon. We have suggested both in writing and at face to face site meetings re routing a permanent access way to reduce the impact on the farm and to offer NG a more direct shorter route to the relevant pylon. In meeting Fisher German agree with us and say they will take it to NG, but nothing happens. The convoluted route remains the route being pursued. We were asked at the initial consultations to put forward proposals to mitigate the loss of 30 acres of grass for 5 years which will severely affect our sheep numbers. We found our neighbouring farm is willing to put 30 acres of arable land into a 5 year ley and let this to us. We have written to Fisher German numerous times asking for accommodation works to achieve this i.e fencing and seeding of grass. Nothing has been heard in response. At our last meeting with FG in May we were told that nothing could be done until the DCO was determined. But to have grass to graze in Spring 2026 we need to be sowing the grass this autumn and that means NG should be negotiating and drafting a Farm Business Tenancy now. It would be easy to agree a break clause in the event of the DCO being refused. It is immensely frustrating to face the threat of serious damage to your farming business and be unable to have a dialogue with NG to address the issues and resolve them. NG doesn't seem to care about what damage it does so long as the line is built on time, it appears blind to everything else. |
| Jane Sarah Bird | 2820 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a lack of necessity to acquire these rights when clearly short term rights would suffice. There are a number of locations where rights are looking to be acquired just for future convenience of the project. This disproportionately prevents efficient and profitable running of the farm in the future. •There has been no consideration of any alternatives to minimize the effect on property rights. No consultation with landowners has been taken seriously and they cannot show where any discussions have been taken into account. •Insufficient negotiations have been made to discuss the Heads of terms, they cannot show where any discussions have been taken into account when drawing up these very generic and wide spread heads of terms. |
| William Nicholas Bird | 2394 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | All | Both | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a lack of necessity to acquire these rights when clearly short term rights would suffice. There are a number of locations where rights are looking to be acquired just for future convenience of the project. This disproportionately prevents efficient and profitable running of the farm in the future. •There has been no consideration of any alternatives to minimize the effect on property rights. No consultation with landowners has been taken seriously and they cannot show where any discussions have been taken into account. •Insufficient negotiations have been made to discuss the Heads of terms, they cannot show where any discussions have been taken into account when drawing up these very generic and wide spread heads of terms. |
| David Michael Stacey | 5513 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The disruption to our daily work activities. We have no rights to object to the actions (it's our land), lack of compensation for any actions. |
| Gavin Richard Clark | 2309 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | despite raising questions and concerns directly in person with National Grid / representatives we are yet to receive answers to eg the working hours of the set down site at Church Lane, Margareting le no working/activity outside of Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm. Any potential impact to internet signal from nearby pylons noting we run a business etc |
| karen elizabeth clark | 1890 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | despite raising questions and concerns directly in person with National Grid / representatives we are yet to receive answers to eg the working hours of the set down site at Church Lane, Margareting le no working/activity outside of Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm. Any potential impact to internet signal from nearby pylons noting we run a business etc |
| Michael John Golding | 25624 | No | | | | |
| Benjamin Richard Coode-Adams | 1030 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | | Both | I notice that the information you are asking for is not freely available nor searchable and you use acronyms with abandon. For this reason your consultation process is flawed and should be restarted with forms people can actually use. I am Ben Coode-Adams, farming partner of G&S Coode-Adams Farm Partnership, operating Feering Bury Farm and Coggeshall Hall Farm in Essex. Three proposed towers — TB077, TB078 and TB079 — fall on farm land. TB080 lies immediately across the road from the boundary and will cause construction-phase disruption to access and operations. This objection is confined to land rights interference under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. No environmental objection is raised. The DCO proposes permanent acquisition of rights, temporary possession and intrusive survey powers at TB077, TB078 and TB079. TB079 is particularly damaging: it falls within fields planted with early blackcurrant varieties entirely dependent on a permanently installed frost-protection and sprinkler irrigation system. Disruption cascades across the whole enterprise. No other part of the farm has frost protection and the early variety cannot be relocated. Yield decline begins before construction, as bushes must be retained beyond their productive lifespan. Total impact spans approximately eight years — the construction period plus a four-year replanting lag. Some 14 hectares will be lost, eliminating a stewardship scheme worth approximately £56,000. Quantified losses include approximately £150,000 per year in lost blackcurrant revenue for up to eight years; approximately £100,000 to relocate and £100,000 to reinstate frost infrastructure; approximately £20,000 per year from farm severance; and approximately £24,000 per year in management costs. Surveys cause further losses through destroyed bushes, compacted headlands and yield suppression. Construction access along Coggeshall Hall drive generates claims for wear, nuisance and safety risk. Ditch disruption may impede run-off to the farm reservoir. TB080 adds construction-phase access disruption. Under section 122 and DCLG Guidance paragraph 8, the applicant must demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored and that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate. The siting of TB079 within frost-protected fields is not the only workable alignment. A modest repositioning could avoid or substantially reduce cascading enterprise losses. No evidence shows alternatives were assessed and rejected. The cumulative impact of three towers together with TB080's proximity renders the interference disproportionate to any marginal advantage of the chosen alignment. Section 122(3) and DCLG Guidance paragraph 13 require the Secretary of State to be satisfied there is a compelling case in the public interest. Parliament has consistently held that land should be taken compulsorily only where public benefit clearly outweighs private loss. Private loss here is very substantial: destruction of a specialist enterprise dependent on unique fixed infrastructure, financial losses well in excess of £1 million, and permanent imposition of rights over productive freehold land. No assessment weighs these losses against the incremental benefit of the chosen positions. Specific alternatives warranting investigation include repositioning TB079 away from the frost-irrigated fields; repositioning TB077 and TB078 to reduce cumulative impact; provision of replacement frost infrastructure within the consented scheme; engineering measures to protect the ditch and reservoir; and modification of the construction access route. No evidence was provided that any of these was properly examined. The conditions of sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 have not been met. I respectfully request that the Secretary of State decline to include compulsory acquisition provisions in the DCO in respect of my land at TB077, TB078 and TB079, or alternatively modify the DCO to exclude or substantially reduce the impact on the frost-protection system and the blackcurrant enterprise at Feering Bury Farm and Coggeshall Hall Farm. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Benjamin Richard Coode-Adams | 1030 | Yes | All of the above | Not known. I've emailed Fisher German but haven't heard back. | Both | <p>I am Ben Coode-Adams, sole owner of [REDACTED]. This is a Grade II listed sixteenth-century timber-framed barn in separate personal ownership from the adjoining G&S Coode-Adams Farm Partnership. No pylon towers are proposed on the barn land itself. This objection is made as the owner of an interest in land whose peaceful enjoyment, heritage significance, amenity and asset value will be materially and permanently interfered with by the authorised works. It is limited solely to interference with my rights and interests in land under the Planning Act 2008 and DCLG Guidance. No environmental objection is advanced.</p> <p>Towers TB075, TB076, TB077, TB078 and TB079 are located on the adjacent farm landholding; TB076 lies immediately across from the barn boundary. All four towers will be visible from the barn, its curtilage and its approach. The barn is a Grade II listed building of sixteenth-century origin whose heritage significance, character and market value are inseparable from the open agricultural landscape in which it has stood for five centuries. The permanent erection of six 50-metre steel lattice pylons in close proximity will irreversibly alter and diminish that setting in a manner which cannot be mitigated and from which the property cannot recover. This constitutes lasting harm to my interest in the property and an irrecoverable diminution in both heritage significance and market value. No compensation framework has adequately addressed this category of loss for a listed building affected by visible infrastructure of this scale.</p> <p>During construction, the near-continuous temporary haul road — typically 8 metres wide with a 21-metre cross-section including topsoil storage and demarcation fencing — will run close to the property. National Grid and contractor vehicles are excluded from existing public roads and directed onto this haul road, carrying heavy construction traffic for the estimated four-year build. A new bridge across the river is to be constructed nearby. The haul road, its plant, heavy vehicles and bridge construction will generate sustained noise, vibration, dust, light pollution and disturbance in close proximity to the barn throughout that entire period. The cumulative impact on amenity, use and letting value is substantial and prolonged. It falls on a property with no towers on its own land and which has made no agreement with the applicant.</p> <p>Under section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 and DCLG Guidance paragraph 8, interference with rights in land must be necessary and proportionate and all reasonable alternatives must have been explored. The applicant has not demonstrated that haul road routing or tower positions were assessed with specific regard to the setting of this listed building. Under DCLG Guidance paragraph 13, compelling evidence must show public benefit outweighs private loss. The permanent and irrecoverable harm to the heritage setting of a Grade II listed sixteenth-century barn, combined with four years of intensive construction disturbance and consequent falls in asset and letting value, constitute a private loss that has not been weighed against the incremental benefit of the chosen alignment. Under DCLG Guidance paragraph 10 and Article 1 of the First Protocol to the ECHR, interference with peaceful enjoyment of property must be lawful, necessary and proportionate. That balance has not been struck.</p> <p>I request that the examining authority require the applicant to assess the impact of the authorised works on Feering Bury Farm Barn as a Grade II listed building and demonstrate that tower positions and haul road routing were properly considered with regard to the heritage and amenity interests in this property.</p> <p>I note you say 1500 words but you actually mean 4000 characters including spaces. This form is appalling for the use of acronyms and jargon and asking for information that is not available.</p> |
| Mark John Putnam | 6008 | Yes | All of the above | D-3/26 and all | Both | <p>I object to the proposed acquisition of rights over my land and property and submit that National Grid has failed to satisfy the requirements of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 and the principles set out in the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance, "Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition" (September 2013).</p> <p>Section 122 requires that compulsory acquisition powers should only be granted where the land or rights sought are necessary for the development and where there is a compelling case in the public interest. The Guidance further states that applicants must demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been considered and that any interference with private property rights must be proportionate, justified and no more than is reasonably required.</p> <p>I do not believe National Grid has demonstrated that the proposed acquisition of rights affecting my property is necessary or proportionate. Nor do I believe that National Grid has established the compelling case in the public interest required to justify the severe impact that this project is having and will continue to have on my family, our home and our property rights.</p> <p>National Grid has not adequately demonstrated why the proposed cables must be routed through or immediately adjacent to my property. Alternative routes, technologies and methods appear to be available. In particular, alternatives involving HVDC technology, offshore routing and subsea options have been dismissed primarily on the basis of cost. However, the assessment of those costs has been undertaken by National Grid itself and I do not believe sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that alternatives have been evaluated in a transparent, objective and balanced manner which properly weighs cost against the substantial impacts imposed on affected landowners.</p> <p>The Government's Guidance states that applicants should demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been considered before seeking powers to interfere with private land rights. National Grid has failed to demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives have been fully explored and exhausted before seeking compulsory powers affecting my property.</p> <p>My family home is a small two-bedroom bungalow located immediately adjacent to a narrow strip of land which National Grid refers to as a "pinch point" measuring approximately 120 metres in width. National Grid proposes to use this entire corridor for a haul road and the installation of underground high-voltage electricity cables. The scale, intensity and duration of these activities immediately next to our home will have an exceptional and disproportionate impact on our property rights and our ability to enjoy our home.</p> <p>The proposed works will involve extensive construction activity, heavy machinery, excavation works, vehicle movements and associated disturbance immediately adjacent to our property. We have also been advised that much of the work will take place during night-time periods. The prospect of major construction works occurring directly next to our family home, including at night, raises serious concerns regarding noise, disturbance and loss of sleep. My wife, our [REDACTED] child and I will be subjected to prolonged disruption affecting our daily lives, wellbeing and ability to enjoy the peaceful occupation of our home.</p> <p>The impact of this project extends far beyond temporary inconvenience. The project has already caused severe and demonstrable financial harm to my family through the effective blighting of our property.</p> <p>Following the announcement of the project, we actively attempted to sell our home through multiple estate agents. We initially marketed the property at the values recommended by those agents and subsequently reduced the asking price by more than £120,000 (approximately 33%) in an effort to secure a sale. Despite these substantial reductions, we were unable to find a buyer. Feedback received consistently indicated that prospective purchasers were deterred by the potential presence of the transmission infrastructure and/or the proposed works associated with this project.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>As a result, our home has become effectively unsaleable except at a very substantial financial loss. We estimate that the loss in value attributable to the project significantly exceeds £120,000. This is not a speculative concern; it is a real and ongoing financial impact that has already materially affected our property rights and financial security. The effect of the scheme has therefore gone significantly beyond ordinary inconvenience. It has effectively removed our freedom to move home and has trapped us in a property which has suffered severe planning blight. The resulting financial uncertainty has caused considerable distress, anxiety and mental health issues for my family. Recognising the serious impact the project was having upon our property, we requested that National Grid purchase our home at its unaffected market value. National Grid refused. As a result, we remain exposed to the continuing effects of blight, uncertainty and loss while being denied any practical means of mitigating the harm caused by the scheme.</p> <p>I am also concerned that National Grid has not provided sufficient clarity regarding precisely what land rights are required, the extent of those rights, the duration of any occupation, the specific activities that may be undertaken on the land, or the long-term restrictions that may apply following construction. This lack of certainty has left my family in a prolonged state of limbo.</p> <p>We are unable to make informed decisions regarding our future, our finances or our property because key information remains uncertain. The continuing uncertainty surrounding the project has imposed a significant emotional and psychological burden on my family. The prolonged inability to move forward with our lives, coupled with the financial losses already suffered and the prospect of years of disruption, has had a serious adverse impact on our mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>The Guidance accompanying the Planning Act makes clear that there must be a compelling case in the public interest before compulsory acquisition powers can be granted. It also requires a fair balance to be struck between the public benefits of a project and the private losses imposed on those affected.</p> <p>In my case, National Grid seeks powers affecting land immediately adjoining my family home and land within my boundary whilst imposing a level of disruption, uncertainty, financial loss and loss of amenity that is exceptional when compared with the wider public benefit obtained from using this particular corridor. The burden imposed upon my family is disproportionate and National Grid has failed to demonstrate why such a severe interference with our rights is necessary when alternative solutions exist.</p> <p>The Guidance also requires consideration of the rights protected by Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, namely the peaceful enjoyment of possessions, and Article 8, which protects the right to respect for private and family life and the home.</p> <p>The proposed interference with my property rights is substantial. The project has already caused severe financial harm through property blight, has rendered our home effectively unsaleable, has prevented us from moving home without suffering a major financial loss, and threatens years of disruption immediately adjacent to our property. The interference with our family life will be equally significant due to the anticipated noise, disturbance, loss of amenity, uncertainty and stress associated with the works. The scale and intensity of these works in such close proximity to our home will have a severe impact on our property rights and our ability to enjoy our home.</p> <p>In these circumstances, I do not believe National Grid has demonstrated that the proposed interference with my rights is the minimum necessary to achieve the objectives of the scheme. Nor has it demonstrated that less intrusive alternatives have been properly exhausted. Consequently, I do not believe that the required balance between the public interest and private rights has been achieved.</p> <p>For all of the reasons set out above, I submit that National Grid has failed to satisfy the statutory tests contained within Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. The acquisition of rights affecting my property has not been shown to be necessary, proportionate or justified by a compelling case in the public interest. Accordingly, I object to the proposed interference with my land and property rights and respectfully request that the powers sought over my property be refused.</p> |
| Frederica Susan Chisolm Robins | 8681 | Yes | All of the above | not known not available | Both | <p>I am Frederica Robins, joint owner of [REDACTED] a Grade II listed sixteenth-century timber-framed barn held in separate personal ownership from the adjoining G&S Coode-Adams Farm Partnership. No pylon towers are proposed on the barn land. This objection is made as joint owner of an interest in land whose peaceful enjoyment, heritage significance, amenity and asset value will be materially and permanently interfered with by the authorised works. It is limited to interference with my rights and interests in land under the Planning Act 2008 and DCLG Guidance. No environmental objection is advanced.</p> <p>Towers TB075, TB076, TB077, TB078 and TB079 are located on or adjacent to the neighbouring farm landholding; TB076 lies immediately across from the barn boundary. All five towers will be directly and permanently visible from the barn, its curtilage and its approach. The barn is a Grade II listed building of sixteenth-century origin whose heritage significance, character and market value are inseparable from the open agricultural landscape in which it has stood for centuries. The permanent erection of five 50-metre steel lattice pylons in close proximity will irreversibly alter and diminish that setting in a manner which cannot be mitigated and from which the property cannot recover. This constitutes lasting harm to my interest in the property and an irrecoverable diminution in both heritage significance and market value. No compensation framework has adequately addressed this category of loss for a listed building so directly affected by infrastructure of this scale.</p> <p>During construction, the near-continuous temporary haul road — typically 8 metres wide with a 21-metre cross-section including topsoil storage and demarcation fencing — will run close to the property and its access. National Grid and contractor vehicles are excluded from existing public roads and directed onto this haul road, carrying heavy construction traffic for the estimated four-year build. A new bridge across the river is to be constructed nearby. The haul road, its plant, heavy vehicles and bridge works will generate sustained noise, vibration, dust, light pollution and disturbance in close proximity to the barn throughout that period. The cumulative impact on amenity, use and letting value is substantial and prolonged. This burden falls on a property that has made no agreement with the applicant and will be continuously affected for the full duration of the works.</p> <p>Under section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 and DCLG Guidance paragraph 8, interference with rights in land must be necessary and proportionate and all reasonable alternatives must have been explored. The applicant has not demonstrated that haul road routing or tower positions were assessed with regard to the setting of this listed building. Under DCLG Guidance paragraph 13, compelling evidence must show public benefit outweighs private loss. The permanent and irrecoverable harm to the heritage setting of a Grade II listed sixteenth-century barn, combined with four years of construction disturbance and consequent falls in asset and letting value, is a private loss not weighed against the incremental benefit of the chosen alignment. Under DCLG Guidance paragraph 10 and Article 1 of the First Protocol to the ECHR, interference with peaceful enjoyment of property must be lawful, necessary and proportionate. That balance has not been struck.</p> <p>I request that the examining authority require the applicant to assess the impact of the authorised works on Feering Bury Farm Barn as a Grade II listed building and demonstrate that tower positions and haul road routing were properly considered with regard to the heritage and amenity interests in this property.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Donna Chantry | 7604 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>The Norwich to Tilbury project will totally obliterate our countryside, people's homes, affecting wildlife and for no reason there are alternatives like we have already sent over to you.</p> <p>Meetings and webinars were arranged, and those who attended were unanimous in their opposition to the Pylon scheme. Regrettably, our concerns fell on deaf ears. Subsequently, a second consultation emerged, seemingly designed to fulfill checkboxes on National Grid's end, without a genuine consideration of our pleas for offshore or underground alternatives.</p> <p>At a personal level, my family and I are already struggling with the project's impact. The prospect of unsightly pylons marring our countryside and disrupting wildlife habitats deeply troubles us. Should National Grid proceed, the installation of 50-meter-high pylons would undeniably disrupt our local community. Traffic, noise, pollution, and potential health implications all loom large, despite National Grid's assurances of safety. Concerns about cancer risks arising from close proximity to such installations only further our anxieties.</p> <p>As homeowners, we find ourselves in a state of uncertainty. Selling our properties feels unfair to potential buyers, yet the prospect of residing here while awaiting what seems like an inevitable outcome is equally daunting. Recent visits by estate agents have delivered disheartening news — our homes are estimated to depreciate by 30 percent. Having all invested our time, hard efforts, and personal finances into our homes, this revelation is deeply unsettling. Unfortunately, expecting compensation from National Grid for affected properties along this route seems futile. Despite being a privately owned entity, National Grid operates without meaningful government intervention. As a custodian of a grad II listed farm house, I take pride in being a small part of brentwood's rich heritage. However, the impending destruction of the current landscape fills me with deep sadness and concerns for my homes legacy.</p> <p>[REDACTED] -Please do not let this project go through without looking at the alternatives!</p> |
| Jeremy James Fisher | 9639 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Report on Objections to the Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) Scheme under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>1.Introduction</p> <p>This report summarises the principal objections to the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) transmission scheme, with particular regard to the statutory tests governing compulsory acquisition under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. These provisions require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There must be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition. •The land or rights sought must be necessary for the development. •The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the purposes for which the land is acquired justify the interference with private rights, including under human rights legislation. <p>Drawing upon the submitted objection materials, including landowner representations and professional advice, this report identifies key grounds upon which the scheme, as currently promoted, fails to satisfy these statutory requirements.</p> <p>2.Overview of the Proposed Scheme and Impacts</p> <p>The N2T scheme proposes a new overhead electricity transmission line between Norwich and Tilbury, including extensive new pylons, access routes, compounds, and associated infrastructure across rural landholdings. For example, the Faulkbourne Estate alone would be affected by 11 new pylons (TB97–TB113) together with significant haul roads and construction activity,in addition to the 6 from the Pelham to Rayleigh line that already cross the Estate under an Easement.</p> <p>Objections focus not only on the principle of the scheme but, more significantly, on its detailed alignment, the extent of land taken, and the manner in which works would be carried out. The evidence demonstrates that the impacts extend beyond land-take to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Severe disruption to farming operations •Safety risks arising from construction routes •Loss of residential amenity •Interference with existing infrastructure and utilities •Long-term landscape and environmental harm <p>These matters must be assessed against the strict statutory tests in sections 122 and 123.</p> <p>3. Section 122: Necessity and Scope of Compulsory Acquisition</p> <p>3.1Lack of Necessity for Specific Land Interests</p> <p>Section 122(2) requires that land be acquired only if it is necessary for the development. While the overarching project may be justified, there is a strong argument that the extent of land and rights proposed exceeds what is reasonably required.</p> <p>The objections identify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grid may be able to justify the project in principle, but not the specific land parcels or access arrangements proposed. •Certain areas appear to be included for flexibility or convenience rather than strict necessity. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>This is especially evident in relation to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •haul roads and access routes, where alternative alignments exist that would reduce impact without compromising deliverability, and •the extent of land which National Grid are seeking to acquire under the DCO for the provision of environmental mitigation and BNG. The Estate has offered to provide and manage BNG arising from the Scheme through carefully located sites across the Holding, at prevailing BNG Credit values, although equally National Grid could consider the UK BNG Bank. The need to compulsory acquire land for this purpose has not been established. <p>3.2Excessive and Disproportionate Rights A further issue arises where the scheme seeks permanent acquisition or extensive rights where temporary or limited rights would suffice. Key examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Permanent disruption of agricultural land where temporary access could achieve the same objective •Overly wide or intrusive haul roads •Interference with established access routes and farm operations <p>The evidence suggests that National Grid has failed to minimise land-take and rights, contrary to the requirements of proportionality embedded in section 122 and associated guidance.</p> <p>4.Section 123: Compelling Case in the Public Interest 4.1Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case at a Local Level While national energy infrastructure may serve a broad public interest, section 123 requires a balanced assessment of public benefit against private harm. Objectors argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The scheme imposes significant and concentrated burdens on specific landowners and communities •These burdens are not adequately mitigated or justified by the chosen route •The same strategic objectives could be achieved through less harmful alternatives <p>As such, the case for compulsory acquisition is weakened where less intrusive options have not been properly examined.</p> <p>4.2Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives A critical requirement in demonstrating a compelling case is the proper evaluation of alternatives. The objections provide substantial evidence that this has not been adequately carried out.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A proposed offshore cable route from North Norfolk to Tilbury or Bradwell, utilising existing infrastructure corridors •Use of existing redundant pylon routes instead of constructing entirely new infrastructure •Multiple alternative haul road alignments that would reduce disruption to residents and farming operations <p>Despite representations made during earlier consultations (2024–2025), it appears that National Grid has not sufficiently engaged with or incorporated these alternatives. This failure directly undermines the statutory justification for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>4.3Disproportionate Impact on Landowners and Communities The scheme's impacts go well beyond what might reasonably be expected for infrastructure development. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residential impact: properties becoming unlettable due to proximity to haul roads •Safety risks: dangerous junctions and high-speed traffic conflicts created by construction access •Community disruption: interference with footpaths, local routes, and daily activities •Agricultural harm: loss of productivity due to field fragmentation and obstruction of modern farming equipment •Large scale expensive destructive and long term costs when affected landholders seek to reorganise the hedges, trees and tracks on the farms to enable existing farming operations to continue on the land holdings <p>For instance, placing a haul road through the centre of a large field would prevent the use of standard 38m machinery and require a complete redesign of drainage systems. Such impacts suggest a failure to strike a fair balance, a key requirement under both section 123 and human rights law.</p> <p>5.Procedural and Consultation Deficiencies A further significant objection concerns the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process. Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation process fell short of statutory requirements •There were methodological and procedural errors in key assessments, including landscape, heritage, and environmental impacts •Professional and legal opinions (including from senior counsel) conclude that the process is insufficient to support a Development Consent Order (DCO) if established, these deficiencies could mean that: •The Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that all relevant considerations have been taken into account •The statutory tests under sections 122 and 123 cannot properly be met |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>6.Failure to Engage and Negotiate Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 requires that promoters make reasonable efforts to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers. However, the evidence suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiations have been ongoing for several years without resolution •Landowners have not been provided with final or clear terms •NG will not engage with landowners suggestions of even minor changes/ameliorations •The promoter continues to revise fundamental aspects such as the basis of compensation claims <p>This raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compulsory acquisition powers are being used prematurely •The statutory expectation of meaningful negotiation has not been fulfilled Such failures weigh against the existence of a compelling case in the public interest. <p>7.Deliverability and Design Concerns Although not the central objection, there are also questions regarding the practical deliverability of the scheme as designed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insufficient detail on infrastructure such as bridges across flood-prone areas •Construction proposals that are impractical or unsafe •Lack of clarity on how temporary works would be implemented and restored <p>Where a scheme is not clearly deliverable, it becomes difficult to justify the compulsory acquisition of land to facilitate it.</p> <p>8.Application of Sections 122 and 123 Bringing these issues together, the objections demonstrate multiple areas where the scheme fails to meet the statutory tests:</p> <p>Section 122 (Necessity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Land and rights are broader than required •Alternatives exist that would reduce land-take •The scheme has not been optimised to minimise interference <p>Section 123 (Compelling Case in the Public Interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impacts on landowners are severe and disproportionate •Consultation and alternatives analysis are inadequate •Negotiation efforts have been insufficient •The balance between public benefit and private harm is not properly justified <p>9.Conclusion In conclusion, while the strategic need for electricity transmission infrastructure may be accepted, the Norwich to Tilbury scheme—particularly in its current form—raises serious legal and planning concerns under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The extent of compulsory acquisition is not fully justified •Less intrusive alternatives have not been adequately considered •The impacts on affected landowners and communities are excessive •Procedural shortcomings undermine confidence in the scheme <p>Accordingly, there is a credible and substantive basis for objection, and a strong argument that the statutory tests for compulsory acquisition have not yet been met. To proceed lawfully, National Grid need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate genuine optimisation of the route and access arrangements •Provide clear evidence of alternatives being properly assessed •Engage meaningfully with affected parties •Ensure that land acquisition is strictly limited to what is necessary <p>Absent such steps, the justification for compulsory powers remains open to significant challenge.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Aura Power Development Ltd | 10316 | Yes | All of the above | B-1/13, B-1/15, B-1/24, B-1/25, B-1/27, B-1/29, B-1/32, B-1/34, B-1/36, B-1/37, B-1/40, B-1/42, B-1/44 | National Grid | <p>Aura Power objects to the inclusion of its land interests and the proposed interference in its land rights within the forthcoming Development Consent Order (DCO) application. National Grid cannot satisfy the strict statutory conditions as set out within Section 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor the requirements of the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance related procedures for compulsory acquisition The Specific objections regarding the differing types of rights to be acquired by National Grid are detailed below:</p> <p>1. Compulsory Acquisition of Land (Permanent Pylon RG91): Aura Power objects to the compulsory acquisition of land for permanent pylon RG91 under Section 123 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant fails to satisfy Section 122(3) of the Act and Paragraph 13 of the Guidance, which dictate that a DCO may only authorise compulsory acquisition if there is a compelling case in the public interest, which outweighs the private loss suffered. Permanent pylon RG91 would cause severe, disproportionate loss by materially disrupting Aura Power's land rights held via an option for lease (via the project SPV Haedus Solar Ltd (company no. 13663837)) and a restriction against title that it holds over the whole of title SK176181. The title is designated for a utility-scale, ground-mounted solar project which already benefits from planning consent (making it committed development) granted by Mid Suffolk District Council on 13 August 2025 (LPA ref. DC/23/05426). The interference in Aura Power's land rights will directly prevent Aura Power from fulfilling its statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) obligations under its planning consent and its legal obligations relating to provision of skylark plots required under the Section 106 Agreement with Mid Suffolk District Council dated 8 August 2025, and therefore by extension negatively impact overall delivery of the aforementioned consented solar project. By limiting the delivery of a committed, consented renewable energy project, National Grid's proposal creates an irreconcilable conflict between two public interests. Because this DCO application is still in preparation, National Grid has a clear duty under Paragraph 8 of the Guidance to demonstrate that "all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored." National Grid must relocate pylon RG91 to avoid sterilising this committed green energy asset. Failure to modify the scheme means National Grid cannot demonstrate that the land taken is "no more than is reasonably required" under Paragraph 11 of the Guidance, invalidating their case under Section 122(2).</p> <p>2. Compulsory Acquisition of Rights (Permanent Access to Pylons RG89, RG90 and RG91): Aura Power objects to the compulsory acquisition of permanent rights of access across titles SK176181, SK113952, and SK129903. These access rights permanently conflict with Aura Power's option for lease and cable easement rights for its consented solar development and associated cable route.</p> <p>These permanent rights of access propose to cross Aura Power's consented cable route in at least five locations and will therefore negatively impact Aura Power's land rights to lay a section of underground cable of approx 850 metres that forms part of the essential connection between the solar project and the point of grid connection at Diss BSP, in line with the planning consent granted by South Norfolk District Council on 7 April 2025 (LPA ref. 2023/3574).</p> <p>Severing or restricting the grid connection infrastructure of an independent renewable energy asset means National Grid cannot justify these rights as "necessary and proportionate" under Paragraph 8 of the Guidance. National Grid has failed to prove that alternative access routes have been fully explored to mitigate this impact, meaning the statutory threshold under Section 122(3) has not been met.</p> <p>3. Compulsory Acquisition of Rights (Overhead Line Stringing between Pylons RG90, RG91, and RG92): The proposed location for the stringing of the new overhead line between pylons RG90, RG91, and RG92 would introduce unquantified operational risks to Aura Power's committed development. If National Grid requires operational safety buffers underneath the line, it will force an alteration of the aforementioned consented solar project's layout causing a direct loss of solar panels, clean generation output, and revenue for the solar project. Under Paragraph 9 of the Guidance, a DCO applicant must have a "clear idea of how they intend to use the land which it is proposed to acquire." By leaving potential buffer zone restrictions unconfirmed during the pre-application phase, National Grid is seeking disproportionate powers without a legitimate, fully defined purpose. This fails the test of proportionality and necessity set out in Paragraph 8 of the Guidance and Section 122(2) of the Act.</p> <p>4. Temporary Possession (Haul Road & Construction SuDS for Pylons RG89-RG92): While temporary possession is distinct from permanent acquisition, the draft DCO provision must still satisfy the overarching test of justification, minimisation of impact and proportionality by Paragraph 8 of the Guidance.</p> <p>Temporary possession of land outlined for the Haul Road to reach pylons RG89, RG90, RG91, and RG92 and its associated Construction SuDS would have a material impact on Aura Power's enjoyment of its land rights that exist via an option for lease (via the project SPV Haedus Solar Ltd (company no 13663837)) and restriction against title that it holds over the whole of title SK176181 for the development of a utility scale ground mounted solar project. The interference in Aura Power's land rights will negatively impact its ability to meet its BNG obligations under its planning consent granted by Mid Suffolk District Council on 13 August 2025 (LPA ref. DC/23/05426), negatively impact its legal obligations relating to provision of skylark plots required under the Section 106 Agreement with Mid Suffolk District Council dated 8 August 2025, and negatively impact the visual landscaping that Aura Power hold land rights to implement by virtue of the Haul Road route also crossing through a proposed new hedgerow and new 10m deep treebelt. Therefore the interference in land rights held will impact overall delivery of the aforementioned consented solar project that is already committed development.</p> <p>Forcing temporary possession over this specific alignment creates an immediate compliance breach for an extant planning permission. National Grid has failed to justify why alternative, less damaging haulage routes cannot be utilised, failing the requirements of Paragraph 8 and Section 122(2).</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Claire Monica Oxley Fisher (The Faulkbourne Estate) | 6234 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Report on Objections to the Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) Scheme under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>1. Introduction This report summarises the principal objections to the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) transmission scheme, with particular regard to the statutory tests governing compulsory acquisition under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. These provisions require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There must be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition. •The land or rights sought must be necessary for the development. •The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the purposes for which the land is acquired justify the interference with private rights, including under human rights legislation. <p>Drawing upon the submitted objection materials, including landowner representations and professional advice, this report identifies key grounds upon which the scheme, as currently promoted, fails to satisfy these statutory requirements.</p> <p>2. Overview of the Proposed Scheme and Impacts The N2T scheme proposes a new overhead electricity transmission line between Norwich and Tilbury, including extensive new pylons, access routes, compounds, and associated infrastructure across rural landholdings. For example, the Faulkbourne Estate alone would be affected by 11 new pylons (TB97–TB113) together with significant haul roads and construction activity, in addition to the 6 from the Pelham to Rayleigh line that already cross the Estate under an Easement. Objections focus not only on the principle of the scheme but, more significantly, on its detailed alignment, the extent of land taken, and the manner in which works would be carried out. The evidence demonstrates that the impacts extend beyond land-take to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Severe disruption to farming operations •Safety risks arising from construction routes •Loss of residential amenity •Interference with existing infrastructure and utilities •Long-term landscape and environmental harm <p>These matters must be assessed against the strict statutory tests in sections 122 and 123.</p> <p>3. Section 122: Necessity and Scope of Compulsory Acquisition 3.1 Lack of Necessity for Specific Land Interests Section 122(2) requires that land be acquired only if it is necessary for the development. While the overarching project may be justified, there is a strong argument that the extent of land and rights proposed exceeds what is reasonably required. The objections identify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grid may be able to justify the project in principle, but not the specific land parcels or access arrangements proposed. •Certain areas appear to be included for flexibility or convenience rather than strict necessity. <p>This is especially evident in relation to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •haul roads and access routes, where alternative alignments exist that would reduce impact without compromising deliverability, and •the extent of land which National Grid are seeking to acquire under the DCO for the provision of environmental mitigation and BNG. The Estate has offered to provide and manage BNG arising from the Scheme through carefully located sites across the Holding, at prevailing BNG Credit values, although equally National Grid could consider the UK BNG Bank. The need to compulsorily acquire land for this purpose has not been established. <p>3.2 Excessive and Disproportionate Rights A further issue arises where the scheme seeks permanent acquisition or extensive rights where temporary or limited rights would suffice. Key examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Permanent disruption of agricultural land where temporary access could achieve the same objective •Overly wide or intrusive haul roads •Interference with established access routes and farm operations <p>The evidence suggests that National Grid has failed to minimise land-take and rights, contrary to the requirements of proportionality embedded in section 122 and associated guidance.</p> <p>4. Section 123: Compelling Case in the Public Interest 4.1 Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case at a Local Level While national energy infrastructure may serve a broad public interest, section 123 requires a balanced assessment of public benefit against private harm. Objectors argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The scheme imposes significant and concentrated burdens on specific landowners and communities •These burdens are not adequately mitigated or justified by the chosen route •The same strategic objectives could be achieved through less harmful alternatives <p>As such, the case for compulsory acquisition is weakened where less intrusive options have not been properly examined.</p> <p>4.2 Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives A critical requirement in demonstrating a compelling case is the proper evaluation of alternatives. The objections provide substantial evidence that this has not been adequately carried out. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A proposed offshore cable route from North Norfolk to Tilbury or Bradwell, utilising existing infrastructure corridors •Use of existing redundant pylon routes instead of constructing entirely new infrastructure •Multiple alternative haul road alignments that would reduce disruption to residents and farming operations <p>Despite representations made during earlier consultations (2024–2025), it appears that National Grid has not sufficiently engaged with or incorporated these alternatives.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>This failure directly undermines the statutory justification for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>4.3 Disproportionate Impact on Landowners and Communities The scheme's impacts go well beyond what might reasonably be expected for infrastructure development. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residential impact: properties becoming unlettable due to proximity to haul roads •Safety risks: dangerous junctions and high-speed traffic conflicts created by construction access •Community disruption: interference with footpaths, local routes, and daily activities •Agricultural harm: loss of productivity due to field fragmentation and obstruction of modern farming equipment •Large scale expensive destructive and long term costs when affected landholders seek to reorganise the hedges, trees and tracks on the farms to enable existing farming operations to continue on the land holdings <p>For instance, placing a haul road through the centre of a large field would prevent the use of standard 38m machinery and require a complete redesign of drainage systems. Such impacts suggest a failure to strike a fair balance, a key requirement under both section 123 and human rights law.</p> <p>5. Procedural and Consultation Deficiencies A further significant objection concerns the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process. Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation process fell short of statutory requirements •There were methodological and procedural errors in key assessments, including landscape, heritage, and environmental impacts •Professional and legal opinions (including from senior counsel) conclude that the process is insufficient to support a Development Consent Order (DCO) <p>If established, these deficiencies could mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that all relevant considerations have been taken into account •The statutory tests under sections 122 and 123 cannot properly be met <p>6. Failure to Engage and Negotiate Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 requires that promoters make reasonable efforts to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers. However, the evidence suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiations have been ongoing for several years without resolution •Landowners have not been provided with final or clear terms •NG will not engage with landowners suggestions of even minor changes/ameliorations •The promoter continues to revise fundamental aspects such as the basis of compensation claims <p>This raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compulsory acquisition powers are being used prematurely •The statutory expectation of meaningful negotiation has not been fulfilled <p>Such failures weigh against the existence of a compelling case in the public interest.</p> <p>7. Deliverability and Design Concerns Although not the central objection, there are also questions regarding the practical deliverability of the scheme as designed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insufficient detail on infrastructure such as bridges across flood-prone areas •Construction proposals that are impractical or unsafe •Lack of clarity on how temporary works would be implemented and restored <p>Where a scheme is not clearly deliverable, it becomes difficult to justify the compulsory acquisition of land to facilitate it.</p> <p>8. Application of Sections 122 and 123 Bringing these issues together, the objections demonstrate multiple areas where the scheme fails to meet the statutory tests:</p> <p>Section 122 (Necessity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Land and rights are broader than required •Alternatives exist that would reduce land-take •The scheme has not been optimised to minimise interference <p>Section 123 (Compelling Case in the Public Interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impacts on landowners are severe and disproportionate •Consultation and alternatives analysis are inadequate •Negotiation efforts have been insufficient •The balance between public benefit and private harm is not properly justified <p>9. Conclusion In conclusion, while the strategic need for electricity transmission infrastructure may be accepted, the Norwich to Tilbury scheme—particularly in its current form—raises serious legal and planning concerns under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The extent of compulsory acquisition is not fully justified •Less intrusive alternatives have not been adequately considered •The impacts on affected landowners and communities are excessive •Procedural shortcomings undermine confidence in the scheme |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | Accordingly, there is a credible and substantive basis for objection, and a strong argument that the statutory tests for compulsory acquisition have not yet been met. To proceed lawfully, National Grid need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate genuine optimisation of the route and access arrangements •Provide clear evidence of alternatives being properly assessed •Engage meaningfully with affected parties •Ensure that land acquisition is strictly limited to what is necessary Absent such steps, the justification for compulsory powers remains open to significant challenge. |
| Stacey Farms Ltd | 10402 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | Lack of financial compensation |
| Carol Gosling | 4794 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | I object to the compulsory acquisition powers sought by National Grid on the basis that it has not demonstrated that the rights sought over my land are necessary, proportionate, or that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered. Land has been included for convenience, future flexibility or wider working areas, rather than because it is essential. This would have a significant impact on the farm business, including disruption to agricultural operations, access, cropping, drainage, irrigation and the general management of the holding. The extent of the rights sought also appears disproportionate. In some cases, National Grid are seeking permanent rights or extensive rights over land where temporary access or more limited rights may be sufficient. The proposed pylons, access tracks, compounds and working areas have not been designed in a way that minimises the impact on the landowner or the retained holding. The interference with private property rights therefore goes further than is reasonably required. National Grid has not properly considered alternatives. Where alternative access routes, compound locations, pylon positions or design changes have been suggested, these do not appear to have been properly explored or adequately responded to. National Grid should be required to demonstrate why less intrusive alternatives cannot be adopted. There has also been insufficient meaningful negotiation on site-specific impacts. The generic Heads of Terms are not in an acceptable format and site specific commitments have not yet been made. National Grid has not taken sufficient steps to acquire the necessary rights by agreement before relying on compulsory acquisition powers. I also remain concerned about the adequacy of the consultation process. The legal opinion of Lord Charles Banner KC, submitted by the Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group, identifies a number of alleged legal deficiencies in National Grid's consultation approach and argues that the consultation falls short of what is required to enable the DCO application to proceed to examination. The ESNP group has also referred to professional reports identifying procedural and methodological concerns in National Grid's approach to landscape, heritage and archaeology, soils and the environment. If these issues have not been properly corrected and consulted upon, they create further concerns regarding the adequacy of the application and the compulsory acquisition powers sought. |
| Dennis Gosling | 7327 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | I object to the compulsory acquisition powers sought by National Grid on the basis that it has not demonstrated that the rights sought over my land are necessary, proportionate, or that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered. Land has been included for convenience, future flexibility or wider working areas, rather than because it is essential. This would have a significant impact on the farm business, including disruption to agricultural operations, access, cropping, drainage, irrigation and the general management of the holding. The extent of the rights sought also appears disproportionate. In some cases, National Grid are seeking permanent rights or extensive rights over land where temporary access or more limited rights may be sufficient. The proposed pylons, access tracks, compounds and working areas have not been designed in a way that minimises the impact on the landowner or the retained holding. The interference with private property rights therefore goes further than is reasonably required. National Grid has not properly considered alternatives. Where alternative access routes, compound locations, pylon positions or design changes have been suggested, these do not appear to have been properly explored or adequately responded to. National Grid should be required to demonstrate why less intrusive alternatives cannot be adopted. There has also been insufficient meaningful negotiation on site-specific impacts. The generic Heads of Terms are not in an acceptable format and site specific commitments have not yet been made. National Grid has not taken sufficient steps to acquire the necessary rights by agreement before relying on compulsory acquisition powers. I also remain concerned about the adequacy of the consultation process. The legal opinion of Lord Charles Banner KC, submitted by the Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group, identifies a number of alleged legal deficiencies in National Grid's consultation approach and argues that the consultation falls short of what is required to enable the DCO application to proceed to examination. The ESNP group has also referred to professional reports identifying procedural and methodological concerns in National Grid's approach to landscape, heritage and archaeology, soils and the environment. If these issues have not been properly corrected and consulted upon, they create further concerns regarding the adequacy of the application and the compulsory acquisition powers sought. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Alexander David Robert Micklem | 6898 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the compulsory acquisition powers sought by National Grid on the basis that it has not demonstrated that the rights sought over my land are necessary, proportionate, or that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered. Land has been included for convenience, future flexibility or wider working areas, rather than because it is essential. This would have a significant impact on the farm business, including disruption to agricultural operations, access, cropping, drainage, irrigation and the general management of the holding. The extent of the rights sought also appears disproportionate. In some cases, National Grid are seeking permanent rights or extensive rights over land where temporary access or more limited rights may be sufficient. The proposed pylons, access tracks, compounds and working areas have not been designed in a way that minimises the impact on the landowner or the retained holding. The interference with private property rights therefore goes further than is reasonably required. National Grid has not properly considered alternatives. Where alternative access routes, compound locations, pylon positions or design changes have been suggested, these do not appear to have been properly explored or adequately responded to. National Grid should be required to demonstrate why less intrusive alternatives cannot be adopted. There has also been insufficient meaningful negotiation on site-specific impacts. The generic Heads of Terms are not in an acceptable format and site specific commitments have not yet been made. National Grid has not taken sufficient steps to acquire the necessary rights by agreement before relying on compulsory acquisition powers. I also remain concerned about the adequacy of the consultation process. The legal opinion of Lord Charles Banner KC, submitted by the Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group, identifies a number of alleged legal deficiencies in National Grid's consultation approach and argues that the consultation falls short of what is required to enable the DCO application to proceed to examination. The ESNP group has also referred to professional reports identifying procedural and methodological concerns in National Grid's approach to landscape, heritage and archaeology, soils and the environment. If these issues have not been properly corrected and consulted upon, they create further concerns regarding the adequacy of the application and the compulsory acquisition powers sought. |
| Charles Nicholas Micklem | 14503 (spreadsheet not been updated since Charles Micklem inherited the land, so does not have own PIL reference) | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I object to the compulsory acquisition powers sought by National Grid on the basis that it has not demonstrated that the rights sought over my land are necessary, proportionate, or that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered. Land has been included for convenience, future flexibility or wider working areas, rather than because it is essential. This would have a significant impact on the farm business, including disruption to agricultural operations, access, cropping, drainage, irrigation and the general management of the holding. The extent of the rights sought also appears disproportionate. In some cases, National Grid are seeking permanent rights or extensive rights over land where temporary access or more limited rights may be sufficient. The proposed pylons, access tracks, compounds and working areas have not been designed in a way that minimises the impact on the landowner or the retained holding. The interference with private property rights therefore goes further than is reasonably required. National Grid has not properly considered alternatives. Where alternative access routes, compound locations, pylon positions or design changes have been suggested, these do not appear to have been properly explored or adequately responded to. National Grid should be required to demonstrate why less intrusive alternatives cannot be adopted. There has also been insufficient meaningful negotiation on site-specific impacts. The generic Heads of Terms are not in an acceptable format and site specific commitments have not yet been made. National Grid has not taken sufficient steps to acquire the necessary rights by agreement before relying on compulsory acquisition powers. I also remain concerned about the adequacy of the consultation process. The legal opinion of Lord Charles Banner KC, submitted by the Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group, identifies a number of alleged legal deficiencies in National Grid's consultation approach and argues that the consultation falls short of what is required to enable the DCO application to proceed to examination. The ESNP group has also referred to professional reports identifying procedural and methodological concerns in National Grid's approach to landscape, heritage and archaeology, soils and the environment. If these issues have not been properly corrected and consulted upon, they create further concerns regarding the adequacy of the application and the compulsory acquisition powers sought. |
| Personal Representative to the Estate of Frederick Hamilton | 25512 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | Current, slightly ambiguously worded, announcements suggest the the project may CA land for use after the construction of the pylon route is completed. While we appreciate that easement access for maintenance to the pylons is required, acquisition of land will severely impact the usefulness of the surrounding fields. Furthermore, it is unclear why such acquisition is justifiable unless the National Grid etc. are planning on farming ? |
| Martyn Mills | 17600 | Yes | All of the above | B-2/23 | Both | Confirmation required that the rights do not extend beyond the highway into my title. |
| Hugh Hamilton | 15833 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | It is unclear why the N-T operator will, upon completion of the project, have need to compulsorily acquire portions of land in order to provide maintenance and upkeep of the line instead of the usual permissive easements which are typically used. Loss of agricultural land will impact the ongoing access, usage & profitability of the surrounding land. |
| Paul Edmund Baker | 3085 14920 5262 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All plots within our interest multiple especially 9/53 9/56 9/102 9/99 | Both | Insufficient consultation. Land originally not impacted then route change (Suffolk 3 Change) occurred with no further consultation in regards to new land impacts created by change. The Rights to be acquired re 9/53 9/56 9/102 9/99 are way beyond what could be achieved with alternatives that we have been unable to discuss that would have lower cost and impact for all parties |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Radnoel Ltd | 17432 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>how's this? Objection to Compulsory Acquisition / Interference with Land Rights (EN020027)</p> <p>I object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of my freehold land in connection with EN020027, as a Category 1 and/or Category 2 Affected Person under section 57 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Compelling case not established (Section 122(3)) The Applicant has failed to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest as required by Section 122(3). There is no adequate justification that my specific land is essential to the scheme, nor that the public benefits clearly outweigh the private harm caused to me as a freehold owner.</p> <p>Lack of necessity and unjustified routing (Section 122(2)) Section 122(2) requires that land is no more than reasonably necessary to deliver the development. The routing appears to have been selected in a way that directly affects my freehold despite the apparent availability of viable alternative alignments that would avoid my land entirely. My land does not represent the most logical or least intrusive option. The Applicant has not demonstrated that alternatives have been properly assessed or that the extent of land take represents the minimum required.</p> <p>Failure to engage and negotiate (DCLG Guidance, paras 8–10, 25–27) The DCLG Guidance requires meaningful efforts to acquire land by agreement and to engage directly with affected persons. To date, engagement has been limited to generic communications, with no meaningful one-to-one negotiation, no attempt to agree terms, and no exploration of how impacts on my land might be avoided or reduced. This falls short of the Guidance requirements.</p> <p>Disproportionate interference (Guidance and human rights principles) The proposed acquisition represents a disproportionate interference with my property rights. Given that alternative routes appear available, the decision to acquire my freehold is not justified. The Applicant has not demonstrated that a less intrusive solution would be incapable of delivering the scheme.</p> <p>Overbreadth of land take (Section 123) The extent of land sought from my freehold is excessive and not clearly limited to what is strictly necessary. No adequate explanation has been provided as to why a reduced land take, or an alternative alignment avoiding my land, would be insufficient.</p> <p>Uncertainty as to deliverability (Section 122(2)(b); Guidance paras 13–17) There is insufficient certainty that the scheme, insofar as it affects my land, is fully funded and deliverable. This further undermines the justification for granting compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>Conclusion The proposed acquisition does not satisfy the statutory tests in Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 or the requirements of the DCLG Guidance (September 2013). The Applicant has failed to demonstrate necessity, proportionality, proper engagement, or a compelling public interest case in respect of my land. The routing unjustifiably targets my freehold where alternatives appear to exist. Accordingly, compulsory acquisition powers should not be authorised in respect of my interest.</p> |
| Stephen Baker, for H&O Godbold Partnership, and Thornbush Energy Ltd | 28420, 28421, 9646, | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>We DO recognise the need for this major upgrade in energy infrastructure, but we have found it necessary to formally object due to the manner in which National Grid have pursued the implementation of the DCO project on our farm.</p> <p>a) The process for gaining CPA/TP does not withstand scrutiny, and is flawed (see our formal objection for legal detail). In particular consultation has been lacking, and - until recently - engagement very poor.</p> <p>b) As yet UKPN have not agreed the land they will finally need access to, and their consultation process has started very late - too late - for CPA/TP to be effective.</p> <p>c) Areas of land initially included by NGET for compulsory purchase (e.g. soil bund, and extension to sub station site) have already been revised following negotiation, which begs the question, where else is no longer necessary to be compulsorily acquired?</p> <p>d) Access requirements/arrangements to allow the farm to continue to function as a business have still not been finalised.</p> <p>e) There is confusion between this and the other DCO (Bramford to Twinstead), with both projects claiming the need to access the same land on our farm. Although work continues on Heads of Terms, and agreeing how the DCO can proceed effectively on Thornbush Farm, the fundamental points made in our objection about process and engagement remain entirely valid, and the lack of progress obliges us to conclude that we cannot withdraw our objection at this time.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Stephanie Jane Bickford | 7371 | Yes | Temporary possession, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | G-4/53 | Both | <p>I object to the proposed interference with my land rights through the acquisition of a temporary access easement over plot G-4/53, at 548 Rayleigh Road, Hutton, Brentwood, Essex, CM13 1SG, registered title number EX681970.</p> <p>Under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, the compulsory acquisition of rights should only be authorised where the applicant can demonstrate that the rights sought are necessary, proportionate and supported by a compelling case in the public interest. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance further requires a clear justification for the extent of any rights sought and that interference with private rights is no greater than is reasonably necessary.</p> <p>I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that these requirements have been met.</p> <p>The rights sought in the application are broad and potentially permit a wide range of activities. However, during discussions, National Grid representatives have indicated that the intended use may be more limited than the powers sought. Despite this, the application documents have not been amended, and there remains uncertainty as to the actual extent of rights required and how they would be exercised.</p> <p>In addition, key information necessary to assess the proportionality of the interference remains outstanding. This includes details of the construction programme, duration and sequencing of works, working hours, traffic and road management arrangements, associated utility works, construction impacts, and mitigation measures. National Grid has also indicated that potential mitigation for impacts on my household, including measures to reduce noise at source, is being considered. National Grid has been made aware that members of my household have protected characteristics which require particular consideration when assessing the impacts of the proposed rights; however, no final assessment, mitigation strategy, implementation plan or supporting documentation has been provided. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to understand how these matters have been taken into account or how they inform the assessment of proportionality.</p> <p>Whilst engagement has taken place, responses have largely been generic and have not provided sufficient property-specific information. Following recent discussions, no written confirmation of proposals, assessments, or mitigation measures has been received, and there remains a lack of clarity between the application documents and information discussed in meetings.</p> <p>There is also no information or documentation provided to demonstrate that alternative approaches, access arrangements, or less intrusive means of delivering the stated objective have been considered in relation to my property. In the absence of such evidence, it is not possible to assess whether the rights sought represent the minimum necessary interference with private property rights.</p> <p>National Grid is seeking broad, flexible rights over my property, but without sufficient property-specific justification or settled parameters it cannot be demonstrated that those rights represent the minimum necessary interference with my land.</p> <p>The information currently available does not enable an assessment of the nature, duration and extent of the interference that may result from the exercise of the rights sought, nor whether the statutory tests in Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 are met.</p> <p>For these reasons, I continue to object to the proposed acquisition of rights over my property on the basis that necessity and proportionality have not been demonstrated.</p> |
| Daniel James Bickford | 5663 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | G-4/53 | Both | <p>I object to the proposed interference with my land rights through the acquisition of a temporary access easement over plot G-4/53, at 548 Rayleigh Road, Hutton, Brentwood, Essex, CM13 1SG, registered title number EX681970.</p> <p>Under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, the compulsory acquisition of rights should only be authorised where the applicant can demonstrate that the rights sought are necessary, proportionate and supported by a compelling case in the public interest. The Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance further requires a clear justification for the extent of any rights sought and that interference with private rights is no greater than is reasonably necessary.</p> <p>I do not consider that National Grid has adequately demonstrated that these requirements have been met.</p> <p>The rights sought in the application are broad and potentially permit a wide range of activities. However, during discussions, National Grid representatives have indicated that the intended use may be more limited than the powers sought. Despite this, the application documents have not been amended, and there remains uncertainty as to the actual extent of rights required and how they would be exercised.</p> <p>In addition, key information necessary to assess the proportionality of the interference remains outstanding. This includes details of the construction programme, duration and sequencing of works, working hours, traffic and road management arrangements, associated utility works, construction impacts, and mitigation measures. National Grid has also indicated that potential mitigation for impacts on my household, including measures to reduce noise at source, is being considered. National Grid has been made aware that members of my household have protected characteristics which require particular consideration when assessing the impacts of the proposed rights; however, no final assessment, mitigation strategy, implementation plan or supporting documentation has been provided. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to understand how these matters have been taken into account or how they inform the assessment of proportionality.</p> <p>Whilst engagement has taken place, responses have largely been generic and have not provided sufficient property-specific information. Following recent discussions, no written confirmation of proposals, assessments, or mitigation measures has been received, and there remains a lack of clarity between the application documents and information discussed in meetings.</p> <p>There is also no information or documentation provided to demonstrate that alternative approaches, access arrangements, or less intrusive means of delivering the stated objective have been considered in relation to my property. In the absence of such evidence, it is not possible to assess whether the rights sought represent the minimum necessary interference with private property rights.</p> <p>National Grid is seeking broad, flexible rights over my property, but without sufficient property-specific justification or settled parameters it cannot be demonstrated that those rights represent the minimum necessary interference with my land.</p> <p>The information currently available does not enable an assessment of the nature, duration and extent of the interference that may result from the exercise of the rights sought, nor whether the statutory tests in Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 are met.</p> <p>For these reasons, I continue to object to the proposed acquisition of rights over my property on the basis that necessity and proportionality have not been demonstrated.</p> |
| Jane Elizabeth Smith | 15224 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We do not want this |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| ScottishPower Renewables UK Limited | 10227 | Yes | All of the above | B-20/174, B-20/179, B-20/181, B-20/182, B-20/183, B-20/185, B-20/191, B-20/195, B-20/197, B-20/199, B-20/202, B-20/204, B-20/205, B-20/180 | National Grid | <p>ScottishPower Renewables UK Limited ("SPRUKL") is the landowner of a consented Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project comprising offshore wind generation and associated onshore transmission infrastructure and is therefore directly affected by the Proposed Development. While it does not object to the principle of reinforcing the electricity transmission network, it objects to the extent and justification of the powers sought over its interests. In particular, SPRUKL submits that the Applicant has failed to comply with the requirements of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance (September 2013) on compulsory acquisition. Section 122(2) requires that land or rights may only be acquired where they are necessary for the development or to facilitate it, and Section 122(3) requires a compelling case in the public interest. SPRUKL's position is that the Applicant has not demonstrated that interference with SPRUKL's land or rights is necessary, as the Proposed Development appears to conflict with existing and consented SPRUKL infrastructure corridors in a manner that could reasonably be avoided through protective provisions or voluntary agreements. The extent of rights sought is not limited to the minimum required but instead risks imposing excessive and unjustified restrictions on the tenants of SPRUKL's ability to access, operate and maintain its infrastructure. The statutory test requires that land be needed rather than merely desirable or convenient, and SPRUKL considers that this threshold has not been met.</p> <p>Furthermore, although SPRUKL recognises the general public benefits associated with the Proposed Development as transmission infrastructure, the Applicant has not demonstrated a compelling case in the public interest in respect of the specific interference with SPRUKL's interests, as required by Section 122(3). The assessment of public interest must consider the balance between the benefits of the scheme and the harm caused, and in this case there has been insufficient consideration of the cumulative interaction between two nationally significant infrastructure projects. SPRUKL's EA11's & EA3's infrastructure contributes to national renewable energy generation and decarbonisation objectives, and any restriction on its operation, maintenance or future development has the potential to undermine those objectives.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has not satisfied the requirements of the DCLG Guidance, which makes clear that compulsory acquisition should only be used where there is a compelling justification, that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered and that the extent of acquisition is proportionate. The Guidance requires that applicants minimise interference and use compulsory powers only as a last resort following reasonable negotiation. In this case, SPRUKL considers that the rights sought are disproportionate, that insufficient steps have been taken to minimise the extent of interference and that meaningful agreement has not yet been achieved. The proposals risk imposing safeguarding constraints and operational limitations.</p> <p>The principles underlying Section 123 of the Planning Act 2008 are also engaged, given the nature of SPRUKL's infrastructure as nationally important energy infrastructure. Those principles require that land should not be acquired where this would cause serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking. SPRUKL is concerned that the Proposed Development may result in such detriment by restricting access for maintenance and emergency works, increasing safety risks and imposing operational inefficiencies. Finally, SPRUKL considers that there has been insufficient engagement and negotiation in accordance with the DCLG Guidance, which requires applicants to seek agreement wherever possible and to use compulsory acquisition only as a measure of last resort. While discussions have taken place, they have not resulted [COMMENT TRUNCATED AT THIS POINT]</p> |
| Annabel Gardiner (Lord Rayleigh's Farm Ltd) | 1275 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | National Grid | <p>REP1-247 and REP3-124 Purpose of Representation – from a tenants and landowners perspective The purpose of this representation is to ensure the scheme is designed and implemented in a manner sympathetic to existing land uses, particularly the Estate's ongoing commercial farming and shooting operations. We also highlight concerns with the engagement process and the potential environmental and operational impacts of the proposals.</p> <p>Key Concerns Environmental Impacts - We are particularly concerned about the effect on local listed buildings and their settings. The mitigation measures proposed to date appear insufficient to fully address potential harm.</p> <p>1. Compulsory Acquisition of Land - The extent of compulsory acquisition proposed is considered unnecessary and will have a significant adverse impact on the Estate's commercial shoot operations.</p> <p>2. Design Issues - There is no clear justification provided for the decision not to use underground cabling, which could reduce surface impacts. Additionally, safety concerns arise regarding machinery working near overhead cables.</p> <p>3. Construction Impacts - The construction phase is expected to have a massive impact on the small rural roads around Fairstead, causing disruption, safety issues, and inconvenience to local residents and businesses.</p> <p>4. Stakeholder Engagement - Engagement to date has been very poor. Notifications have been late, information insufficient or inaccurate, and responses to submitted concerns have not been forthcoming. This has caused unnecessary stress and uncertainty.</p> <p>5. Soil and Drainage - We are concerned about the long-term impacts on soil quality and drainage, particularly in haul road areas. There is insufficient detail about how soil compaction and drainage disruption will be mitigated or remediated.</p> <p>Engagement The Estate, together with its agent, has engaged extensively with National Grid and Fisher German. A formal response was submitted on 29th July 2025 during the Landowner Consultation, following an extension due to initially incorrect mapping, as well as an additional submission on 26th February 2026. To date, we have not received any substantive response to this submission. The plans provided during consultation were often incorrect and of low resolution, hampering meaningful review and causing significant time and stress. The late notification of additional land required for an attenuation pond is a further example of inadequate consultation. Impact on the Estate</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Farming Operations - The proposals will cause significant disruption during construction, with potential long-term impacts on farming productivity, including risks of soil compaction and reduced yields.</p> <p>1. Soil and Drainage - Existing drainage systems must be maintained intact, as per drainage plans provided by the Estate. We seek assurance that land disturbed will be fully restored.</p> <p>2. Cable Depth - We request a minimum soil cover of 1.2 metres above cables to protect agricultural machinery and land use.</p> <p>3. Construction Management - Managing the farm during construction will require significant additional time and resources for access coordination, supervision, and ongoing operational adjustments.</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Heads of Terms We are not yet in a position to negotiate Heads of Terms, pending further instruction from our agent. It is critical that the extent of land acquisition is fully justified and minimised. A properly designed scheme is essential to reduce impacts on the Estate.</p> <p>Environmental and Landscape Considerations The development will result in disruption to landscape character and farming practices. This representation aims to ensure impacts are minimised and appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>Pylon Locations - TB116 should be repositioned as far east as possible toward the hedged boundary to reduce farming impacts. - TB117 should be at least 40 metres from the southern field boundary to allow machinery access.</p> <p>Permanent Access Routes (Plan 1275) We request permanent access routes follow existing field boundaries rather than cross through fields.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Woodland identified for BNG within Plan 1275 must be removed from Order Limits, as it is not available for sale and is integral to the Estate's commercial shooting operations.</p> <p>Solar DCO Interaction The land is subject to an approved DCO for Longfield Solar Farm, with existing third-party rights. Early coordination between National Grid, the Solar Farm, and the Estate is essential to minimise conflict.</p> <p>Shooting and Farming Operations Two key shooting drives will be affected, potentially making the shoot unviable during construction. We request National Grid works with the Estate to avoid shooting seasons and minimise farming disruption. Failure to do so may lead to financial losses and compensation claims.</p> <p>Final Note - The cumulative burden of the process so far — including poor engagement and unaddressed consultation points — has caused considerable stress and operational challenges. We request that these concerns be fully taken into account in the examination.</p> |
| Lucy Alexandra Nutting | 7972 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>1) the consultations have been defective</p> <p>2) there are fundamental errors in National Grid's DCO application,</p> <p>3) I do not consider the compulsory acquisition of my land and rights to be in the public interest, particularly where reasonable alternatives are available, as proposed previously.</p> <p>4) I do not consider that the Applicant has properly considered reasonable alternatives to reduce the impact on my holding.</p> <p>5) The Applicant has not listened to constructive feedback from landowners, or taken sufficient steps to reduce impacts and mitigate losses.</p> <p>6) The rights being sought may be wider than necessary for the scheme.</p> <p>7) The Heads of Terms are still not in a reasonable or acceptable format.</p> <p>8) The current Heads of Terms impose unfair and unreasonable restrictions on landowners.</p> <p>I do not consider that the Applicant has demonstrated that the interference with my land and rights is necessary, proportionate, or limited to what is reasonably required.</p> |
| Nigel Edwin Markham | 101 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>One of the NtoT pylons is planned to be situated at the corner of our field. There are normal pylons and a gas main crossing the same corner, but despite numerous requests, no one has been able to clarify for us how/where the normal pylons and the gas main will be relocated and the implications to us.</p> <p>We haven't been told the implications to us of the NtoT pylons either outwith it being on our land. We need a realistic image of what the NtoT pylons are anticipated to look like so that the impact to our land can be fully assessed, for example loss of potential development value.</p> <p>Also we have no information on what compensation we would be offered if any of our land was to be put under CA or TP.</p> <p>We need all this information to be able to consider the impact of the NtoT plans.</p> <p>Lastly with modern engineering capabilities, we find it hard to believe that these cables can't be put underground as they have been elsewhere where it has been deemed to be more important to do so.</p> |
| Elizabeth Anne Sprunt | 6786 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>One of the NtoT pylons is planned to be situated at the corner of our field. There are normal pylons and a gas main crossing the same corner, but despite numerous requests, no one has been able to clarify for us how/where the normal pylons and the gas main will be relocated and the implications to us.</p> <p>We haven't been told the implications to us of the NtoT pylons either outwith it being on our land. We need a realistic image of what the NtoT pylons are anticipated to look like so that the impact to our land can be fully assessed, for example loss of potential development value.</p> <p>Also we have no information on what compensation we would be offered if any of our land was to be put under CA or TP.</p> <p>We need all this information to be able to consider the impact of the NtoT plans.</p> <p>Lastly with modern engineering capabilities, we find it hard to believe that these cables can't be put underground as they have been elsewhere where it has been deemed to be more important to do so.</p> |
| Silke Pinson-Roxburgh | 17619 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | National Grid | It will impede on my rights to my own property |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Colin Pinson-Roxburgh Paul Lanham | 17618 539 | Yes Yes | All of the above All of the above | All All land interests at Dukes Farm, [REDACTED] affected by the proposed acquisition of land, acquisition of rights and/or temporary possession. | Both Both | because of the disruption it will cause I object to the proposed interference with my land rights at Dukes Farm, [REDACTED]. The proposed acquisition of rights and/or temporary possession would result in a substantial and disproportionate interference with the operation of my farm business and my use and enjoyment of the land. Dukes Farm is a long-established working agricultural holding. The land affected forms an integral part of the farming operation and supports livestock grazing, a commercial turkey enterprise, agricultural activities and associated business interests. The proposed rights would interfere with the day-to-day management of the farm, impact grazing land, disrupt farming operations and create significant biosecurity concerns associated with third-party access, vehicles and equipment entering the holding. The turkey enterprise operates under strict biosecurity requirements. Any increase in third-party access across the farm presents a significant risk to those operations and to the continued viability of that part of the business. Biosecurity is a critical consideration for livestock enterprises and the proposed rights would introduce ongoing uncertainty and risk. In addition, the proposals would affect areas associated with the fishing lake and surrounding land which form an important part of the wider farm business. Any access associated with the project, whether temporary, permanent, occasional, maintenance-related or otherwise, represents an interference with my land rights and with the normal operation of the farm. The issue is not simply the frequency of access but the imposition of rights over private agricultural land where less harmful alternatives are available. I do not consider that National Grid has demonstrated that the interference with my land rights is necessary or proportionate as required by Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. Alternative access arrangements have been identified and raised during the examination process which would significantly reduce the impact on Dukes Farm and the wider farming business. In these circumstances, I do not believe that a compelling case in the public interest has been demonstrated for the extent of the interference proposed at Dukes Farm. For these reasons, I object to the compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession of rights affecting Dukes Farm and request that the Examining Authority gives full consideration to the alternative access arrangements and the significant impact that the proposed interference would have on my property, farming business and livelihood. |
| Ben Knighton | 3677 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | 1.An extension for drainage from contaminated digging of the trench and laying of cables direct to the brook on our land (which runs to the River Stour) 2.Interruption of land drains, probably irredeemable, leading to loss of fertility and value of cultivable land 3.Raising of clay and stones close to the topsoil, later subsidence of soil over the trench, and soil compaction, leading to loss of fertility and value of cultivable land 4.50m pylons and the cables to the west and east will still daunt the plot 200m from where I was born 5.Permanent structures, above-ground apparatus, tracks, and easements on the plot, which will interfere with agricultural operations |
| Stephen Mugliston | 2253 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | The applicant has failed to explain why the land rights are required for the development or even provide details of what land rights are required. Because of this lack of detail, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there are no alternatives and has made no genuine attempt to negotiate. During a meeting with the applicant's agent, Fisher German, stated that they could not provide any details about the reason for the proposed acquisition, nor could they explain why the applicant needed to acquire any rights over the land. They also stated that "It was unlikely that National Grid would need to compulsory purchase but retained it as a possibility as details of the rights that need to be acquired were not available....." This despite a compulsory acquisition notification being issued. For something described on the "Compulsory land acquisition schedule" as "house and premises," National Grid should have provided more information. The applicant claims a meeting took place to "review discuss and negotiate detailed clauses within Heads of Terms issue v1," but in the absence of adequate information provided by National Grid, no meaningful negotiations took place. The statutory notices do not correlate with the entries in the Land Rights Tracker documentation. There are "land rights" listed on "AENC-TQST-LAN-REP-0002 Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker - Category 1 & 2 interests", that do not appear in the statutory notifications. The email "correspondence" that National Grid claims took place, consists of a variety of statutory notices and notifications and does not constitute a genuine attempt to negotiate. In summary, the applicant's actions to date consist of a deluge of notices and notifications which provide no specific information about the acquisition of rights. Their agent cannot even advise the nature of the rights that National Grid want to acquire. Their approach appears to be a rushed attempt to complete procedural steps without providing detailed, specific information about how the landowner will be affected. As a result, National Grid have been unable to enter into meaningful negotiations and are unable to establish that the proposed acquisition is necessary and proportionate. Other evidence supplied to the Planning Inspectorate has clearly demonstrated that the public benefits for the scheme have been overstated and therefore National Grid cannot effectively assess that the public benefit outweighs the harm to the affected party's property nor are they able to fully explore alternative arrangements that do not involve the compulsory acquisition of rights over the affected land. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| June Elizabeth Mugliston | 2253 24 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | Both | <p>The applicant has failed to explain why the land rights are required for the development or even provide details of what land rights are required. Because of this lack of detail, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there are no alternatives and has made no genuine attempt to negotiate. During a meeting with the applicant's agent, Fisher German, stated that they could not provide any details about the reason for the proposed acquisition, nor could they explain why the applicant needed to acquire any rights over the land. They also stated that "It was unlikely that National Grid would need to compulsory purchase but retained it as a possibility as details of the rights that need to be acquired were not available....." This despite a compulsory acquisition notification being issued.</p> <p>For something described on the "Compulsory land acquisition schedule" as "house and premises," National Grid should have provided more information. The applicant claims a meeting took place to "review discuss and negotiate detailed clauses within Heads of Terms issue v1," but in the absence of adequate information provided by National Grid, no meaningful negotiations took place. The statutory notices do not correlate with the entries in the Land Rights Tracker documentation. There are "land rights" listed on "AENC-TQST-LAN-REP-0002 Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker - Category 1 & 2 Interests", that do not appear in the statutory notifications.</p> <p>The email "correspondence" that National Grid claims took place, consists of a variety of statutory notices and notifications and does not constitute a genuine attempt to negotiate.</p> <p>In summary, the applicant's actions to date consist of a deluge of notices and notifications which provide no specific information about the acquisition of rights. Their agent cannot even advise the nature of the rights that National Grid want to acquire. Their approach appears to be a rushed attempt to complete procedural steps without providing detailed, specific information about how the landowner will be affected. As a result, National Grid have been unable to enter into meaningful negotiations and are unable to establish that the proposed acquisition is necessary and proportionate. Other evidence supplied to the Planning Inspectorate has clearly demonstrated that the public benefits for the scheme have been overstated and therefore National Grid cannot effectively assess that the public benefit outweighs the harm to the affected party's property nor are they able to fully explore alternative arrangements that do not involve the compulsory acquisition of rights over the affected land.</p> |
| The Honourable John Frederick Strutt | 9897 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>REP3-158 and REP1-393 Purpose of Representation The purpose of this representation is to ensure the scheme is designed and implemented in a manner sympathetic to existing land uses, particularly the Estate's ongoing commercial farming and shooting operations. I also highlight concerns with the engagement process, environmental and heritage impacts, and the potential operational impacts of the proposals.</p> <p>Consultation and Engagement The Estate, together with its agent, has engaged extensively with National Grid and Fisher German. A formal response was submitted on 29th July 2025 during the Landowner Consultation, following an extension due to initially incorrect mapping, as well as an additional submission on 26th February 2026. To date, we have not received any substantive response to this submission. The plans provided during consultation were often incorrect and of low resolution, hampering meaningful review and causing significant time and stress.</p> <p>Key Concerns and Harm Caused by the Project Heritage - Significant visual impact on the Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin at Fairstead and Beauchamps House. To avoid detracton from the rural setting, we request the lines be buried. Environment, Habitat, and Species - The project passes near Galley Cable Wood and Troys Spring, which are important wildlife sites. Ground-nesting birds and other species will be affected. Landscape - The project will compound landscape impacts caused by existing 400kV lines. The alignment should, where possible, follow the route of existing lines to minimise new impacts. Proximity to Business - Agricultural workability of fields will be significantly reduced. Sporting rights (shooting operations) will also be severely affected. Breaches of Holford Rules - We have concerns regarding design and routing in relation to Holford Rules, particularly regarding landscape sensitivity. Access Roads - Proposed access roads will have a severe impact on agricultural output and soil compaction. Connection Method - The connection should be either under the sea or underground to minimise surface impacts.</p> <p>Impact on Farming and Shooting Operations The Estate operates a commercial shoot, with two principal drives likely to be affected, potentially making them unviable. National Grid should coordinate with the Estate to avoid shooting seasons during construction and minimise impacts on farming operations. Failure to do so will likely result in financial losses and potential compensation claims.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Solar DCO Interaction The land is subject to an approved DCO for Longfield Solar Farm. There are existing third-party rights. Early engagement between National Grid, Longfield Solar Farm, and the Estate is critical to minimise development conflicts.</p> <p>Access Routes Plan 5111-1: Permanent access should follow the existing track along the field edge, not cut into the field. Plan 5111-2: Permanent access should follow the existing track along the field edge, not cut into the field.</p> <p>Environmental and Landscape Considerations The development will result in landscape, environmental, and heritage impacts. This representation aims to ensure impacts are minimised and appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>Final Note The cumulative burden of the consultation process, poor engagement, and the proposed impacts on the Estate's operations and environment is substantial. We request that these concerns be fully taken into account during the examination.</p> |
| Alan Bruce Marshall | 3513 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>My wife and I have been custodians and farmers of this land for over 45 years. Our land is all grade 1 BMV and should be kept as that. Defra say there is only 3% of this quality in the country. We feel that the nations food security should be taken more into account. The planning act (2008) clearly states that the land requirement must prove there is no alternative especially where grade 1 land is involved. We have seen no proof and have been asking since the first consultation. We have turned down offers from a quarry company as we overly 12m of sand and ballast including silica sand. We have turned down an application for building. This is how strongly we feel! We have looked after it, to the best of our ability, without any doubt for the future and being able to pass it on to our children. They are now of the age they should be discussing their views for the future of our farm but this has now been put on hold for probably 5+ years during the proposed construction and we don't know what devastation we will be left with afterwards! We are a small farm of 78 acres of which the proposed project is claiming 64 acres leaving us one 11 acre field that we are going to struggle to get a contractor interested in servicing. Our fields are edged by ancient hedgerows which provide us our land security. These will apparently be devastated by the proposed project which will also affect the vast amount of wildlife, that we have encouraged, that rely on such hedges. The rights being sought are far wider than necessary for the scheme and the applicant seems to have ignored any constructive feedback from ourselves and other landowners. The applicant has not demonstrated to us that they have considered any alternatives schemes. The applicant is asking for us to sign Heads of Terms that are unfair and contain unreasonable restrictions. The cash incentives look like a bribe to get us to sign but then find we are no longer able to comment on the scheme!</p> |
| EDF Energy Renewables Ltd | 15477 | Yes | All of the above | A-1/42, A-1/43, A-1/44, A-1/45, A-1/46, A-3/9, A-3/14, A-3/15, A-4/7, B-4/85, B-5/29, B-5/33, B-5/38, B-5/39, B-5/40, B-5/41, B-5/42, B-5/43, B-5/44, B-5/45, B-5/50, B-5/52, B-5/53, B-5/55, B-5/56, B-5/57, B-5/58, B-5/60, B-5/62, B-5/72, B-5/82, B-5/90, B-5/92, B-5/93, B-5/96, B-5/97, B-5/99, B-5/102, B-5/103, B-5/104, B-5/105, B-5/106, B-5/110, B-5/112, B-5/113, B-6/1, B-6/4, B-6/5, B-6/6, B-6/8, B-6/11, B-6/15, B-20/107, B-20/108, B-20/109, B-20/113, B-20/114, B-20/118, B-20/121, B-20/125, B-20/133, B-20/135, B-20/136, B-20/137, B-20/138, B-20/142, B-20/143, B-20/145, B-20/147, B-20/148, B-20/149, B-20/150, B- | Both | <p>Paragraph 8 of the Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" (September 2013) ("the Guidance") provides that the Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored. The Guidance further states that the applicant will need to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored, as required by the Guidance, principally because negotiations are at a very early stage and alternative designs or routes have not been properly considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made adequate attempts to acquire the land and rights by agreement before seeking compulsory acquisition powers, contrary to the expectation set out in paragraph 25 of the Guidance that authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. Agreement has not yet been reached, and the Applicant has not afforded our client a proper opportunity to negotiate terms that could avoid the need for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed scheme on EDF Energy Renewable's infrastructure have not been adequately considered by the Applicant. The Applicant has not engaged sufficiently to understand the nature and extent of the impact on EDF Energy Renewable's infrastructure, nor has it properly assessed the consequences that the proposed compulsory acquisition would have upon the operation and maintenance of that infrastructure. Without adequate engagement, the Applicant cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the interference the land and rights is proportionate, or that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.</p> <p>In conclusion, many of the impacts of the proposed scheme on its land and infrastructure might be avoided, or substantially mitigated, if private treaty discussions had been advanced at an earlier stage and in a more meaningful manner. Had the Applicant engaged constructively with our client through private treaty negotiations, it is likely that mutually acceptable arrangements could have been reached that would protect our client's infrastructure whilst accommodating the requirements of the scheme. The Applicant's failure to pursue this course means that it has not discharged the burden of demonstrating that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate, and the Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 are met. We will continue to engage in negotiations with the Applicant and will update the Examining Authority on the status of negotiations as they progress.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Pivoted Power LLP | 20342 | Yes | All of the above | A-1/2, A-1/7, A-1/53, B-20/188, B-20/189, B-20/190, B-20/194, B-20/196, B-20/198, B-20/200, B-20/203, B-20/208, B-20/213, B-20/221, B-20/229, B-20/230, B-20/232, B-20/233, B-20/234, B-20/237, B-20/239, B-20/242, B-20/243, B-20/244, B-20/246, B-20/247, B-20/249, B-20/253, B-20/257, B-20/258, B-20/259, B-20/260 | Both | <p>Paragraph 8 of the Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" (September 2013) ("the Guidance") provides that the Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored. The Guidance further states that the applicant will need to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored, as required by the Guidance, principally because negotiations are at a very early stage and alternative designs or routes have not been properly considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made adequate attempts to acquire the land and rights by agreement before seeking compulsory acquisition powers, contrary to the expectation set out in paragraph 25 of the Guidance that authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. Agreement has not yet been reached, and the Applicant has not afforded our client a proper opportunity to negotiate terms that could avoid the need for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed scheme on Pivoted Power LLP's infrastructure have not been adequately considered by the Applicant. The Applicant has not engaged sufficiently to understand the nature and extent of the impact on Pivoted Power LLP's infrastructure, nor has it properly assessed the consequences that the proposed compulsory acquisition would have upon the operation and maintenance of that infrastructure. Without adequate engagement, the Applicant cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the interference the land and rights is proportionate, or that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.</p> <p>In conclusion, many of the impacts of the proposed scheme on its land and infrastructure might be avoided, or substantially mitigated, if private treaty discussions had been advanced at an earlier stage and in a more meaningful manner. Had the Applicant engaged constructively with our client through private treaty negotiations, it is likely that mutually acceptable arrangements could have been reached that would protect our client's infrastructure whilst accommodating the requirements of the scheme. The Applicant's failure to pursue this course means that it has not discharged the burden of demonstrating that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate, and the Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 are met. We will continue to engage in negotiations with the Applicant and will update the Examining Authority on the status of negotiations as they progress.</p> |
| Ashgreen Energyfarm Limited | 15917 | Yes | All of the above | A-1/2, A-1/7, A-1/53, A-1/56, A-1/57, A-2/12, A-2/14, A-2/21, A-2/31, A-2/45, A-2/46 | Both | <p>Paragraph 8 of the Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" (September 2013) ("the Guidance") provides that the Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored. The Guidance further states that the applicant will need to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored, as required by the Guidance, principally because negotiations are at a very early stage and alternative designs or routes have not been properly considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made adequate attempts to acquire the land and rights by agreement before seeking compulsory acquisition powers, contrary to the expectation set out in paragraph 25 of the Guidance that authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. Agreement has not yet been reached, and the Applicant has not afforded our client a proper opportunity to negotiate terms that could avoid the need for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed scheme on Ashgreen Energyfarm Limited's infrastructure have not been adequately considered by the Applicant. The Applicant has not engaged sufficiently to understand the nature and extent of the impact on Ashgreen Energyfarm Limited's infrastructure, nor has it properly assessed the consequences that the proposed compulsory acquisition would have upon the operation and maintenance of that infrastructure. Without adequate engagement, the Applicant cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the interference the land and rights is proportionate, or that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.</p> <p>In conclusion, many of the impacts of the proposed scheme on its land and infrastructure might be avoided, or substantially mitigated, if private treaty discussions had been advanced at an earlier stage and in a more meaningful manner. Had the Applicant engaged constructively with our client through private treaty negotiations, it is likely that mutually acceptable arrangements could have been reached that would protect our client's infrastructure whilst accommodating the requirements of the scheme. The Applicant's failure to pursue this course means that it has not discharged the burden of demonstrating that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate, and the Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 are met. We will continue to engage in negotiations with the Applicant and will update the Examining Authority on the status of negotiations as they progress.</p> |
| W Bradshaw & Son C/o David William Bradshaw | 7196 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The Consultations have been defective - see Legal Opinion of Lord Charles Banner QC submitted by Essex Suffolk Norfolk campaign group who found numerous legal deficiencies in National Grid's approach to the consultations arguing it falls well short of adequate pre-application consultation sufficient to enable a Development Consent Order application to proceed to examination. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Longfield Solar Energy Farm Limited | 25194 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | E-6/31, E-6/32, E-6/38, E-6/39, E-6/40, E-6/42, E-6/43, E-8/1, E-8/2, E-8/3 | Both | <p>Paragraph 8 of the Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" (September 2013) ("the Guidance") provides that the Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored. The Guidance further states that the applicant will need to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored, as required by the Guidance, principally because negotiations are at a very early stage and alternative designs or routes have not been properly considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made adequate attempts to acquire the land and rights by agreement before seeking compulsory acquisition powers, contrary to the expectation set out in paragraph 25 of the Guidance that authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. Agreement has not yet been reached, and the Applicant has not afforded our client a proper opportunity to negotiate terms that could avoid the need for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed scheme on Longfield Solar Energy Farm Limited's infrastructure have not been adequately considered by the Applicant. The Applicant has not engaged sufficiently to understand the nature and extent of the impact on Longfield Solar Energy Farm Limited's infrastructure, nor has it properly assessed the consequences that the proposed compulsory acquisition would have upon the operation and maintenance of that infrastructure. Without adequate engagement, the Applicant cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the interference the land and rights is proportionate, or that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.</p> <p>In conclusion, many of the impacts of the proposed scheme on its land and infrastructure might be avoided, or substantially mitigated, if private treaty discussions had been advanced at an earlier stage and in a more meaningful manner. Had the Applicant engaged constructively with our client through private treaty negotiations, it is likely that mutually acceptable arrangements could have been reached that would protect our client's infrastructure whilst accommodating the requirements of the scheme. The Applicant's failure to pursue this course means that it has not discharged the burden of demonstrating that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate, and the Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 are met. We will continue to engage in negotiations with the Applicant and will update the Examining Authority on the status of negotiations as they progress.</p> |
| DamsonGreen Energyfarm Limited | 29271 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Temporary possession | B-20/176, B-20/186, B-20/187, B-20/192, B-20/193 | National Grid | <p>Paragraph 8 of the Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" (September 2013) ("the Guidance") provides that the Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored. The Guidance further states that the applicant will need to demonstrate that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, and that it is necessary and proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been explored, as required by the Guidance, principally because negotiations are at a very early stage and alternative designs or routes have not been properly considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made adequate attempts to acquire the land and rights by agreement before seeking compulsory acquisition powers, contrary to the expectation set out in paragraph 25 of the Guidance that authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. Agreement has not yet been reached, and the Applicant has not afforded our client a proper opportunity to negotiate terms that could avoid the need for compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed scheme on DamsonGreen Energyfarm Limited's infrastructure have not been adequately considered by the Applicant. The Applicant has not engaged sufficiently to understand the nature and extent of the impact on DamsonGreen Energyfarm Limited's infrastructure, nor has it properly assessed the consequences that the proposed compulsory acquisition would have upon the operation and maintenance of that infrastructure. Without adequate engagement, the Applicant cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the interference the land and rights is proportionate, or that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.</p> <p>In conclusion, many of the impacts of the proposed scheme on its land and infrastructure might be avoided, or substantially mitigated, if private treaty discussions had been advanced at an earlier stage and in a more meaningful manner. Had the Applicant engaged constructively with our client through private treaty negotiations, it is likely that mutually acceptable arrangements could have been reached that would protect our client's infrastructure whilst accommodating the requirements of the scheme. The Applicant's failure to pursue this course means that it has not discharged the burden of demonstrating that compulsory acquisition is necessary and proportionate, and the Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that the conditions in section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 are met. We will continue to engage in negotiations with the Applicant and will update the Examining Authority on the status of negotiations as they progress.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Mrs Jayne Bridget Marshall | 5883 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | ALL | Both | <p>Our family run farm has provided us with a steady income, security and a much loved home in a rural environment that we have managed and cared for with dedication for +40 years. Our home is our safe place and where we work, rest and enjoy time with family and friends. The thought of losing this is upsetting and a constant worry, to say the least! It belongs to us!</p> <p>Our plans for our children to take over the farm in future years will offer no incentive for them to do so if pylons, overhead high voltage cables and underground HVAC cabling are to blight our land and take over the area as they currently know it. All our land is of finest quality Grade 1 BMV soil (approximately only 3% nationwide), which enables high volumes of good quality staple diet crops (eg wheat, barley, potatoes, sugarbeet) to be grown on it. Maintaining sustainable returns for us, whilst contributing also to our country's all important food chain (National Food Security) is of massive importance to us. During the proposed construction period, our 45 year old bramley apple orchard would be affected by dust, resulting in smaller fruit size, surface contamination and a crop not fit for sale. Our land structure will never recover! We are totally opposed to the use of any soil stabilization materials, as has been suggested! Our property will be open and vulnerable to trespassing and fly tipping if our ancient hedgerows are ripped out (some with tree preservation orders in place). These provide much natural security. Insurance premiums are likely to increase (extra cost to us) if security is compromised. National grid's (NG) proposals to upgrade its grid system (Norwich to Tilbury) now threaten everything we, as a family have worked hard for, and just the thought of what's planned is indescribably sickening! The proposals contradict the Planning Act of 2008 (section 122) and where it states that applicants (in this case, National Grid) must demonstrate that they have explored all other alternatives to ensure compulsory acquisition is a last resort and kept to the absolute minimum. To date, National Grid has failed to provide us with any alternative options, failed to answer questions and many of its representatives are often arrogant and dismissive. National Grid's consultations have been defective throughout, there are fundamental errors in the DCO and as an example, we are still waiting for results from all survey works carried out on our land thus far, despite having asked on numerous occasions. Where are these results? Most of our land will be ruined beyond repair (3 pylons and 200 meter swathes for HVAC underground cabling) if this project is granted planning consent. One remaining field (so we thought) of 11 acres will be difficult to manage efficiently and cost effectively. We have, in the last few days, been informed by our land agent that Fisher German (on behalf of NG) now want to survey this field also, which is outside of the order limit. Why is it that NG seems to be doing just as it pleases? I question why changes to an already submitted DCO application should be permitted, as has been the case on numerous occasions? It's undemocratic, unfair and unacceptable! Our entire land/property will be devalued! Relocation is not an option! You cannot move a farm and we also have another business on site. Compulsory acquisition is not in the interest of the public when alternative methods of upgrading the system haven't been considered. We have, in the past, rejected offers from housing developers to purchase some of our land. We know we have at least 12 meters of sand and ballast beneath our fine topsoil, yet we've declined the opportunity to excavate; for the simple reason that Farmland is For Food! We will still be expected to pay our annual land drainage charge to the Environment Agency, as will most of the affected landowners. This hasn't been mentioned! The Heads of Terms are unreasonable and should be considered bribery! A case of 'signing prior to a DCO being consented and receive an early-signing incentive payment' (up to 20% land fights value), or forfeit this by refusing. By signing, we will be unable to make further comments about the proposal (in other words....Sign up and shut up). These are bully-boy tactics! The applicant (NG) hasn't demonstrated that interference is necessary, proportionate or limited to what is reasonably required. We feel we can't plan for the future, invest in solar panels for a new barn we built, erect new fencing, plant a foraging woodland (as we had hoped to do) or invest in new equipment. In conclusion: Our farm is our life! We ALL need food, and in order to provide it, we must protect the land upon which it grows!</p> |
| Cullum Agric Ltd | 5577 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | Both | <p>This submission is made on behalf of T A Cullum and is based upon the detailed written representations submitted at Deadline 4 for CAH2.</p> <p>This Landowner objects to the proposed compulsory acquisition (CA) on the basis that the Applicant has not met the statutory tests under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor followed the 2013 DCLG Guidance.</p> <p>Under Section 122, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the land and rights are necessary or justified. The land take is considered excessive, with inclusion of areas beyond what is required or feasible, and reasonable alternatives, such as route changes or undergrounding, have not been properly explored. In addition, key technical matters remain unresolved, meaning the full impacts cannot be understood, while harm to the farming business is significant and may outweigh any benefits.</p> <p>Under Section 123, the proposals lack sufficient clarity and definition, particularly in relation to access, easements, and working areas, and are supported by incomplete and fragmented information.</p> <p>The Applicant has also not complied with the 2013 Guidance, with no agreed Heads of Terms, inconsistent engagement, limited effort to minimise land take, and inadequate supporting evidence. Compulsory acquisition has not been demonstrated to be a last resort.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals would result in long term and permanent agricultural land loss, operational disruption, and long-term business impacts, which have not been adequately mitigated.</p> <p>By way of an update a meeting has been arranged with the Applicant and their agent on 19 June to progress ongoing negotiations regarding the Heads of Terms.</p> <p>To conclude while not objecting to the scheme in principle, the landowner considers compulsory acquisition premature and unjustified, and therefore objects to the exercise of CA powers at this stage.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| T A Cullum Contracting Ltd | 24776 | Yes | Temporary possession, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | All | National Grid | <p>The landowner objects to the proposed compulsory acquisition (CA) on the basis that the Applicant has not met the statutory tests under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor followed the 2013 DCLG Guidance.</p> <p>Under Section 122, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the land and rights are necessary or justified. The land take is considered excessive, with inclusion of areas beyond what is required, and reasonable alternatives, such as route changes or undergrounding, have not been properly explored. In addition, key technical matters remain unresolved, meaning the full impacts cannot be understood, while harm to the farming business is significant and outweighs any benefits.</p> <p>Under Section 123, the proposals lack sufficient clarity and definition, particularly in relation to access, easements, and working areas, and are supported by incomplete and fragmented information.</p> <p>The Applicant has also not complied with the 2013 Guidance, with no agreed Heads of Terms, inconsistent engagement, limited effort to minimise land take, and inadequate supporting evidence. Compulsory acquisition has not been demonstrated to be a last resort.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals would result in long term and permanent agricultural land loss, operational disruption, and long-term business impacts, which have not been adequately mitigated.</p> <p>By way of an update a meeting has been arranged with the Applicant and their agent on 19 June to progress ongoing negotiations regarding the Heads of Terms.</p> <p>To conclude while not objecting to the scheme in principle, the landowner considers compulsory acquisition premature and unjustified, and therefore objects to the exercise of CA powers at this stage.</p> |
| Norwich Diocesan Board of Finance Limited | 10177 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | National Grid | <p>This submission is made on behalf of the Norwich Diocesan Board of Finance Limited and is based upon the detailed Written Representation submitted at Deadline 4 for CAH2.</p> <p>Our client objects to the proposed compulsory acquisition (CA) on the basis that the Applicant has not met the statutory tests under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor followed the 2013 DCLG Guidance.</p> <p>Under Section 122, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the land and rights are necessary or justified. The land take is considered excessive, with inclusion of areas beyond what is required, and reasonable alternatives, such as route changes or undergrounding, have not been properly explored. In addition, key technical matters remain unresolved, meaning the full impacts cannot be understood, while harm to the farming business is significant and outweigh any benefits.</p> <p>Under Section 123, the proposals lack sufficient clarity and definition, particularly in relation to access, easements, and working areas, and are supported by incomplete and fragmented information.</p> <p>The Applicant has also not complied with the 2013 Guidance, with no agreed Heads of Terms, inconsistent engagement, limited effort to minimise land take, and inadequate supporting evidence. Compulsory acquisition has not been demonstrated to be a last resort.</p> <p>The Applicant has further failed to properly address occupier interests, where land is subject to agricultural tenancies. It is inappropriate to expect the landowner to negotiate on the Applicant's behalf, and this omission creates additional uncertainty, contrary to the Guidance requirement to identify and address all land interests.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals would result in long term and permanent agricultural land loss, operational disruption, and long-term business impacts, which have not been adequately mitigated.</p> <p>By way of an update a meeting has been arranged with the Applicant and their agent on 19 June to progress ongoing negotiations regarding the Heads of Terms.</p> <p>To conclude while not objecting to the scheme in principle, the landowner considers compulsory acquisition premature and unjustified, and therefore objects to the exercise of CA powers at this stage.</p> |
| D N Grady & Sons Ltd | 10516 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | Both | <p>This submission is made on behalf of D N Grady Ltd and is based upon the detailed written representations submitted at Deadline 4 for CAH2.</p> <p>The landowner objects to the proposed compulsory acquisition (CA) on the basis that the Applicant has not met the statutory tests under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, nor followed the 2013 DCLG Guidance.</p> <p>Under Section 122, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the land and rights are necessary or justified. The land take is considered excessive, with inclusion of areas beyond what is required, and reasonable alternatives, such as route changes or undergrounding, have not been properly explored. In addition, key technical matters remain unresolved, meaning the full impacts cannot be understood, while harm to the farming business is significant and outweighs any benefits.</p> <p>Under Section 123, the proposals lack sufficient clarity and definition, particularly in relation to access, easements, and working areas, and are supported by incomplete and fragmented information.</p> <p>The Applicant has also not complied with the 2013 Guidance, with no agreed Heads of Terms, inconsistent engagement, limited effort to minimise land take, and inadequate supporting evidence. Compulsory acquisition has not been demonstrated to be a last resort.</p> <p>The Applicant has further failed to properly address the occupier interests, where the land is subject to agricultural tenancy. It is inappropriate to expect the landowner to negotiate on the Applicant's behalf, and this omission creates additional uncertainty, contrary to the Guidance requirement to identify and address all land interests.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals would result in long term and permanent agricultural land loss, operational disruption, and long-term business impacts, which have not been adequately mitigated.</p> <p>By way of an update a meeting has been arranged with the Applicant and their agent on 19 June to progress ongoing negotiations regarding the Heads of Terms.</p> <p>To conclude while not objecting to the scheme in principle, the landowner considers compulsory acquisition premature and unjustified, and therefore objects to the exercise of CA powers at this stage.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Katherine S Lee | 25468 9410 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | UK Power Networks | <p>This submission is made on behalf of Katherine Lee and in her role as Personal Representative to the Estate of Michael Lee and is based upon the detailed Written Representation submitted at Deadline 4 for CAH2.</p> <p>The landowner is affected only by third-party utility works and objects to the interference with the land and rights on the basis that the Applicant has failed to satisfy the statutory requirements of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, and has not complied with the principles of the DCLG Guidance (September 2013). Under Section 122, there is no compelling case, with insufficient clarity on third-party utility works, limited engagement, and failure to properly consider a less impactful alternative route. The land and rights sought have not been shown to be necessary or proportionate, and impacts on farming operations have not been minimised. Under Section 123, the proposals lack clarity and completeness, with uncertainty over land take, temporary possession, construction activities, and reinstatement. Supporting information is fragmented and high-level, preventing proper assessment. The Applicant has also not complied with Guidance, having failed to treat compulsory acquisition as a last resort, properly consider alternatives, provide a robust evidence base, or minimise impacts. The scheme would cause temporary land loss, disruption to farming, and long-term business impacts, which have not been adequately mitigated and are therefore disproportionate. By way of an update UKPN's agents have now offered a meeting to discuss outstanding matters, however, issues relating to coordination, routing, and impacts remain unresolved, and this does not overcome the fundamental deficiencies identified above. Overall, compulsory acquisition is premature and unjustified, as the scheme is not sufficiently defined, impacts remain unclear, and meaningful engagement has not taken place.</p> |
| 2 Agriculture Growing Limited | 15476 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | ALL | Both | <p>This objection is submitted on behalf of 2 Agriculture Growing Ltd and is based on the detailed written representations provided at Deadline 4 for CAH2, which set out the landowner's concerns in full. Our client is affected by third-party utility works and objects on the basis that the Applicant has failed to satisfy the statutory requirements of Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008, and has not complied with the principles of the DCLG Guidance (September 2013). Under Section 122, there is no compelling case, with insufficient clarity on third-party utility works, limited engagement, and failure to properly consider a less impactful alternative route. The land and rights sought have not been shown to be necessary or proportionate, and impacts on farming operations have not been minimised. There has been a failure to engage with the occupier's interests, as a tenant operating a poultry unit. The Applicant has not shown that the land and rights sought are necessary or proportionate, nor that reasonable steps have been taken to acquire them by agreement. The absence of engagement and clarity around occupier rights undermines the case that compulsory acquisition is justified. The proposals lack clarity and completeness, particularly in relation to the rights sought and how occupiers' legal interests will be secured. There is no clear framework setting out how engagement will take place or what is expected of affected parties, leaving the tenant in a position of uncertainty and preventing meaningful negotiation. The Applicant has also failed to comply with the 2013 Guidance, including not demonstrating compulsory acquisition as a last resort, by failing to engage meaningfully with our client. The scheme presents a risk of significant disruption to an operational poultry business, with potential impacts not yet properly understood or addressed due to lack of engagement and clarity. By way of an update UKPN's agents have now offered a meeting to discuss outstanding matters, however, issues relating to coordination, routing, and impacts remain unresolved, and this does not overcome the fundamental deficiencies identified above. Overall, compulsory acquisition is premature and unjustified, as the Applicant has not properly engaged with our client, has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable steps have been taken to secure agreement, and has not provided sufficient clarity on the rights sought or impacts of the scheme.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| East Anglia Three Limited | 20335 | Yes | All of the above | B-20/174, B-20/179, B-20/181, B-20/182, B-20/183, B-20/185, B-20/191, B-20/195, B-20/197, B-20/199, B-20/202, B-20/204, B-20/205. | National Grid | <p>Note plot B-20/180 appears to be marked for compulsory acquisition on EN020027-002892-2.2 Land Plans – Section B, Revision C however is not marked for compulsory acquisition under the Book of Reference, this is to be clarified. In any event, it is marked in the Book of Reference for temporary possession, to which we object. East Anglia Three Limited ("EA3L") is the developer of a consented Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project comprising offshore wind generation and associated onshore transmission infrastructure, and is directly affected by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>NGET seek CA and TP powers over land owned by ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited ("SPRUKL"), EA3L's direct owner, in which EA3L has various rights. The compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land owned by SPRUKL, in combination with powers sought under Articles 14 and 16 of the draft DCO to temporarily close Bullen Lane, would put EA3, a critical national infrastructure project, at risk. Bullen Lane is the only access road leading to the EA3 substation, and then to the access track used to access the SuDs pond for the EA3 substation. It is therefore vital that 24/7 uninterrupted access to the EA3 substation via Bullen Lane is maintained for fire and safety reasons, as well as to ensure the continued maintenance of the EA3 substation and SuDs pond, which are vital parts of the overall EA3 windfarm operation.</p> <p>While EA3L does not object to the principle of reinforcing the electricity transmission network, it objects to the extent and justification of the powers sought over its interests. In particular, EA3L submits that the Applicant has failed to comply with the requirements of Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance (September 2013) on compulsory acquisition. Section 122(2) requires that land or rights may only be acquired where they are necessary for the development or to facilitate it, and Section 122(3) requires a compelling case in the public interest.</p> <p>EA3L's position is that the Applicant has not demonstrated that the extent of CA and TP powers being sought, which would allow the Applicant to exclude EA3L from using Bullen Lane, the access road to the EA3 substation, and the access track to the SuDs pond, rights is necessary. The extent of rights sought is not limited to the minimum required but instead risks imposing excessive and unjustified restrictions on EA3L's ability to access, operate and maintain its infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, although EA3L recognises the general public benefits associated with the Proposed Development as transmission infrastructure, the Applicant has not demonstrated a compelling case in the public interest in respect of the specific interference with EA3L's interests, as required by Section 122(3). The assessment of public interest must consider the balance between the benefits of the scheme and the harm caused, and in this case there has been insufficient consideration of the cumulative interaction between two nationally significant infrastructure projects. EA3's infrastructure contributes to national renewable energy generation and decarbonisation objectives, and any restriction on its operation, maintenance or future development has the potential to undermine those objectives.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has not satisfied the requirements of the DCLG Guidance (paragraphs 8-10), which makes clear that compulsory acquisition should only be used where there is a compelling justification, that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered and that the extent of acquisition is proportionate. The Guidance requires that applicants minimise interference and use compulsory powers only as a last resort following reasonable negotiation. In this case, EA3L considers that the rights sought are disproportionate, that insufficient steps have been taken to minimise the extent of interference and that meaningful agreement has not yet been achieved. The proposals risk imposing safeguarding constraints and operational limitations.</p> <p>The principles underlying Section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 are also engaged, given the nature of EA3L's infrastructure as nationally important critical energy infrastructure. Those principles require that the Secretary of State cannot authorise the compulsory acquisition of statutory undertakers' land where this would cause serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking. EA3 holds an interest in the listed plots for the purposes of carrying on the construction and operation of the EA3 offshore windfarm. EA3 is significantly concerned that the Proposed Development will result in serious detriment to the carrying on of the construction and operation of the EA3 offshore windfarm by restricting access to the EA3 substation and its SuDs pond for maintenance and emergency works, increasing safety risks and imposing operational inefficiencies. The EA3 substation is a vital part of the overall windfarm operation, which is wholly dependent on the operation and function of the EA3 substation.</p> <p>Finally, EA3L considers that there has been insufficient engagement and negotiation in accordance with the DCLG Guidance (paragraph 25), which requires applicants to seek agreement wherever possible and to use compulsory acquisition only as a measure of last resort. While discussions have taken place, they have not resulted in agreed protective provisions or coexistence arrangements sufficient to safeguard EA3L's interests, and the Applicant's reliance on compulsory powers is therefore premature. Accordingly, EA3L objects to the compulsory acquisition powers sought over its rights.</p> |
| Hugh French / Guy French / Rockbrook Ltd / James French / E French & Sons | 14142 | Yes | All of the above | All. | Both | We object to land or any being compulsorily acquired. National Grid should engage in meaningful negotiations with landowners over any land rights they require. Our Agents have advised there are various aspects to these negotiations which are reasonable comprises by the landowner, that National Grid is currently not agreeing to. |
| Hugh French / Guy French / James French | 2746 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We object to land or rights being compulsorily acquired. National Grid should engage in meaningful negotiations with landowners over any land rights they require. Our Agents have advised there are various aspects to these negotiations which are reasonable comprises by the landowner, that National Grid is currently not agreeing to. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| East Anglia One Limited | 13598 | Yes | All of the above | B-20/174, B-20/179, B-20/181, B-20/182, B-20/183, B-20/185, B-20/191, B-20/195, B-20/197, B-20/199, B-20/202, B-20/204, B-20/205. | National Grid | Note plot B-20/180 appears to be marked for compulsory acquisition on EN020027-002892-2.2 Land Plans – Section B, Revision C however is not marked for compulsory acquisition under the Book of Reference, this is to be clarified. In any event, it is marked in the Book of Reference for temporary possession, to which we object. East Anglia One Limited ("EA1L") is the developer of a consented Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project offshore wind generation and associated onshore transmission infrastructure, and is directly affected by the Proposed Development. NGET seek CA and TP powers over land owned by ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited ("SPRUKL"), EA1L's direct owner, in which EA1L has various rights and generation assets within EA1's substation compound. The compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land owned by SPRUKL, in combination with powers sought under Articles 14 and 16 of the draft DCO to temporarily close Bullen Lane, would put EA1, a critical national infrastructure project, at risk. Bullen Lane is the only access road leading to the EA1 substation, where EA1L still holds generation assets within. It is therefore vital that 24/7 uninterrupted access to the EA1 substation via Bullen Lane is maintained for fire and safety reasons, as well as to ensure the continued maintenance of the EA1 substation, which are vital parts of the overall EA1 windfarm operation. While EA1L does not object to the principle of reinforcing the electricity transmission network, it objects to the extent and justification of the powers sought over its interests. EA1L's position is that the Applicant has not demonstrated that the extent of CA and TP powers being sought, which would allow the Applicant to exclude EA1L from using Bullen Lane, the access road to the EA1 substation, rights is necessary. The extent of rights sought is not limited to the minimum required but instead risks imposing excessive and unjustified restrictions on EA1L's ability to access, operate and maintain its infrastructure. The principles underlying Section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 are also engaged, given the nature of EA1L's infrastructure as nationally important critical energy infrastructure. Those principles require that the Secretary of State cannot authorise the compulsory acquisition of statutory undertakers' land where this would cause serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking. EA1 holds an interest in the listed plots for the purposes of carrying on the operation of the EA1 offshore windfarm. EA1 is significantly concerned that the Proposed Development will result in serious detriment to the carrying on of the operation of the EA1 offshore windfarm by restricting access to the EA1L's generation assets within the EA1 substation for maintenance and emergency works, increasing safety risks and imposing operational inefficiencies. The EA1 generation assets within the substation are a vital part of the overall windfarm operation, which is wholly dependent on the operation and function of the EA1 substation. |
| Margaret Eileen Hamilton | 9148 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | The recent paperwork appearing to outline plans for compulsory acquisition & holding by the operator after the construction project, when typically landowners provide easement rights for access and maintenance, requires clarification on case-by-case basis because CA of significant areas of land will affect agricultural activities for many parties including ourselves. |
| Stephen Chantry | 1857 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | apart from all the objections with regards the desecration of the countryside, wildlife, our family home worth nothing, the affects on the local community whilst work is carried out, road capabilities as we are always having floods, and that none of our concerns are looked into by national grid???, there are better ways underground or offshore. SITE SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS: national grids plans show that part of our garden/paddock lie just east of TB207. This is a area where there are ancient oaks,centuries old supporting a large range of wildlife, they are irreplaceable part of the local ecosystem. IMPACT ON STABLES AND HORSE WELFARE: near the affected area there are stables, during construction it would impact and distress the horses, noise, vibration and site activity could be disastrous. national grid have failed to demonstrate the need, the applicants justification under NPS EN-1 AND EN5 is weak. They have not adequately consider alternatives, use existing power lines or update them, go underground, offshore???. ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY , this has not been taken into consideration. Landscape and Heritage: We live in a listed building and the land is in the curtilage of this, placing a 50 metre pylon will totally obliterate the whole point of importance in the heritage and listed system. My family have all been affected by this proposal, my wife stressed and anxious now taking medication how can this be fair?. As far as ED milband criticising (NIMBYs) as he calls people it has now come to light that his own wife fought against a proposal that would affect their home and it is not going ahead now??? how two faced is that. PLEASE RE THINK THIS SCHEME. KIND REGARDS STEPHEN CHANTRY |
| LIH Dunton Hills Limited (c/o Agents BTSurveyors) | 29095 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights,Temporary possession | All, excluding plot 6/127 | National Grid | This response is a summary of LIH Dunton Hills Ltd's (LIH) position on interference with its land interests. A fuller explanation of these issues is set out in the Representations dated November 2025 submitted by BTS on behalf of LIH. LIH's primary concern relates to the proposed CA of rights for the works relating to Pylon TB 229 (in particular, plot G-6/133). As currently proposed, rights are sought over a wide area, and the exercise of the rights risks sterilising some land intended for residential development, and therefore may impact on the delivery of LIH's Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) project. This potential conflict between the NTT project and LIH's developable land, and the extent of the interference with LIH's interests, is disproportionate and is not properly justified. This is particularly the case given that, based on discussions between the Applicant and LIH, design solutions may be available which would limit the impact on LIH's interests. LIH welcomes the engagement of the Applicant and progress towards agreeing Heads of Terms for an agreement between the parties. The agreement is expected to include obligations which seek to address LIH's concerns through the detailed design process, including reviewing the works and location for Pylon TB229 to avoid or minimise material impacts on DHGV. Until terms are agreed, LIH maintains its objection to the proposed CA powers. LIH does not object to the CA powers sought for diversion of the UKPN overhead 132 kV cables (PSC 3-7) but still intends to agree terms for voluntary acquisition of those rights. |
| SBS Spares Ltd | 3623 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | We object to the rights being taken by compulsion. We are not against entering into a voluntary agreement and commencing in commercial negotiations with UK Power and /or National Grid or their agents. As you are aware we have appointed Landbridge land agents, Rivers Court, High Street, Sproughton, Ipswich IP8 3AP to act on our behalf. Future correspondence on this should be directed to them FAO Will Barton |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Bianca Moller Robert Moore | 4235 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>I object to the proposed project for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Failure to properly consider alternatives to pylons The applicant has failed to adequately consider alternatives to the use of pylons for this project. Less intrusive options appear to exist, but these have not been properly assessed, explained, or justified.</p> <p>2) Failure to consider less harmful alternatives The proposal does not demonstrate that the least damaging or least intrusive option has been selected. The applicant has not shown that alternative routes, technologies, mitigation measures, or methods of delivery have been fully explored in order to reduce the impact on affected landowners, businesses, homes, and livelihoods.</p> <p>3) Disproportionate private loss and human rights impact The proposed project would cause very significant private loss and would have a serious impact on the rights and livelihoods of affected landowners and businesses. In our case, the proposed power lines would cross our farm and would cause substantial harm to our business, including the destruction of a wedding venue, which is the small farm's main source of income. This impact is severe, personal, and disproportionate. The harm to land, businesses, income, and way of life outweighs any public benefit that the applicant claims would arise from the project.</p> <p>4) Lack of a compelling case in the public interest The applicant has failed to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest for this project in its proposed form. There has been insufficient justification for why the project must proceed using pylons, why this route has been selected, and why less intrusive alternatives have not been pursued.</p> <p>5) Insufficient pre-application work and inadequate consultation Prior to submitting the DCO application, the applicant failed to carry out sufficient detailed preparatory work, particularly in relation to consultation and engagement with affected landowners.</p> <p>6) We have been trying to address the issue of the proposed power lines crossing our farm with the applicant for three years. Despite this, we have received limited feedback and there has been no meaningful progress towards resolving our concerns. This demonstrates inadequate engagement, poor communication, and a failure to properly consult with those most directly affected.</p> <p>7) Inadequate engagement and negotiation The applicant has not engaged with us in a constructive or meaningful way. Given the scale of the impact on our farm and business, we would have expected detailed discussions, proper negotiation, and genuine attempts to reduce or avoid the harm caused. This has not happened. I imagine many other businesses / farms have similar concerns</p> <p>8) Compensation concerns We have serious concerns about whether affected parties will receive fair, adequate, and timely compensation. The damage to our business and livelihood would be substantial, and to date there has been no communication from the applicant about how losses will be assessed, how compensation will be calculated, and when compensation would be paid.</p> <p>9) No heads of terms or voluntary agreement No heads of terms or voluntary agreement has been signed. This is due to the lack of meaningful engagement and negotiation by the applicant. The absence of agreed terms further demonstrates that the applicant has not properly addressed the impact of the project on our land and business.</p> <p>For these reasons, I object to the application. I ask that the Examining Authority gives significant weight to the severe impact on our farm, business, livelihood, and property rights, and requires the applicant to properly consider less intrusive alternatives before any consent is granted.</p> |
| Jeremy Nicholas John Sheppard | 2976 | Yes | All of the above | F-6/24, F-6/27 | Both | <p>My wife and I own the freehold on Braddocks, a residential property situated on Mashbury Road, Chignal St James. The property is approximately 160 metres north of the proposed line of pylons and a crossing point for the haul road. Two plots of land on the property are the subject of compulsory acquisition. Firstly, a narrow strip of land forming the roadside margin which has been aggregated with other land to form plot F-6/24. Secondly, an area of approximately 72 sq metres contained within the boundary of the property, forming plot F-6/27. We contributed to both the statutory and landowner consultations and met with representatives of the applicant's agents, Fisher German, on multiple occasions. As part of those meetings we asked for explanations of the justification for the proposed compulsory acquisition, details of any work that would be done within the plots and what considerations were given to the implications for existing infrastructure – primarily a water main, hydrant point, culverted land drain and overhead telephone and fibre optic cables which all lie within the boundary of plot F-6/24. Fisher German assured us the requests had been passed back to the applicant however we have never received a response. With no response, the applicant has so far failed to provide any justification for seeking permanent rights over the affected land (Planning Act s. 122 and Guidance paras 5-7), has not provided us with an opportunity to consider any reasonable alternatives, including temporary rights of access, (Guidance para 8) and has failed to explain how the rights over the land will be used (Guidance para 9).</p> <p>We also have more specific concerns about the impact of the proposed permanent rights and how they interfere with our property.</p> <p>Plot F-6/24 : Properties on Mashbury Road are not connected to mains drainage. Treated effluent from Braddocks is discharged into the culverted drain within plot F-6/24. The permanent rights sought under Class 4 (g) and (h) can be used to render the property uninhabitable by allowing the applicant to prevent the removal of effluent from the property by decommissioning the drain and forbidding its replacement. This infringes on our Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 rights under the ECHR.</p> <p>Plot F-6/27 : This comprises two sections, 1) a narrow strip within which there is a mature 8 foot high mixed hawthorn hedge fronting onto Mashbury Road and some mature fruit trees within the garden itself, and 2) a surfaced area between Mashbury Road and the gate to Braddocks which comprises the primary access point to the property. The hedge provides security and privacy to the property however the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (b) and (e) would allow the applicant to require its removal and forbid any replacement. In the document Ref EN020027, submitted by the applicant, covering tree and hedgerow management all fruit trees in the garden are marked as "unaffected" and the hawthorn hedge is only classed as "potentially affected". This strongly indicates that the permanent rights sought are unnecessary, the applicant has failed to provide an appropriate justification for seeking permanent rights and what would be done with them (Guidance, paras 5-9) when temporary access would be sufficient. In respect of the primary access to the property, the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (a)-(d) would allow the applicant to control access to the property in perpetuity by the simple act of parking vehicles upon it. Together, the effect of the permanent rights sought is grossly disproportionate for this residential property. They constitute a disproportionate and severe infringement of our rights under Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 of the ECHR (Guidance para 10) and would be detrimental to the habitable use, safety, amenity, privacy, value and saleability of the property.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Susan Jane Sheppard | 1772 | Yes | All of the above | F-6/24, F-6/27 | Both | <p>My husband and I own the freehold on Braddocks, a residential property situated on Mashbury Road, Chignal St James. The property is approximately 160 metres north of the proposed line of pylons and a crossing point for the haul road. Two plots of land on the property are the subject of compulsory acquisition. Firstly, a narrow strip of land forming the roadside margin which has been aggregated with other land to form plot F-6/24. Secondly, an area of approximately 72 sq metres contained within the boundary of the property, forming plot F-6/27. We contributed to both the statutory and landowner consultations and met with representatives of the applicant's agents, Fisher German, on multiple occasions. As part of those meetings we asked for explanations of the justification for the proposed compulsory acquisition, details of any work that would be done within the plots and what considerations were given to the implications for existing infrastructure – primarily a water main, hydrant point, culverted land drain and overhead telephone and fibre optic cables which all lie within the boundary of plot F-6/24. Fisher German assured us the requests had been passed back to the applicant however we have never received a response. With no response, the applicant has so far failed to provide any justification for seeking permanent rights over the affected land (Planning Act s. 122 and Guidance paras 5-7), has not provided us with an opportunity to consider any reasonable alternatives, including temporary rights of access, (Guidance para 8) and has failed to explain how the rights over the land will be used (Guidance para 9).</p> <p>We also have more specific concerns about the impact of the proposed permanent rights and how they interfere with our property.</p> <p>Plot F-6/24 : Properties on Mashbury Road are not connected to mains drainage. Treated effluent from Braddocks is discharged into the culverted drain within plot F-6/24. The permanent rights sought under Class 4 (g) and (h) can be used to render the property uninhabitable by allowing the applicant to prevent the removal of effluent from the property by decommissioning the drain and forbidding its replacement. This infringes on our Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 rights under the ECHR.</p> <p>Plot F-6/27 : This comprises two sections, 1) a narrow strip within which there is a mature 8 foot high mixed hawthorn hedge fronting onto Mashbury Road and some mature fruit trees within the garden itself, and 2) a surfaced area between Mashbury Road and the gate to Braddocks which comprises the primary access point to the property. The hedge provides security and privacy to the property however the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (b) and (e) would allow the applicant to require its removal and forbid any replacement. In the document Ref EN020027, submitted by the applicant, covering tree and hedgerow management all fruit trees in the garden are marked as "unaffected" and the hawthorn hedge is only classed as "potentially affected". This strongly indicates that the permanent rights sought are unnecessary, the applicant has failed to provide an appropriate justification for seeking permanent rights and what would be done with them (Guidance, paras 5-9) when temporary access would be sufficient. In respect of the primary access to the property, the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (a)-(d) would allow the applicant to control access to the property in perpetuity by the simple act of parking vehicles upon it. Together, the effect of the permanent rights sought is grossly disproportionate for this residential property. They constitute a disproportionate and severe infringement of our rights under Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 of the ECHR (Guidance para 10) and would be detrimental to the habitable use, safety, amenity, privacy, value and saleability of the property.</p> |
| Alex Haden - BTSurveyors Ltd - Representative of Orsett Golf Club | 10292 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | The grounds for objection have been outlined in our previous Representations on behalf of Orsett Golf Club (November 2025 & February 2026) . We are in ongoing, discussions with National Grid and their appointed agents with a view to covering outstanding matters within a confidential Heads of Terms Agreement. |
| Monika Weglarz, TLT on behalf of Basildon BESS Ltd | 27173 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights | H-1/1, H-1/5 | Both | Basildon BESS Ltd has previously stated, in its relevant representation [RR-0334], its written representation [REP1-203] and at the compulsory acquisition hearing on 29 April, that it has an installation, on leased land, in parts of plots H-1/1, H-1/5 and H-1/11 comprising of an operational Battery Energy Storage System to the north of the UKPN substation. Basildon BESS has been liaising with the Applicant in respect of these plots and the interests that are sought over them and during these discussions it has become apparent that Basildon BESS does not have an interest in plot H-1/11. In respect of the remaining two plots, the parties have recently agreed the wording of a side agreement. However, the agreement has not yet reached completion and, until such a time as it does, Basildon BESS maintains its strong objection to the Applicant's proposals in their current form. |
| TC East Anglia One OFTO Limited | 13598 | Yes | All of the above | B-20/199, B-20/179, B-20/191, B-20/195, B-20/209, B-20/174, B-20/180, B-20/182, B-20/196, B-20/197, B-20/204, B-20/205, B-20/214 | Both | Please note that TC East Anglia One OFTO Limited leases land and benefits from rights in adjoining land, but they do not feature in the Book of Reference. We are wrongly not detailed in this document [Book of Reference]. This needs to be rectified as it has been raised previously. [See previous submissions] |
| PACE Nano Energy Limited | 15947 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | All | National Grid | Until such time as the Commercial Agreement between PACE Nano Energy Ltd and NGET is executed, PACE objects to the compulsory acquisition of its rights and interests in land and the temporary use of the land it holds an interest in. Once completed, the terms of the Commercial Agreement will resolve PACE's concerns with the interference of its rights and following which PACE Nano will withdraw its objection. PACE refers to its previous submissions in this examination ([REP-2789], [REP1-264], [REP3-129] and [REP5-261]) and the draft Statement of Common Ground ([REP4-227]) between the parties for context of the issues and reasons for objection. |
| Gillian Ann Whittle | 3768 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | C-49/9 and C-14/10 | Both | Neither NG nor UK Power Networks have need or necessity for these rights over our land. The impact would be disproportionate, and there has been a severe lack of communication and negotiation to acquire any such rights at any point. Communication from NG or Fisher German has been absolutely zero since a meeting with them on 19th June 2024, when they promised to be in touch with answers within a couple of weeks. Their lack of engagement with people and communities in these circumstances has been wholly inadequate, despite NG's claims to have communicated fully. |
| Nicola Jane Underwood | 16149 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | My husband and I purchased a very small piece of land behind our house, [REDACTED] from Whittle Agricultural College in December 2016. We have tried to inform you on several occasions that we do not think that our land is part of this process and we do not own any other land in this area and certainly have no knowledge of ownership of the 13 parcels of land that appear on your document REP4-051 in our names. We believe these parcels of land probably do, or used to belong to Whittle Agricultural College. We have been unable to identify our land as being listed on the document REP4-051 at all. Our TP1 form location map shows a Search Reference of: 1617_00939 and the Property Address as: [REDACTED] |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Stephen Hilary Underwood | 16148 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | My wife and I purchased a very small piece of land behind our house, [REDACTED] from Writtle Agricultural College in December 2016. We have tried to inform you on several occasions that we do not think that our land is part of this process and we do not own any other land in this area and certainly have no knowledge of ownership of the 13 parcels of land that appear on your document REP4-051 in our names. We believe these parcels of land probably do, or used to belong to Writtle Agricultural College. We have been unable to identify our land as being listed on the document REP4-051 at all. Our TP1 form location map shows a Search Reference of: 1617_00939 and the Property Address as: [REDACTED] |
| Bank of Ireland UK Plc Tessa Saunders / Anglian Water Services Limited | 24735 10188 | | | | | |
| | | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | A-3/6, A-7/20, A-7/30, A-13/68, A-13/69, A-13/70, C-17/36, C-17/37, C-17/57, C-17/60, C-17/69, C-17/66, C-17/72, C-17/74, C-17/76, C-17/79, C-17/80, C-17/81, C-17/86, G-3/3, G-3/7, G-3/21, G-3/22, G-3/27, G-3/28, G-3/33, G3-3/34, G-3/38, G-3/42 | Both | <p>Anglian Water Services Limited (AWSL) is raising objections to those plot numbers where we have a freehold interest and matters are not resolved in respect of compulsory acquisition of rights over our land assets or temporary use. This includes our following assets: Land at Bracon Ash; Forncett End water recycling centre (WRC); Roydon-Barnards Lane Pumping Station, Bressingham Road; Land at Ardeleigh – Dedham Road; Ardeleigh-Wick Lane Reservoir; Shenfield and Hutton WRC.</p> <p>These matters are listed in the draft Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and AWSL [REP4-101], as matters under discussion. Whilst AWSL has a large number of assets (i.e. sewers and water mains) on plots where our land interest is identified as 'occupation' these interfaces will be addressed through the bespoke Protective Provisions for Anglian Water, which are substantively agreed, but not yet included on the face of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). The compulsory acquisition of rights and temporary use of our land is still under discussion with the Applicant.</p> <p>Shenfield and Hutton WRC: AWSL's agents, Savills, are awaiting a date for a site visit with National Grid's contractors to discuss mitigations of the proposed access route.</p> <p>Forncett End WRC: AWSL is progressing the phosphorus and nitrogen removal schemes due for delivery at the WRC by 31 March 2030. This will assess the alternative land offered by the Applicant.</p> <p>Ardeleigh-Wick Lane Reservoir: The Applicant held a meeting with AWSL and Affinity Water to discuss the proposals including overhead line and easement across the reservoir and UKPN diversion works. A Land Disposal Risk Assessment has been prepared and circulated for review.</p> <p>Our Estates Partner, Savills, is liaising with the Applicant's Lands Team on a number of these interfaces. For each location a Land Disposal Risk Assessment is being prepared. When Anglian Water disposes of any property, whether freehold, leasehold or an easement right, the Estates Partner uses the Land Disposal Risk Assessment (LDRA) to document and confirm approval of the proposal. This ensures that the relevant stakeholders have been consulted and that any potential issues are identified and appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>The four stakeholders that are consulted are the Site Manager of the affected property, who reviews whether the proposal impacts the day-to-day operation of the site; the Asset Delivery Planning team, who assess whether there are any future schemes planned for the site that may be affected by the proposal; the Biodiversity Team, who review any potential impacts on Anglian Water's environmental commitments, particularly in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain; and the Estates team, who consider any estate-related matters such as covenants or existing agreements affecting the land parcel in question. Both the Site Manager and Asset Delivery Planning teams are consulted to review the impact of the proposal on Anglian Water's duties as a statutory undertaker, both now and in the future.</p> <p>In respect of Ardeleigh in this example, AVH Parks, who manage the recreational activities on behalf of Anglian Water, will also be consulted and included within the LDRA process. For example, where a commercial activity may be affected by a compulsory purchase proposal, mitigation may include a business loss claim.</p> <p>If all relevant stakeholders agree to the proposal and the associated mitigation measures, the matter is then referred to the Commercial Team, who manage the Estates Partner function within Anglian Water, to provide final approval. This process ensures that all affected stakeholders have formally confirmed their approval of the proposal.</p> <p>The approved Land Disposal Risk Assessment then forms part of the legal instruction to Anglian Water's in-house legal department, who will complete the relevant agreement with support from the Estates Partner. This process will help inform ongoing discussions with the Applicant.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Ian Nicholas Thomson | 5342 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Report on Objections to the Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) Scheme under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>1. Introduction This report summarises the principal objections to the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) transmission scheme, with particular regard to the statutory tests governing compulsory acquisition under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. These provisions require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There must be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition. •The land or rights sought must be necessary for the development. •The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the purposes for which the land is acquired justify the interference with private rights, including under human rights legislation. <p>Drawing upon the submitted objection materials, including landowner representations and professional advice, this report identifies key grounds upon which the scheme, as currently promoted, fails to satisfy these statutory requirements.</p> <p>2. Overview of the Proposed Scheme and Impacts The N2T scheme proposes a new overhead electricity transmission line between Norwich and Tilbury, including extensive new pylons, access routes, compounds, and associated infrastructure across rural landholdings. Objections focus not only on the principle of the scheme but, more significantly, on its detailed alignment, the extent of land taken, and the manner in which works would be carried out.</p> <p>The evidence demonstrates that the impacts extend beyond land-take to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Severe disruption to farming operations •Safety risks arising from construction routes •Loss of residential amenity •Interference with existing infrastructure and utilities •Long-term landscape and environmental harm <p>These matters must be assessed against the strict statutory tests in sections 122 and 123.</p> <p>3. Section 122: Necessity and Scope of Compulsory Acquisition 3.1 Lack of Necessity for Specific Land Interests Section 122(2) requires that land be acquired only if it is necessary for the development. While the overarching project may be justified, there is a strong argument that the extent of land and rights proposed exceeds what is reasonably required.</p> <p>The objections identify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grid may be able to justify the project in principle, but not the specific land parcels or access arrangements proposed. •Certain areas appear to be included for flexibility or convenience rather than strict necessity. <p>This is especially evident in relation to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •haul roads and access routes, where alternative alignments exist that would reduce impact without compromising deliverability, and •the extent of land which National Grid are seeking to acquire under the DCO for the provision of environmental mitigation and BNG. <p>3.2 Excessive and Disproportionate Rights A further issue arises where the scheme seeks permanent acquisition or extensive rights where temporary or limited rights would suffice.</p> <p>Key examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Permanent disruption of agricultural land where temporary access could achieve the same objective •Overly wide or intrusive haul roads •Interference with established access routes and farm operations <p>The evidence suggests that National Grid has failed to minimise land-take and rights, contrary to the requirements of proportionality embedded in section 122 and associated guidance.</p> <p>4. Section 123: Compelling Case in the Public Interest 4.1 Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case at a Local Level While national energy infrastructure may serve a broad public interest, section 123 requires a balanced assessment of public benefit against private harm. Objectors argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The scheme imposes significant and concentrated burdens on specific landowners and communities •These burdens are not adequately mitigated or justified by the chosen route •The same strategic objectives could be achieved through less harmful alternatives <p>As such, the case for compulsory acquisition is weakened where less intrusive options have not been properly examined.</p> <p>4.2 Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives A critical requirement in demonstrating a compelling case is the proper evaluation of alternatives. The objections provide substantial evidence that this has not been adequately carried out.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A proposed offshore cable route from North Norfolk to Tilbury or Bradwell, utilising existing infrastructure corridors •Use of existing redundant pylon routes instead of constructing entirely new infrastructure •Multiple alternative haul road alignments that would reduce disruption to residents and farming operations <p>Despite representations made during earlier rounds of both non-statutory and statutory consultations, it appears that National Grid has not sufficiently engaged with or incorporated alternative proposals put forward in many cases.</p> <p>This failure directly undermines the statutory justification for compulsory acquisition.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>4.3 Disproportionate Impact on Landowners and Communities The scheme's impacts go well beyond what might reasonably be expected for infrastructure development. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residential impact: properties becoming unlettable due to proximity to haul roads •Safety risks: dangerous junctions and high-speed traffic conflicts created by construction access •Community disruption: interference with footpaths, local routes, and daily activities <p>•Agricultural harm: loss of productivity due to field fragmentation and obstruction of modern farming equipment •Large scale expensive destructive and long term costs when affected landholders seek to reorganise the hedges, trees and tracks on the farms to enable existing farming operations to continue on the land holdings For example, placing a haul road through the centre of a large field will prevent the use of large scale machinery and require a complete redesign of drainage systems. Such impacts suggest a failure to strike a fair balance, a key requirement under both section 123 and human rights law.</p> <p>5. Procedural and Consultation Deficiencies A further significant objection concerns the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process. Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation process fell short of statutory requirements •There were methodological and procedural errors in key assessments, including landscape, heritage, and environmental impacts •Professional and legal opinions (including from senior counsel) conclude that the process is insufficient to support a Development Consent Order (DCO) <p>If established, these deficiencies could mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that all relevant considerations have been taken into account •The statutory tests under sections 122 and 123 cannot properly be met <p>6. Failure to Engage and Negotiate Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 requires that promoters make reasonable efforts to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers. However, the evidence suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiations have been ongoing for several years without resolution •Landowners have not been provided with final or clear terms •NG will not engage with landowners suggestions of even minor changes/ameliorations •The promoter continues to revise fundamental aspects such as the basis of compensation claims <p>This raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compulsory acquisition powers are being used prematurely •The statutory expectation of meaningful negotiation has not been fulfilled <p>Such failures weigh against the existence of a compelling case in the public interest.</p> <p>7. Deliverability and Design Concerns Although not the central objection, there are also questions regarding the practical deliverability of the scheme as designed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insufficient detail on infrastructure such as bridges across flood-prone areas •Construction proposals that are impractical or unsafe •Lack of clarity on how temporary works would be implemented and restored <p>Where a scheme is not clearly deliverable, it becomes difficult to justify the compulsory acquisition of land to facilitate it.</p> <p>8. Application of Sections 122 and 123 Bringing these issues together, the objections demonstrate multiple areas where the scheme fails to meet the statutory tests:</p> <p>Section 122 (Necessity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Land and rights are broader than required •Alternatives exist that would reduce land-take •The scheme has not been optimised to minimise interference <p>Section 123 (Compelling Case in the Public Interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impacts on landowners are severe and disproportionate •Consultation and alternatives analysis are inadequate •Negotiation efforts have been insufficient •The balance between public benefit and private harm is not properly justified <p>9. Conclusion In conclusion, while the strategic need for electricity transmission infrastructure may be accepted, the Norwich to Tilbury scheme—particularly in its current form—raises serious legal and planning concerns under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The extent of compulsory acquisition is not fully justified •Less intrusive alternatives have not been adequately considered •The impacts on affected landowners and communities are excessive •Procedural shortcomings undermine confidence in the scheme <p>Accordingly, there is a credible and substantive basis for objection, and a strong argument that the statutory tests for compulsory acquisition have not yet been met.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>To proceed lawfully, National Grid need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate genuine optimisation of the route and access arrangements •Provide clear evidence of alternatives being properly assessed •Engage meaningfully with affected parties •Ensure that land acquisition is strictly limited to what is necessary <p>Absent such steps, the justification for compulsory powers remains open to significant challenge.</p> |
| Carolyn Gordon / Northumbrian Water Ltd | 10192 | Yes | All of the above | H-1A/1, H-1A/2, H-1A/4, H-1A/5, H-1A/6, H-1A/11, H-1A/12, H-1A/14 | Both | <p>REP4-381, REP5-279</p> <p>NWL have undertaken an initial and high-level desktop study and have identified a number of key or strategic assets that are shown to be within the revised red line boundary of the Proposed Scheme. Further engagement is required to understand the impact on NWLs assets before removing any objection to the proposed limit changes.</p> |
| Julie Russell on behalf of National Highways Limited | 10201 | Yes | All of the above | All plots to which National Highways have an interest | Both | <p>1. Overview of NH's Objection</p> <p>1.1NH objects to the compulsory acquisition ("CA") and temporary possession ("TP") powers sought over approximately 154 plots of land owned or occupied by NH for the purposes of its statutory undertaking as strategic highway authority. NH's core submission is that the inclusion of these plots in the Book of Reference is neither necessary nor proportionate, and that the statutory tests for authorising compulsory acquisition are not met.</p> <p>2. Overview of NH's Objection</p> <p>2.1Under section 122 of the Planning Act 2008, an order granting development consent may include provision authorising compulsory acquisition of land only if the Secretary of State is satisfied that the land is (a) required for the development to which the development consent relates, (b) required to facilitate or is incidental to that development, or (c) replacement land given in exchange. Under section 123, there must be a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily, taking into account the availability of alternatives and proportionality.</p> <p>2.2The DCLG Guidance (September 2013) elaborates on these tests, emphasising that the applicant must demonstrate that the land sought is necessary (i.e., no more land is included than is reasonably required) and that the proposed interference is proportionate to the objectives of the scheme.</p> <p>3. NH's Specific Grounds of Objection</p> <p>3.1Compulsory Acquisition of Operational Land is Not Necessary</p> <p>3.1.1NH submits that the plots in question constitute operational land acquired for the purpose of maintaining its statutory undertaking. NH identifies that the permanent land take plots fall into two principal categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Land which is currently NH-managed highway and is required for highway works to the Strategic Road Network ("SRN") or widening works as part of the Applicant's proposals. Such works are already authorised by the DCO subject to protective provisions, and therefore CA is unnecessary. <input type="checkbox"/> Land which is not highway but is owned by NH and is required for SRN widening as part of the Applicant's proposals. This land does not need to be acquired only to be transferred back to NH; access can be granted through protective provisions and by agreement. <p>3.1.2NH contends that there is no need for plots in either category to be compulsorily acquired, as they are either already part of the SRN or land that will become part of the new SRN. Their inclusion in the Book of Reference is therefore not necessary or proportionate as required by the Planning Act CA Guidance.</p> <p>3.2Acquisition of Rights is Not Necessary</p> <p>3.2.1Regarding the acquisition of rights (principally for overhead lines and underground cabling), NH submits that the majority of plots relate to operational highway forming part of the SRN. NH argues that rights are not in fact required because National Grid already possesses statutory powers under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 to install, maintain, and repair apparatus in a public highway, with section 105 of that Act confirming that references to "in" a highway include works under, over, across, along or upon it. Accordingly, National Grid can undertake overhead line works without CA, and the inclusion of these plots is again not necessary or proportionate as required by the CA Guidance.</p> <p>3.2.2Where an underground cable may require an easement, NH is prepared to grant that easement by consent and is willing to negotiate terms, further obviating the need for compulsory powers.</p> <p>3.2.3Discussions with the Applicant as to the appropriateness of the utilising the powers in the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are on going. NH hope to be in a position to provide an update in the above regard at CAH3 which is due to be held on 24 June.</p> <p>3.3Section 127: Serious Detriment to the Undertaking</p> <p>3.3.1 NH also relies on section 127 of the Planning Act 2008, which provides that an order granting development consent may only include provision authorising the CA of statutory undertakers' land to the extent that the Secretary of State is satisfied that the land can be purchased and not replaced without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking, or can be replaced without such detriment. NH submits that if its operational land were compulsorily acquired, it could cause serious detriment to the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, as NH needs to remain in control of its highway and subsoil.</p> <p>3.4 Historic Ownership Plots</p> <p>3.4.1 NH notes that certain plots where rights are sought relate to roads that have been detrunked, meaning ownership has in fact passed to the local authority but the transfer has not been registered at the Land Registry. As this land is non-operational, NH can agree to transfer any interest it retains by agreement, and CA is therefore not necessary.</p> <p>4. Summary and Conclusion</p> <p>4.1 In essence, NH's objection rests on the proposition that the tests of necessity and proportionality under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008 and the DCLG Guidance are not satisfied, because the Applicant can achieve its objectives without compulsory acquisition — either through existing statutory powers, protective provisions, or voluntary agreement. Additionally, the serious detriment test under section 127 presents a further barrier to the acquisition of NH's operational land.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Rosemary Carol Thomson | 7272 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Report on Objections to the Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) Scheme under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>1. Introduction This report summarises the principal objections to the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) transmission scheme, with particular regard to the statutory tests governing compulsory acquisition under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. These provisions require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There must be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition. •The land or rights sought must be necessary for the development. •The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the purposes for which the land is acquired justify the interference with private rights, including under human rights legislation. <p>Drawing upon the submitted objection materials, including landowner representations and professional advice, this report identifies key grounds upon which the scheme, as currently promoted, fails to satisfy these statutory requirements.</p> <p>2. Overview of the Proposed Scheme and Impacts The N2T scheme proposes a new overhead electricity transmission line between Norwich and Tilbury, including extensive new pylons, access routes, compounds, and associated infrastructure across rural landholdings. Objections focus not only on the principle of the scheme but, more significantly, on its detailed alignment, the extent of land taken, and the manner in which works would be carried out.</p> <p>The evidence demonstrates that the impacts extend beyond land-take to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Severe disruption to farming operations •Safety risks arising from construction routes •Loss of residential amenity •Interference with existing infrastructure and utilities •Long-term landscape and environmental harm <p>These matters must be assessed against the strict statutory tests in sections 122 and 123.</p> <p>3. Section 122: Necessity and Scope of Compulsory Acquisition 3.1 Lack of Necessity for Specific Land Interests Section 122(2) requires that land be acquired only if it is necessary for the development. While the overarching project may be justified, there is a strong argument that the extent of land and rights proposed exceeds what is reasonably required.</p> <p>The objections identify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grid may be able to justify the project in principle, but not the specific land parcels or access arrangements proposed. •Certain areas appear to be included for flexibility or convenience rather than strict necessity. <p>This is especially evident in relation to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •haul roads and access routes, where alternative alignments exist that would reduce impact without compromising deliverability, and •the extent of land which National Grid are seeking to acquire under the DCO for the provision of environmental mitigation and BNG. <p>3.2 Excessive and Disproportionate Rights A further issue arises where the scheme seeks permanent acquisition or extensive rights where temporary or limited rights would suffice.</p> <p>Key examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Permanent disruption of agricultural land where temporary access could achieve the same objective •Overly wide or intrusive haul roads •Interference with established access routes and farm operations <p>The evidence suggests that National Grid has failed to minimise land-take and rights, contrary to the requirements of proportionality embedded in section 122 and associated guidance.</p> <p>4. Section 123: Compelling Case in the Public Interest 4.1 Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case at a Local Level While national energy infrastructure may serve a broad public interest, section 123 requires a balanced assessment of public benefit against private harm. Objectors argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The scheme imposes significant and concentrated burdens on specific landowners and communities •These burdens are not adequately mitigated or justified by the chosen route •The same strategic objectives could be achieved through less harmful alternatives <p>As such, the case for compulsory acquisition is weakened where less intrusive options have not been properly examined.</p> <p>4.2 Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives A critical requirement in demonstrating a compelling case is the proper evaluation of alternatives. The objections provide substantial evidence that this has not been adequately carried out.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A proposed offshore cable route from North Norfolk to Tilbury or Bradwell, utilising existing infrastructure corridors •Use of existing redundant pylon routes instead of constructing entirely new infrastructure •Multiple alternative haul road alignments that would reduce disruption to residents and farming operations <p>Despite representations made during earlier rounds of both non-statutory and statutory consultations, it appears that National Grid has not sufficiently engaged with or incorporated alternative proposals put forward in many cases.</p> <p>This failure directly undermines the statutory justification for compulsory acquisition.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>4.3 Disproportionate Impact on Landowners and Communities</p> <p>The scheme's impacts go well beyond what might reasonably be expected for infrastructure development. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residential impact: properties becoming unlettable due to proximity to haul roads •Safety risks: dangerous junctions and high-speed traffic conflicts created by construction access •Community disruption: interference with footpaths, local routes, and daily activities •Agricultural harm: loss of productivity due to field fragmentation and obstruction of modern farming equipment •Large scale expensive destructive and long term costs when affected landholders seek to reorganise the hedges, trees and tracks on the farms to enable existing farming operations to continue on the land holdings <p>For example, placing a haul road through the centre of a large field will prevent the use of large scale machinery and require a complete redesign of drainage systems. Such impacts suggest a failure to strike a fair balance, a key requirement under both section 123 and human rights law.</p> <p>5. Procedural and Consultation Deficiencies</p> <p>A further significant objection concerns the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process.</p> <p>Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation process fell short of statutory requirements •There were methodological and procedural errors in key assessments, including landscape, heritage, and environmental impacts •Professional and legal opinions (including from senior counsel) conclude that the process is insufficient to support a Development Consent Order (DCO) <p>If established, these deficiencies could mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that all relevant considerations have been taken into account •The statutory tests under sections 122 and 123 cannot properly be met <p>6. Failure to Engage and Negotiate</p> <p>Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 requires that promoters make reasonable efforts to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers.</p> <p>However, the evidence suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiations have been ongoing for several years without resolution •Landowners have not been provided with final or clear terms •NG will not engage with landowners suggestions of even minor changes/ameliorations •The promoter continues to revise fundamental aspects such as the basis of compensation claims <p>This raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compulsory acquisition powers are being used prematurely •The statutory expectation of meaningful negotiation has not been fulfilled <p>Such failures weigh against the existence of a compelling case in the public interest.</p> <p>7. Deliverability and Design Concerns</p> <p>Although not the central objection, there are also questions regarding the practical deliverability of the scheme as designed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insufficient detail on infrastructure such as bridges across flood-prone areas •Construction proposals that are impractical or unsafe •Lack of clarity on how temporary works would be implemented and restored <p>Where a scheme is not clearly deliverable, it becomes difficult to justify the compulsory acquisition of land to facilitate it.</p> <p>8. Application of Sections 122 and 123</p> <p>Bringing these issues together, the objections demonstrate multiple areas where the scheme fails to meet the statutory tests:</p> <p>Section 122 (Necessity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Land and rights are broader than required •Alternatives exist that would reduce land-take •The scheme has not been optimised to minimise interference <p>Section 123 (Compelling Case in the Public Interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impacts on landowners are severe and disproportionate •Consultation and alternatives analysis are inadequate •Negotiation efforts have been insufficient •The balance between public benefit and private harm is not properly justified |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>9. Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion, while the strategic need for electricity transmission infrastructure may be accepted, the Norwich to Tilbury scheme—particularly in its current form—raises serious legal and planning concerns under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The extent of compulsory acquisition is not fully justified •Less intrusive alternatives have not been adequately considered •The impacts on affected landowners and communities are excessive •Procedural shortcomings undermine confidence in the scheme <p>Accordingly, there is a credible and substantive basis for objection, and a strong argument that the statutory tests for compulsory acquisition have not yet been met.</p> <p>To proceed lawfully, National Grid need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate genuine optimisation of the route and access arrangements •Provide clear evidence of alternatives being properly assessed •Engage meaningfully with affected parties •Ensure that land acquisition is strictly limited to what is necessary <p>Absent such steps, the justification for compulsory powers remains open to significant challenge.</p> |
| Christopher Edward Broom | 20000 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | <p>Report on Objections to the Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) Scheme under Sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>This report summarises the principal objections to the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury (N2T) transmission scheme, with particular regard to the statutory tests governing compulsory acquisition under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008. These provisions require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There must be a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition. •The land or rights sought must be necessary for the development. •The Secretary of State must be satisfied that the purposes for which the land is acquired justify the interference with private rights, including under human rights legislation. <p>Drawing upon the submitted objection materials, including landowner representations and professional advice, this report identifies key grounds upon which the scheme, as currently promoted, fails to satisfy these statutory requirements.</p> <p>2. Overview of the Proposed Scheme and Impacts</p> <p>The N2T scheme proposes a new overhead electricity transmission line between Norwich and Tilbury, including extensive new pylons, access routes, compounds, and associated infrastructure across rural landholdings.</p> <p>Objections focus not only on the principle of the scheme but, more significantly, on its detailed alignment, the extent of land taken, and the manner in which works would be carried out.</p> <p>The evidence demonstrates that the impacts extend beyond land-take to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Severe disruption to farming operations •Safety risks arising from construction routes •Loss of residential amenity •Interference with existing infrastructure and utilities •Long-term landscape and environmental harm <p>These matters must be assessed against the strict statutory tests in sections 122 and 123.</p> <p>3. Section 122: Necessity and Scope of Compulsory Acquisition</p> <p>3.1 Lack of Necessity for Specific Land Interests</p> <p>Section 122(2) requires that land be acquired only if it is necessary for the development. While the overarching project may be justified, there is a strong argument that the extent of land and rights proposed exceeds what is reasonably required.</p> <p>The objections identify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grid may be able to justify the project in principle, but not the specific land parcels or access arrangements proposed. •Certain areas appear to be included for flexibility or convenience rather than strict necessity. |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>This is especially evident in relation to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •haul roads and access routes, where alternative alignments exist that would reduce impact without compromising deliverability, and •the extent of land which National Grid are seeking to acquire under the DCO for the provision of environmental mitigation and BNG. <p>3.2 Excessive and Disproportionate Rights A further issue arises where the scheme seeks permanent acquisition or extensive rights where temporary or limited rights would suffice. Key examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Permanent disruption of agricultural land where temporary access could achieve the same objective •Overly wide or intrusive haul roads •Interference with established access routes and farm operations <p>The evidence suggests that National Grid has failed to minimise land-take and rights, contrary to the requirements of proportionality embedded in section 122 and associated guidance.</p> <p>4. Section 123: Compelling Case in the Public Interest 4.1 Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case at a Local Level While national energy infrastructure may serve a broad public interest, section 123 requires a balanced assessment of public benefit against private harm. Objectors argue that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The scheme imposes significant and concentrated burdens on specific landowners and communities •These burdens are not adequately mitigated or justified by the chosen route •The same strategic objectives could be achieved through less harmful alternatives <p>As such, the case for compulsory acquisition is weakened where less intrusive options have not been properly examined.</p> <p>4.2 Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives A critical requirement in demonstrating a compelling case is the proper evaluation of alternatives. The objections provide substantial evidence that this has not been adequately carried out. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A proposed offshore cable route from North Norfolk to Tilbury or Bradwell, utilising existing infrastructure corridors •Use of existing redundant pylon routes instead of constructing entirely new infrastructure •Multiple alternative haul road alignments that would reduce disruption to residents and farming operations <p>Despite representations made during earlier rounds of both non-statutory and statutory consultations, it appears that National Grid has not sufficiently engaged with or incorporated alternative proposals put forward in many cases. This failure directly undermines the statutory justification for compulsory acquisition.</p> <hr/> <p>4.3 Disproportionate Impact on Landowners and Communities The scheme's impacts go well beyond what might reasonably be expected for infrastructure development. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residential impact: properties becoming unlettable due to proximity to haul roads •Safety risks: dangerous junctions and high-speed traffic conflicts created by construction access •Community disruption: interference with footpaths, local routes, and daily activities •Agricultural harm: loss of productivity due to field fragmentation and obstruction of modern farming equipment •Large scale expensive destructive and long term costs when affected landholders seek to reorganise the hedges, trees and tracks on the farms to enable existing farming operations to continue on the land holdings <p>For example, placing a haul road through the centre of a large field will prevent the use of large scale machinery and require a complete redesign of drainage systems. Such impacts suggest a failure to strike a fair balance, a key requirement under both section 123 and human rights law.</p> <p>5. Procedural and Consultation Deficiencies A further significant objection concerns the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process. Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation process fell short of statutory requirements •There were methodological and procedural errors in key assessments, including landscape, heritage, and environmental impacts •Professional and legal opinions (including from senior counsel) conclude that the process is insufficient to support a Development Consent Order (DCO) <p>If established, these deficiencies could mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Secretary of State cannot be satisfied that all relevant considerations have been taken into account •The statutory tests under sections 122 and 123 cannot properly be met <p>6. Failure to Engage and Negotiate Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 requires that promoters make reasonable efforts to acquire land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers. However, the evidence suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiations have been ongoing for several years without resolution •Landowners have not been provided with final or clear terms •NG will not engage with landowners suggestions of even minor changes/ameliorations •The promoter continues to revise fundamental aspects such as the basis of compensation claims |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>This raises concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compulsory acquisition powers are being used prematurely •The statutory expectation of meaningful negotiation has not been fulfilled <p>Such failures weigh against the existence of a compelling case in the public interest.</p> <p>7. Deliverability and Design Concerns</p> <p>Although not the central objection, there are also questions regarding the practical deliverability of the scheme as designed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insufficient detail on infrastructure such as bridges across flood-prone areas •Construction proposals that are impractical or unsafe •Lack of clarity on how temporary works would be implemented and restored <p>Where a scheme is not clearly deliverable, it becomes difficult to justify the compulsory acquisition of land to facilitate it.</p> <p>8. Application of Sections 122 and 123</p> <p>Bringing these issues together, the objections demonstrate multiple areas where the scheme fails to meet the statutory tests:</p> <p>Section 122 (Necessity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Land and rights are broader than required •Alternatives exist that would reduce land-take <p>•The scheme has not been optimised to minimise interference</p> <p>Section 123 (Compelling Case in the Public Interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impacts on landowners are severe and disproportionate •Consultation and alternatives analysis are inadequate •Negotiation efforts have been insufficient •The balance between public benefit and private harm is not properly justified <p>Accordingly, there is a credible and substantive basis for objection, and a strong argument that the statutory tests for compulsory acquisition have not yet been met.</p> <p>To proceed lawfully, National Grid need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate genuine optimisation of the route and access arrangements •Provide clear evidence of alternatives being properly assessed •Engage meaningfully with affected parties •Ensure that land acquisition is strictly limited to what is necessary <p>Absent such steps, the justification for compulsory powers remains open to significant challenge.</p> <p>9. Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion, while the strategic need for electricity transmission infrastructure may be accepted, the Norwich to Tilbury scheme—particularly in its current form—raises serious legal and planning concerns under sections 122 and 123 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The extent of compulsory acquisition is not fully justified •Less intrusive alternatives have not been adequately considered •The impacts on affected landowners and communities are excessive •Procedural shortcomings undermine confidence in the scheme |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Vicky Fowler on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited | 10163 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Temporary possession | 6/71, 6/71a and 6/71b. | Both | <p>The current scope of Bloor Homes objection relates to land parcels at Chadwell St Mary. In particular plots 6/71, 6/71a and 6/71b. Bloor has an option over this land and is promoting a planning application for the development of up to 1,500 dwellings, together with education, health and retail uses. The land forms part of a growth area proposed by Thurrock Borough Council for the delivery of up to 4,000 homes, and plays a key role in meeting the Borough's housing delivery targets. The Bloor scheme will be delivered in phases and start on site is anticipated in 2029. Taking the parcels in turn:</p> <p>Land Parcel 6/71a: This is a strip of land adjacent to Brentwood Road (coloured brown and referenced 6/71a in the Land Plans). NGET is proposing a compulsory acquisition of this land to provide its temporary and permanent access.</p> <p>This strip of land will be fundamental to the Bloor scheme as it will contain the proposed access to residential development parcels off Brentwood Road and overlaps with the first area for development adjacent to the site entrance. This strip is excessively wide. Bloor has sought comfort that NGET will not require the full extent of this land and was hoping for the land plans to be scaled back. Bloor have also sought comfort that it will be able to construct the permanent access and lay services as required and commence building within Area A as shown on the plan appended to the Statement of Common Ground submitted at deadline 1 [REP1-083].</p> <p>Land Parcels 6/71 and 6/71b Bloor has concerns regarding the other land coloured brown on the Land Plans, including parcels 6/71 and 6/71b. Should these be fully acquired by NGET, this would have very significant adverse consequences for the Bloor scheme.</p> <p>It is Bloor's understanding, through discussions with NGET, that a relatively small proportion of the brown land is actually required for For all 3 parcels, it is Bloor's view that compulsory acquisition is not necessary, and instead Bloor (or the landowner ahead of Bloor's acquisition) could retain the land and grant NGET rights as necessary. Moreover, permanent access to NG apparatus ought to be capable of taking place over the estate roads once constructed.</p> <p>Negotiations with the Applicant have been positive and the dropping of option A is helpful to Bloor. The Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG"), submitted at deadline 1, records agreement on several key matters, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •that NGET will only implement land and property rights to the extent actually required; •that the NGET permanent access route can be varied to be routed through the Bloor Scheme; •the broad location for a construction access preferred by both parties to the north of the main access to the residential development; •an understanding that restrictions on built development in certain areas are not intended to prevent Bloor's enabling works; and a commitment to exploring opportunities for shared facilities and materials. <p>Bloor objects to both the compulsory acquisition ("CA") and temporary possession ("TP") powers sought by NGET in respect of the Bloor Scheme land, to the extent that these are not reduced in size, changed to temporary or regulated by a binding legal agreement to reflect the commitments given.</p> <p>Bloor would still like to see the land plans amended and a commitment to locate the permanent overhead line as far north in the site as possible. Importantly the commitments set out in the SoCG need to be secured in a legal agreement. Bloor have received heads of terms for such an agreement and understand that the negotiation of the agreement will progress with the aim of completing the same during the Examination. Taken at face value, the Land Plans suggest a fundamental constraint to the Bloor scheme and if the permanent acquisition was simply exercised without regard to the agreed matters then that would remove the access to a strategic housing site.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Claire Lincoln-White | 2859 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>We own the freehold on Brittons Hall Farm, a residential property situated on Mashbury Road. The property is situated next to a field which is planned by NG for the situation of a pylon and a crossing point for the haul road. There are F-6/40/46/47/49/50/54. We met with representatives of the applicants agents on multiple occasions. As part of those meetings we asked for explanations of the justification for the proposed acquisition, details of any work that would be done within the plots and what considerations were given to the implications for existing infrastructure and access to the property but have not received a response. With no response, the applicant has so far failed to provide any justification for temporary right nor seeking permanent rights over the affected land (Planning Act s. 122 and Guidance paras 5-7), has not provided us with an opportunity to consider any reasonable alternatives and has failed to explain how the rights over the land will be used (Guidance para 9). In addition, the applicant has not explained why there needs to be access at night and failed to explain how our property will remain safe, secure and private.</p> <p>Specific concerns which have not been responded to by the applicant are: 1) the boundary of the garden and the field onto which the haul road will be build is not clear. The option area shaded seems to include part of the field which does not belong to the property. 2) the purpose of acquiring the garden is not clear, even on a temporary basis. The haul road is not being built on it. There are mature trees and hedges at the end of this section backing onto the field where the haul road will be situated and onto Mashbury Road. This provides not only habitats for wildlife but also security and privacy for the property. Fisher German have said they are not clear what this land will be intended to be used for but speculated it is for visibility for traffic from the haul road crossing Mashbury Road. We have asked why they cannot consider traffic lights or moving the haul road slightly further away from the boundary of the property into the field which is already impacted as alternatives to negate the need for the acquisition and destruction on boundary trees/hedges. 3) It is not clear whether current access to the property will be impacted by proposed acquisitions. 4) Asked what provisions they will make to ensure our property is kept safe and secure if work goes ahead and if access is granted during the day or night. 5) It is not clear how overhead lines / telecom lines will be impacted and where they will occupy air space in and around the property or whether they are likely to be buried underground. 6) We rely on non-fibre wifi which is delivered via antenna on our property. Electricity pylons and overhead lines can interfere with this and we've asked for how this would be addressed.</p> <p>The applicant has said the plots 'may be affected' but cannot explain how, have not considered alternatives and have failed to outline how our property (and its occupants) would remain safe, secure and have privacy during any works and afterwards, where applicable. This strongly indicates the applicant has failed to provide an appropriate justification for seeking permanent rights and what would be done with them (Guidance, paras 5-9) when temporary access would be sufficient, and have insufficiently considered why permanent / temporary access is required at all, particularly in relation to the garden. In respect of the primary access, the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (a)-(d) would allow the applicant to control land close to the access to the property in perpetuity by the simple act of parking vehicles upon it. Together, the effect of the permanent and temporary rights sought, constitute a disproportionate and severe infringement of our rights under Articles 1 and 8 of the ECHR and would be detrimental to the habitable use, safety, amenity, privacy, value and saleability of the property.</p> |
| Richard White | 8024 | Yes | All of the above | ALL | Both | <p>We own the freehold on Brittons Hall Farm, a residential property situated on Mashbury Road. The property is situated next to a field which is planned by NG for the situation of a pylon and a crossing point for the haul road. There are F-6/40/46/47/49/50/54. We met with representatives of the applicants agents on multiple occasions. As part of those meetings we asked for explanations of the justification for the proposed acquisition, details of any work that would be done within the plots and what considerations were given to the implications for existing infrastructure and access to the property but have not received a response. With no response, the applicant has so far failed to provide any justification for temporary right nor seeking permanent rights over the affected land (Planning Act s. 122 and Guidance paras 5-7), has not provided us with an opportunity to consider any reasonable alternatives and has failed to explain how the rights over the land will be used (Guidance para 9). In addition, the applicant has not explained why there needs to be access at night and failed to explain how our property will remain safe, secure and private.</p> <p>Specific concerns which have not been responded to by the applicant are: 1) the boundary of the garden and the field onto which the haul road will be build is not clear. The option area shaded seems to include part of the field which does not belong to the property. 2) the purpose of acquiring the garden is not clear, even on a temporary basis. The haul road is not being built on it. There are mature trees and hedges at the end of this section backing onto the field where the haul road will be situated and onto Mashbury Road. This provides not only habitats for wildlife but also security and privacy for the property. Fisher German have said they are not clear what this land will be intended to be used for but speculated it is for visibility for traffic from the haul road crossing Mashbury Road. We have asked why they cannot consider traffic lights or moving the haul road slightly further away from the boundary of the property into the field which is already impacted as alternatives to negate the need for the acquisition and destruction on boundary trees/hedges. 3) It is not clear whether current access to the property will be impacted by proposed acquisitions. 4) Asked what provisions they will make to ensure our property is kept safe and secure if work goes ahead and if access is granted during the day or night. 5) It is not clear how overhead lines / telecom lines will be impacted and where they will occupy air space in and around the property or whether they are likely to be buried underground. 6) We rely on non-fibre wifi which is delivered via antenna on our property. Electricity pylons and overhead lines can interfere with this and we've asked for how this would be addressed.</p> <p>The applicant has said the plots 'may be affected' but cannot explain how, have not considered alternatives and have failed to outline how our property (and its occupants) would remain safe, secure and have privacy during any works and afterwards, where applicable. This strongly indicates the applicant has failed to provide an appropriate justification for seeking permanent rights and what would be done with them (Guidance, paras 5-9) when temporary access would be sufficient, and have insufficiently considered why permanent / temporary access is required at all, particularly in relation to the garden. In respect of the primary access, the permanent rights sought under Class 4 (a)-(d) would allow the applicant to control land close to the access to the property in perpetuity by the simple act of parking vehicles upon it. Together, the effect of the permanent and temporary rights sought, constitute a disproportionate and severe infringement of our rights under Articles 1 and 8 of the ECHR and would be detrimental to the habitable use, safety, amenity, privacy, value and saleability of the property.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| BRICKKILN FARM SOLAR LIMITED | 10138 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | All | Both | <p>Brickkiln Farm Solar Limited ("Brickkiln") maintains the position expressed in its consultation responses of 25 July 2024 and 17 July 2025 and in its representations submitted on 27 November 2025 (Examination Library ref. REP1-211) and 26 February 2026 (Examination Library ref. REP1-212) (together, "the Representations" and each a "Representation") in respect of the application by National Grid Electricity Transmission ("NGET") for development consent for its Norwich to Tilbury project ("the Proposed Development").</p> <p>There has been no material progress in negotiations with NGET since the submission of the latest Representation despite Brickkiln's efforts to engage: the information requested from NGET in the Representations has not been provided, no heads of terms for the voluntary acquisition of land rights have been received, and NGET has not confirmed that an indemnity will be provided for any damage caused to Brickkiln Solar Farm by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Executive summary</p> <p>NGET has not demonstrated a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of rights over Brickkiln Solar Farm.</p> <p>NGET has not made reasonable efforts to negotiate with Brickkiln, nor has it provided evidence to clarify the full extent of the impact that the Proposed Development would have on Brickkiln Solar Farm. It is reasonable to assume that the Proposed Development could cause Brickkiln to suffer significant financial losses and it is not clear whether NGET has allocated sufficient resources to fully compensate Brickkiln.</p> <p>NGET has also not provided any evidence to suggest that reasonable alternatives and modifications to the scheme have been considered which would avoid the need for rights over Brickkiln Solar Farm.</p> <p>In any event, it would be counterintuitive for improvements to low-carbon transmission infrastructure to come at the expense of an operational renewable electricity generating station.</p> <p>Brickkiln therefore respectfully requests the Inspector to require modifications to the Proposed Development to avoid Brickkiln Solar Farm and refuse to grant compulsory acquisition powers in relation to Brickkiln Solar Farm.</p> <p>Relevant legislation and guidance</p> <p>Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 ("the 2008 Act") provides that a DCO may include provision authorising the compulsory acquisition of land only if the Secretary of State ("SoS") is satisfied that the land is (inter alia): (a) required for the development to which the DCO relates; or (b) required to facilitate or incidental to that development. There must also be a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily.</p> <p>The September 2013 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition' ("the Guidance") identifies a number of factors which the SoS will refer to in deciding whether to authorise the compulsory acquisition of land in the DCO. These include that:</p> <p>(i) the applicant should be able to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored and the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the land is for a legitimate purpose, necessary, and proportionate (paragraph 8 of the Guidance);</p> <p>(ii) the applicant must be able to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect of the requisite funds for acquisition becoming available (paragraph 9)</p> <p>(iii) the SoS must be persuaded that the purposes for which the DCO authorises compulsory acquisition of land are legitimate and sufficient to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected (paragraph 10);</p> <p>(iv) the SoS must be satisfied that the land to be acquired is: (i) no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development where land is required for the development; or (ii) no more than reasonably necessary for the purpose for which it is acquired and is proportionate where the land is required to facilitate or is incidental to the development (paragraph 11);</p> <p>(v) the SoS must be persuaded there is compelling evidence that the public benefits that would be derived from the compulsory acquisition will outweigh the private loss that would be suffered by those whose land is to be acquired (paragraph 13).</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the Guidance provides that the SoS could decide against including provisions authorising the compulsory acquisition of land in the DCO where the SoS is not persuaded all of the land is necessary or considers that the scheme should be modified.</p> <p>Paragraph 25 of the Guidance provides that applicants should seek to acquire land by negotiation wherever practicable.</p> <p>Objection to interference with land</p> <p>Brickkiln's land at Brickkiln Solar Farm ("the Land") is identified for compulsory acquisition on Land Plan A Sheet 2 (plots A-2/31, A-2/35, A-2/36, A-2/37, A-2/38, A-2/39, A-2/40, A-2/41, and A-2/43).</p> <p>According to the draft Order for the Proposed Development (document reference 3.1), rights over the Land may be needed for the construction and installation of a new overhead transmission electric line (Route RG) between the two gantries at Norwich Main Substation (Work No. 1) and the two gantries at Bramford Substation (Work No. 3), including: (a) the foundations and steelwork to construct new pylons; (b) the installation of 69 kilometres of overhead transmission electric line between Norwich Main Substation and Bramford Substation; (c) the installation of conductors, insulators and fittings; and (d) the installation of fibre optic conductors. The DCO application contemplates rights being compulsorily acquired over the Land for overhead and underground cables and temporary use of the Land ("the Rights").</p> <p>It does not appear that NGET has considered all reasonable alternatives which would avoid the need for the Rights to be compulsorily acquired. It may be possible to meet the need for low-carbon transmission infrastructure without compulsorily acquiring the Rights. Brickkiln has not been provided with any site-specific assessment to justify the need for the Rights over the Land. NGET has therefore not demonstrated that it is proposing to compulsorily acquire no more land than is reasonably required or necessary for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Brickkiln acknowledges that pylon RG14 is now located outside the operational boundary for Brickkiln Solar Farm to mitigate earthing interactions and safety risks. However, it is not clear that NGET has considered undergrounding or any other modifications to the scheme to avoid the need for the Rights to be acquired. It is therefore not clear that the proposed interference with the Land is for a legitimate purpose and necessary for the Proposed Development. If there is a reasonable alternative to acquiring the Rights, it is neither legitimate nor necessary to authorise the use of compulsory acquisition powers which would disrupt Brickkiln's enjoyment of its land.</p> <p>The interference to Brickkiln Solar Farm would also be disproportionate. The operation of Brickkiln Solar Farm, which is currently producing renewable energy and contributing to Clean Power 2030, should not be prejudiced by the compulsory acquisition of the Rights if reasonable alternatives should have been given further consideration. It is not proportionate to disrupt renewable electricity generation at an operational solar farm with a view to enabling the delivery of low-carbon transmission infrastructure if the Proposed Development could be delivered without the Rights being compulsorily acquired.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>In the absence of detailed design, method statements, and outage requirements, Brickkiln has been unable to carry out a shading analysis and other evaluations to accurately assess the level of loss it would suffer as a result of the compulsory acquisition of the Rights. Brickkiln has also been unable to confirm the operational, safety, and earthing risks posed by the Proposed Development. However, it appears likely that the overhead cabling would cause shading, and the construction and operation of the cables would require the displacement and/or removal of solar panels. This would disrupt the generation of electricity at Brickkiln Solar Farm, and it is not unreasonable to assume this would cause Brickkiln to suffer significant financial losses. Such losses carry weight and must be assessed against the public benefit of the Proposed Development, but the appropriate weight to be given to these losses cannot be identified until the losses themselves have been accurately quantified. As the level of loss has not been accurately quantified at this stage, this also casts doubt on whether NGET has allocated sufficient resources to fully compensate Brickkiln for its losses.</p> <p>Brickkiln further objects to the grant of compulsory acquisition powers on the basis that NGET has not satisfactorily engaged in negotiations with Brickkiln to date. NGET has not yet provided information to allow Brickkiln to assess its commercial position in terms of the risks posed by the Proposed Development. This has prevented Brickkiln from being able to meaningfully negotiate with NGET. NGET has also not issued proposed heads of terms for acquisition by agreement. Brickkiln has therefore not been presented with an alternative proposal to consider instead of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>Brickkiln therefore respectfully invites the Inspector to require modifications to the Proposed Development to avoid Brickkiln Solar Farm and to refuse to grant compulsory acquisition powers in relation to Brickkiln Solar Farm.</p> <p>Brickkiln reserves the right to maintain its objection to the Proposed Development throughout the Examination unless and until satisfactory information is provided or changes to the scheme are made. Brickkiln also reserves the right to submit further representations.</p> |
| John Stacey | 5698 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights, All of the above, Temporary possession | All | Both | <p>Reasons for objecting.</p> <p>No alternative route</p> <p>At the onset, on receiving the first documents from NG we were only given a purple swathe where NG had pre-determined the pylon route. This was not at the formative stage so did not meet the first Gunning Principle Rule.</p> <p>Lack of engagement.</p> <p>We only had direct engagement with FG, NG avoided direct engagement. The statutory guidance to which NGET need to "have regard" is here: Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - GOV.UK. The section "What is needed for consideration of land matters?" "the strong expectation is that applicants of proposed NSIPs will act reasonably in engaging with landowners". One example of a lack of engagement is the survey licences. According to the terms of these licences land owners are allowed to receive the raw survey data within 14 days.</p> <p>NG consistently refused our requests for these results. This would have led to less design issues going forward. The only opportunity to speak directly was at the Consultation events. We were always told at these events that our horses were a special case and NG were aware of the problem. We were led to believe that provision would be in place for our horses wellbeing. We were also promised electric gates for our crossing points. At present these seem hollow promises. We made representation at every consultation event, any suggested route of design change was difficult to find as it was lost in the general documents available on line.</p> <p>At every opportunity we proposed options to allow our horses to remain in their existing paddock and field. We also highlighted the excess harm the haul road planned routing would have in the need to remove around 100m of hedge and deep ditch. This could be minimised by a small western change to the route.</p> <p>NG avoided any direct engagement and therefore localised design accommodation was avoided.</p> <p>Both of my neighbours have indicated that they have proposed slight movement of pylons TB94 and TB100 to the West. If there had been a coordinated approach we could all have had our requests accommodated.</p> <p>Route Design</p> <p>The route should have been designed to minimise the harm.</p> <p>Soils</p> <p>NG still make the claim that the routing and siting selection process confirms that there are no other suitable soils sites of poorer agricultural quality that can accommodate the project.</p> <p>They highlight that they looked at the impact on agricultural land and sought to minimise impacts on the BMV land. This cannot be true as, according to NG, soils were scoped out in the design and routing process.</p> <p>Proximity to our house.</p> <p>The route could have been designed to allow a greater distance from our house.</p> <p>Crossing Horse paddock</p> <p>During the design process there was a lack of consideration the construction would have on horses.</p> <p>When pylon TB98 did get moved 80m its construction area footprint was still within the paddock and the construction noise still in a position that the horses would not tolerate, this is also the case with the haul road which runs alongside the paddock.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>This re positioning of TB98 has in fact been counterproductive as its resighting has still meant the horses will need moving and the pylon is now not near the field edge. Harm from the haul road. The haul road that runs to the west of TB97 has been designed to run diagonally across our 4m deep ditch. This has meant that around 100m of hedge will also be removed. The ditch has seven field drains running into it, these will need to be kept open and running and the ditch will need to be reinstated. UKPN works In July 2025 we found out that NG had changed the plans and decided to re-route the existing 11KV OHL through our farm yard. This will cause immense disruption. We have since offered to allow the undergrounding to be rerouted through a grass area around the house which would be considerably cheaper and avoid the considerable disruption the planned route would create. Unfortunately, this is outside the DCO draft order limit so is not possible. If there had been any engagement from NG and UKPN before May 2026, when we first found out the reason for it going through the farm yard, this could have been resolved before the DCO. Some 5 weeks later we are still awaiting further contact from either party. This is not the only issue we have with the OHL rerouting. Over by TB96 there is to be over 300m of undergrounding for the OHL, this OHL that is being removed is not even on our land.</p> <p>Lack of updated maps Looking at the design, firstly it has been and still is difficult to establish what is proposed, the amendments in 2025 were not available on NG's interactive map until the DCO was made.</p> <p>Suds The suds are not all positioned to allow natural drainage from the haul roads.</p> <p>Construction Compound. The plan is that there will be a construction compound on our land alongside the B1018, the bellmouth into the compound will be problematic as the field is around a metre higher than the road and the compound has been placed where the road has a gradual curve. I have been told that NG will not lower the field level, but as a landowner we need to see a design as eventually we will need to bring the area back into crop production.</p> <p>Permanent Access These tend to run within the fields and do not make use of the headlands. This access needs to be agreed mutually and not just imposed upon us from the NG desktop design.</p> <p>Draft Order Limit The width of the draft order is excessive. We are uncertain what is planned within this area. Will we be able to farm the land up to the start of construction and what will the area of land that will not be available to be cropped be and how long for? Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives. Several alternatives have not been properly considered. TS Conductors These would mean potential for a reduced number of pylons. Offshore. After a lot of pressure NG made a token attempt at looking at an offshore option. They did not look at an offshore hub but just a direct route, this was for three 2MW DC Cables. In fact, as it was DC, two cables would have been sufficient as found in the Eastern Green Link 3 & 4 Strategic Optioneering Report 2024 HVDC Undergrounding. This could be considerably less harmful and would only need 4MW as DC is more efficient. Project costs. The 10% contingency is considerably low and would cover the injurious compensation which seems impossible to have benchmarked when the level of design is at such a preliminary stage. Farm safety. Clearance of farm machinery According to NG, line safety clearance for farm machinery is expected to be implemented by third parties whenever they are near overhead lines. NG state that agricultural vehicles, such as combine harvesters will be safe to pass underneath. Across our farm the indicated line will be below 10m at its lowest point. According to the Energy Network Association Passing safety clearance is for harvesting is 4.3m for 400 Kv, at present the largest New Holland Combine at its highest point is 6.56m. This will create unacceptable safety concerns for farmers. Payment rates NG are using their Land Rights Strategy for payments for pylons, these payments are too low and NG are relying on injurious compensation. EirGrid are offering an upfront payment of €43,000 for pylons and €140 per metre for power lines. In addition, there is a minimum payment of €8,000, and landowners may seek further compensation within six years. Current negotiations We met FG in February and discussed UKPN Undergrounding, Siting of Pylons/Haul roads, Horse Paddocks, Construction Impacts, Footpath Diversions, Trees, Haul Roads and Badger Setts. We then had a meeting with NG and FG on 12TH May. We had expected at this meeting to receive answers to the points we raised at the February meeting but NG couldn't tell us anything. Do NG have plans or are they just not willing to share them with us? We are uncertain on their plans for our horses, as if the plan goes ahead they will need permanently relocating well ahead of any works, which will be a considerable cost that we cannot afford and cannot be burdened with. Conclusion We are not going accept a voluntary agreement as NG, over the four years, have not sufficiently engaged with us and have withheld information. They have not taken on board our suggestions even though we indicated that we would not voluntarily agree if they did not resolve the issue with the horses and move the pylon away from their paddock. The design at its infancy should have considered a higher degree of embedded mitigation for noise even if it had been further from our residence.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Richard Long Group Limited | 10184 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | <p>The objections to the interference with land rights are summarized as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Applicant's failure to consider alternatives for their project, less intrusive options exist •The land is not necessary for the scheme, alternative designs or routes could avoid acquisition of these rights. •The private loss and human rights impact due to the proposed project outweighs the public benefit with significant harm to landowners, business and livelihoods, in this case involving a solar farm •Pre-application-there has been insufficient detailed preparatory work by the Applicant prior to the DCO application both in consulting landowners and considering alternative routes and design changes which have been put forward •Inadequate engagement or negotiation-we have been trying to address with the Applicant the issue of the proposed power lines crossing the solar site for nearly 3 years with little feedback from the Applicant •Lack of compelling case in the public interest-the Applicant has not demonstrated a sufficiently strong justification for the project •Compensation issues-we have concerns about whether affected parties will receive fair and timely compensation •Heads of Terms-despite negotiations with the Applicant no heads of terms for a voluntary agreement are agreed, again due to a lack of engagement from the Applicant |
| Linda Fisher | 1169 | Yes | All of the above | D-6/3 | Both | <p>am writing to you because my land is directly affected by the proposed Norwich to Tilbury Grid Upgrade Scheme, with our comments for the statutory consultation in relation to Norwich to Tilbury Grid Upgrade.</p> <p>Property description My property comprises a detached cottage with gardens and additional, connected, land containing a reservoir. The property is located on Fossetts Lane in the village of Fordham in Essex.</p> <p>The land and reservoir, serve a very important role in my family life, providing a safe recreation and amenity area for family and friends.</p> <p>My property is not a commercial horticultural or agricultural property, and therefore differs from the majority of properties directly affected by the scheme, which are predominantly, traditional agricultural use. A Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) has significant impact on all types of property that are directly affected by it, but often greater impact is felt on residential properties, such as mine.</p> <p>In most cases, residential occupiers are unfamiliar with any form of compulsory purchase and the direct impact this can have. As a result, it is even more important that detailed information is provided to them to enable them to understand the impacts, and to attempt to allay natural fears and heightened anxiety.</p> <p>Land Plans The land plans showing the scheme requirements provided to me in Fisher Germans letter date 16th June 2025 are, for a lay-person unfamiliar with such infrastructure schemes, very difficult to interpret. Two plans were provided with the letter. One shows the scheme requirements related to one HM Land Registry Title Number at small scale and the other at a larger scale. From the Legend accompanying the plans it is not possible to ascertain with any certainty what the areas are required for. The plans show a portion of the southeast bank of the reservoir shaded green. The Legend states that this is "Zone for permanent assets (NGET)". No further detail is provided.</p> <p>In an attempt to gain clarity, the Norwich to Tilbury interactive map accessed at https://norwichtotilburymap.nationalgrid.com/ was referred to. This shows similar to the plans issued, and with no further detail regarding the works.</p> <p>As may be anticipated, the thought that part of my land is to be acquired by National Grid for any purpose is incredibly unnerving and has created a massive amount of stress and anxiety. The additional stress from the lack of information on the proposed use of the land has only served to make matters even worse.</p> <p>Landowner Engagement Over the past two years I, together with my land agents have engaged with your land agents Fisher German, and at every consultation stage useful feedback has been provided on National Grids proposed scheme. Additional detailed information and clarity has been requested from Fisher German / National Grid regarding the potential impacts of the scheme on my property. At each meeting, the said requested additional information has not been available for Fisher German to share with us and as a result, despite the two years of engagement, i still have very little significant specific information on how the scheme will actually affect my property.</p> <p>Although engagement meetings have been provided to me, as stated, the distinct lack of significant content and details provided at those meetings has not only NOT helped allay my fears, but has actually increased my concerns.</p> <p>I am retired and enjoy the amenity that the reservoir provides to my property and the recreational opportunities it provides to my wider family.</p> <p>Despite having entered into early engagement meetings, the position that I find myself in now with regards the scheme, through no fault of my own, is taking a considerable toll on my life and my wider family's life. The complete lack of significant information being provided from National Grid, has put me in an intolerable position.</p> |
| Chris Smith | 14516 | Yes | All of the above | All, but C-15/24, C-17/23, C-17/39, C-17/107 and C-17/112 in particular | Both | <p>The interference with our land in Little Bromley is only being considered because of the plan to build a substation or connecting point at Ardeigh. I do not believe that a proper, evidence based case has been made for the alleged need to construct a sub station at Ardeigh. It is not needed for the Norwich to Tilbury project itself, and there are better ways to connect Five Estuaries and North Falls to the grid. The requirements of section 122 (2) are not therefore satisfied because the interference with our rights is not required for the Norwich to Tilbury project and is not incidental to it. In particular the Norwich to Tilbury project could and should be completed without coming anywhere near Ardeigh or Little Bromley.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Natalie Smith | 14087 | Yes | All of the above | All, but C-15/24, C-17/23, C-17/39, C-17/107 and C-17/112 in particular | Both | The interference with our land in Little Bromley is only being considered because of the plan to build a substation or connecting point at Ardeigh. I do not believe that a proper, evidence based case has been made for the alleged need to construct a sub station at Ardeigh. It is not needed for the Norwich to Tilbury project itself, and there are better ways to connect Five Estuaries and North Falls to the grid. The requirements of section 122 (2) are not therefore satisfied because the interference with our rights is not required for the Norwich to Tilbury project and is not incidental to it. In particular the Norwich to Tilbury project could and should be completed without coming anywhere near Ardeigh or Little Bromley. |
| John Fisher | 6961 | Yes | All of the above | D-6/3 | Both | <p>We have been to the various public exhibitions to view the plans but pylons were the only option on the table, no consideration given to the alternatives, eg underground or offshore. Surely all options should have been available so the public could have a balanced view.</p> <p>NG have not taken into account the consequences of their actions will alter the character and visually pollute a wide corridor of East Anglian countryside either side of the route. The cables will be a major hazard to migrating birds, the footings will eat up many acres of productive farmland.</p> <p>We are privileged to live in a cottage in FORDHAM that has enjoyed unblemished views over the beautiful Colne Valley for over 500 years. The woodland trust recently planted 1000's of trees around the village and visitors come from all around the country to enjoy them but if the preferred route goes ahead not only will our cottage will be SURROUNDED by pylons, the trees will be a casualty, who would like to picnic under a pylon! Thankfully there is a lot of opposition against these plans, with the alternatives of underground and the preferred option of offshore pipelines suggested.</p> <p>National Grid should consider undergrounding between TB42 and TB50 in light of the special character of the Fordham Valley and the disproportionate impact pylons there would bring.</p> <p>6) There is significant archaeology in the area between TB46 and TB52. Damage to these sites is unacceptable and careful routing will be required to avoid entirely, regardless of whether pylons or underground cable are employed. The woodlands at Fiddlers Farm / Fiddlers Woods are ancient and Fiddlers Farm is a Listed Building, ruling out a more easterly route.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p> |
| Robert Gray Farming Contractors Ltd | 10555 | Yes | All of the above | All | National Grid | <p>Our objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grids failure to consider alternatives for their project, there are less intrusive options •The land is not necessary for the scheme, alternative routes could avoid acquisition of these rights. •The private loss and human rights impact due to the proposed project outweighs the public benefit with significant harm to landowners, business and livelihoods. •Pre-application-there has been insufficient detailed preparatory work by National Grid prior to the DCO application both in consulting landowners and considering alternative routes and design changes which have been put forward •Inadequate engagement or negotiation-we have been trying to address with National Grid the issue of the proposed power lines crossing our land with little feedback •Lack of compelling case in the public interest-National Grid has not demonstrated a sufficiently strong justification for the project •Compensation issues-we have concerns about whether affected parties will receive a fair compensation •Heads of Terms-despite negotiations with the National Grid no heads of terms for a voluntary agreement are agreed, again due to a lack of engagement |

| Your full name | Person with interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks ? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| ARU Writtle (Writtle University College / Anglia Ruskin University) | 7116 28443 | Yes | All of the above | F-8/9, F-8/15, F-8/16, F-8/17, F-8/19, F-8/20, F-8/21, F-8/23, F-8/24, F-8/25, F-8/26, F-8/27, F-8/29, F-8/30, F-8/32, F-8/33, F-8/36, F-8/37, F-8/42, & F-8/47 | Both | <p>ARU Writtle (F1201D065, NTOT-AFP2247) is described in the Lands Right Tracker and the Schedule of Affected Persons as "Writtle University College" (PIL 7116) and "Anglia Ruskin University Higher Education Corporation" (PIL 28443).</p> <p>ARU Writtle's objection centres on the legal requirement that compulsory acquisition powers in a Development Consent Order (DCO) must be necessary, justified, and supported by a compelling public interest case, and that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) has failed to meet those standards in relation to ARU Writtle's land and most notably Plot 8/42. The objection relies on the statutory tests in particularly the emphasis on necessity, proportionality, and consideration of alternatives. NGET have failed to satisfy Section 122(2) and 123 PA 2008 through lack of necessity or requirement as the purpose of CA Plot 8/42 can be achieved through powers already included in the draft DCO, TRO's and road closures. Failure in relation to Section 122(3) that there is no compelling case in the public interest as the scheme can proceed without interfering with ARU Writtle's land rights and the acquisition is therefore disproportionate and unnecessary. The Application creates a logical contradiction; if traffic is excluded, scaffolding access becomes unnecessary and if alternative access exists, additional rights are duplicative. The statutory tests cannot be satisfied.</p> <p>In relation to the Government Guidance ARU Writtle argues that the guidance requires a clear justification that land is needed for the scheme, but that the presence of alternative access routes and powers shows no genuine need. There is a lack of proper consideration of alternatives. The guidance stresses that interference with private rights must be no more than necessary but acquiring Plot 8/42 exceeds what is required, especially where the objective can be achieved via less intrusive means and the impact of access and use of Plot 8/42 is so impactful on ARU Writtle.</p> <p>Severe disruption to a nationally significant education and research facility The proposed overhead line and construction access directly affect ARU Writtle's Equine Unit, which underpins teaching, research, industry collaboration and student placements across agriculture, animal sciences and equine studies.</p> <p>Unacceptable health and safety risks Construction traffic and works would pass through the Equine Centre, close to stables, teaching rooms, parking areas and riding arenas, creating serious risks to students (including under 18s), staff and horses, and obstructing emergency access and evacuation routes.</p> <p>Incompatibility with equine welfare and animal safety Horses are highly sensitive to noise, machinery, vibration and EMFs. Overhead lines above grazing paddocks would render fields unusable, increase stress and health risks, force prolonged stabling and compromise animal welfare.</p> <p>Loss of essential grazing and long term operational constraints Construction and reinstatement would lead to extended loss of safe equine grazing, with paddocks taking 12+ months to become suitable again, causing enduring disruption beyond the construction phase.</p> <p>Irreplaceable educational harm Practical, hands on learning is fundamental to 17 FE, undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. Current proposals would prevent safe delivery of assessments, clinical exams and required contact hours, risking non compliance with regulatory and accreditation requirements.</p> <p>Significant financial and reputational damage Expected losses include reduced tuition income, additional stabling and veterinary costs, disruption to loan horse schemes, cancellation of external clinics and competitions, and long term reputational harm affecting recruitment, retention and partnerships.</p> <p>Increased traffic and access pressures Construction traffic would intensify pressures on narrow single-track routes (including Cow Watering Lane), exacerbating congestion, safety risks and disruption at peak times.</p> <p>Environmental and ecological impacts The proposed acquisition would result in avoidable disturbance to undeveloped paddock land that is not being mitigated. It will introduce additional ground disturbance, soil compaction, loss of vegetation, fragmentation of paddock habitats and dangers to horses and humans introducing cumulative long term environmental and ecological impacts and effects.</p> <p>Overall The compulsory acquisition is unnecessary and is not the least intrusive option. The Secretary of State cannot lawfully include Plot 8/42 in the DCO because, section 122(2) is not satisfied (no necessity), and section 122(3) is not satisfied (no compelling case). Consent should only be granted for development that is "required". Plot 8/42 is not "required", so it must be excluded.</p> <p>This is set out in full in ARU Writtle's written submissions REP1-200, REP3-117, REP4-348.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Robert Gray | 14200 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>Our Objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •National Grids failure to consider alternatives for their project, there are less intrusive options •The land is not necessary for the scheme, alternative routes could avoid acquisition of these rights. •The private loss and human rights impact due to the proposed project outweighs the public benefit with significant harm to landowners, business and livelihoods. •Pre-application-there has been insufficient detailed preparatory work by National Grid prior to the DCO application both in consulting landowners and considering alternative routes and design changes which have been put forward •Inadequate engagement or negotiation-we have been trying to address with National Grid the issue of the proposed power lines crossing our land with little feedback •Lack of compelling case in the public interest-National Grid has not demonstrated a sufficiently strong justification for the project •Compensation issues-we have concerns about whether affected parties will receive a fair compensation •Heads of Terms-despite negotiations with the National Grid no heads of terms for a voluntary agreement are agreed, again due to a lack of engagement |
| Deborah Smith / Andrew Donald Smith | 3398 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | I do not give any permission relating to my property relating to this scheme. The scheme is environmentally detrimental, personally financially detrimental. This is my land. I am already disadvantaged by this scheme so I am totally against it in every way. I do not have any permissions. |
| Richard Long Limited | 10556 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of rights, Temporary possession | All | National Grid | <p>The objections to the interference with land rights are summarized as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Applicant's failure to consider alternatives for their project, less intrusive options exist •The land is not necessary for the scheme, alternative designs or routes could avoid acquisition of these rights. •The private loss and human rights impact due to the proposed project outweighs the public benefit with significant harm to landowners, business and livelihoods. •Pre-application-there has been insufficient detailed preparatory work by the Applicant prior to the DCO application both in consulting landowners and considering alternative routes and design changes which have been put forward •Inadequate engagement or negotiation-we have been trying to address with the Applicant the issue of the proposed power lines crossing the land with little feedback from the Applicant •Lack of compelling case in the public interest-the Applicant has not demonstrated a sufficiently strong justification for the project •Compensation issues-we have concerns about whether affected parties will receive fair and timely compensation •Heads of Terms-despite negotiations with the Applicant no heads of terms for a voluntary agreement are agreed, again due to a lack of engagement from the Applicant |
| Joe Hearnden, BTF Partnership on behalf of the Cole Family | The Cole Family (multiple references, see RR-3629 for list of Aps) | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the compulsory acquisition of the Affected Person's specific land or rights is strictly necessary to deliver the scheme. The inclusion of the Affected Person's property appears to be driven by a desire for flexibility or contingency rather than a clearly evidenced requirement. The Application lacks justification as to why the Affected Person's land is essential, nor any evidence that the scheme could not proceed with a reduced land take or alternative configuration. The extent of the rights sought is disproportionate to the needs of the Scheme. The Applicant appears to be seeking permanent rights or outright acquisition in circumstances where temporary access or limited rights would be sufficient. The proposals do not demonstrate that impacts on the Affected Person's property have been minimised and instead impose excessive interference with the Affected Person's use and enjoyment of the land. This includes long-term constraints on use, potential loss of value, and disruption to access or operations. Such interference fails to strike a fair balance between private rights and public benefit. There has been an inadequate consideration of reasonable alternatives. The Applicant has not meaningfully explored different route alignments, layouts, or design refinements that could avoid or reduce impacts on the Affected Person's property. Without a transparent and reasoned assessment of alternatives, it cannot be concluded that the current proposals represent the least intrusive solution or the which is most effective at delivering on the public need. This omission significantly weakens the justification for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding the deliverability of the scheme. Uncertainty remains where Objectors often point to a lack of secured funding, necessary consents, and the realism of the proposed programme. Where delivery is not clearly secured, it is inappropriate to authorise compulsory acquisition powers that may result in land being taken or rights being restricted without the Scheme proceeding as anticipated. These uncertainties undermine the claimed public interest case.</p> <p>The Applicant has not demonstrated that it has taken reasonable steps to acquire the required land or rights by agreement. Engagement to date has been limited and has not amounted to meaningful negotiation. The Applicant has proposed Heads of Terms for the rights and interests being sought, but are unable or unwilling to alter or amend the terms sufficiently for parties to resolve disputes or reach points of common ground. In particular, there has been insufficient effort to reduce the extent of acquisition or to explore less intrusive options through discussion. The Affected Person does not believe that the Applicant has reached the required threshold to justify the use of compulsory acquisition powers as a measure of last resort.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding compliance with procedural and legal requirements. The justification for the inclusion of the Affected Person's land, and for the specific rights sought, has not been clearly or adequately articulated. To the extent that the Order seeks powers beyond what is necessary or lacks sufficient precision, it risks exceeding statutory limits. The panel of Examining Inspectors must be satisfied that all legal requirements are fully and properly met, which does not appear to be the case.</p> <p>The compensation framework concerning the full extent of impacts, including injurious affection, disturbance, and long-term restrictions on the use of the Affected Person's property is inadequate or fails to strike a fair balance under Human Rights legislation. While compensation cannot justify unnecessary acquisition, the framework must still ensure affected parties are treated fairly, which has not been convincingly demonstrated.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Joe Hearnden, BTF Partnership on behalf of the Brice Family | The Brice Family (multiple references, see RR-3626 for list of Aps) | Yes | All of the above | all | Both | <p>The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the compulsory acquisition of the Affected Person's specific land or rights is strictly necessary to deliver the scheme. The inclusion of the Affected Person's property appears to be driven by a desire for flexibility or contingency rather than a clearly evidenced requirement. The Application lacks justification as to why the Affected Person's land is essential, nor any evidence that the scheme could not proceed with a reduced land take or alternative configuration. The extent of the rights sought is disproportionate to the needs of the Scheme. The Applicant appears to be seeking permanent rights or outright acquisition in circumstances where temporary access or limited rights would be sufficient. The proposals do not demonstrate that impacts on the Affected Person's property have been minimised and instead impose excessive interference with the Affected Person's use and enjoyment of the land. This includes long-term constraints on use, potential loss of value, and disruption to access or operations. Such interference fails to strike a fair balance between private rights and public benefit.</p> <p>There has been an inadequate consideration of reasonable alternatives. The Applicant has not meaningfully explored different route alignments, layouts, or design refinements that could avoid or reduce impacts on the Affected Person's property. Without a transparent and reasoned assessment of alternatives, it cannot be concluded that the current proposals represent the least intrusive solution or the which is most effective at delivering on the public need. This omission significantly weakens the justification for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding the deliverability of the scheme. Uncertainty remains where Objectors often point to a lack of secured funding, necessary consents, and the realism of the proposed programme. Where delivery is not clearly secured, it is inappropriate to authorise compulsory acquisition powers that may result in land being taken or rights being restricted without the Scheme proceeding as anticipated. These uncertainties undermine the claimed public interest case.</p> <p>The Applicant has not demonstrated that it has taken reasonable steps to acquire the required land or rights by agreement. Engagement to date has been limited and has not amounted to meaningful negotiation. The Applicant has proposed Heads of Terms for the rights and interests being sought, but are unable or unwilling to alter or amend the terms sufficiently for parties to resolve disputes or reach points of common ground. In particular, there has been insufficient effort to reduce the extent of acquisition or to explore less intrusive options through discussion. The Affected Person does not believe that the Applicant has reached the required threshold to justify the use of compulsory acquisition powers as a measure of last resort.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding compliance with procedural and legal requirements. The justification for the inclusion of the Affected Person's land, and for the specific rights sought, has not been clearly or adequately articulated. To the extent that the Order seeks powers beyond what is necessary or lacks sufficient precision, it risks exceeding statutory limits. The panel of Examining Inspectors must be satisfied that all legal requirements are fully and properly met, which does not appear to be the case.</p> <p>The compensation framework concerning the full extent of impacts, including injurious affection, disturbance, and long-term restrictions on the use of the Affected Person's property is inadequate or fails to strike a fair balance under Human Rights legislation. While compensation cannot justify unnecessary acquisition, the framework must still ensure affected parties are treated fairly, which has not been convincingly demonstrated.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| David William Salmon | 5741 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>We object to the NG Norwich to Tilbury pylon route and especially its lack of engagement with ourselves over the impacts to our business and land holding during the so called 'consultation and engagement meetings'. In particular we object to the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of meaningful engagement and information sharing, in particular information regarding our irrigation reservoir with active fishing club in Ardeleigh (Drawing AENC-TQST-LAN-DWG-0002 parcel ref 17/39) Initially ignoring our feedback regarding our angling club and then not answering questions about the future of angling on the lake, which we now understand will be prohibited completely. •Lack of meaningful engagement regarding the permanent private access road- we have had to feedback on designs at meetings where information is so lacking that our response has been limited. Even with the 2 rounds of variations the engagement was very one sided resulting in each variation being more detrimental to our business than the previous iteration. We provided multiple rounds of feedback and if only the designers consulted with us in a 2 way dialogue a design which sterilises less of our land and has a smaller impact could have been found. As it stands we are still un-clear of how we will access our field (15/52 on drawing AENC-TQST-LAN-DWG-0002) as our only access route has been severed by the road and the latest route sterilises our land in a long 30m wide slither between road and our boundary. •Lack of information regarding the use of the permanent private access road and the shared temporary wind farm substation construction road. When will they be used and for what? There is no meaningful information on how NG would 'share' the wind farm road. We cannot negotiate or provide feedback if there is no information. They have included all the option routes on the wind farm road and cannot provide clarity of what they intend to do. •Cumulative impact of wind farms and NG on our farmland and residential house at Hall Farm is unacceptable. With 2 haul roads and multiple companies/operators involved the resulting un-certainty and direct impact of when/if projects go ahead and the duration of the works will have a significant impact on the farm business, environment and enjoyment of our house(noise/dust/view etc) • Insufficient negotiation on the HOT's on all general points and especially where the substation haul roads are involved, as information is not available. <p>In conclusion we feel the lack of negotiation and information being shared is not acceptable and require progress on all of the above points before we would be in agreement with the CA or TP of land rights by NG.</p> |
| Robert Moore | 4235 | Yes | All of the above | All | Both | <p>I object to the proposed project for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)Failure to properly consider alternatives to pylons The applicant has failed to adequately consider alternatives to the use of pylons for this project. Less intrusive options appear to exist, but these have not been properly assessed, explained, or justified. 2)Failure to consider less harmful alternatives The proposal does not demonstrate that the least damaging or least intrusive option has been selected. The applicant has not shown that alternative routes, technologies, mitigation measures, or methods of delivery have been fully explored in order to reduce the impact on affected landowners, businesses, homes, and livelihoods. 3)Disproportionate private loss and human rights impact The proposed project would cause very significant private loss and would have a serious impact on the rights and livelihoods of affected landowners and businesses. In our case, the proposed power lines would cross our farm and would cause substantial harm to our business, including the destruction of a wedding venue, which is the small farm's main source of income. This impact is severe, personal, and disproportionate. The harm to land, businesses, income, and way of life outweighs any public benefit that the applicant claims would arise from the project. 4)Lack of a compelling case in the public interest The applicant has failed to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest for this project in its proposed form. There has been insufficient justification for why the project must proceed using pylons, why this route has been selected, and why less intrusive alternatives have not been pursued. 5)Insufficient pre-application work and inadequate consultation Prior to submitting the DCO application, the applicant failed to carry out sufficient detailed preparatory work, particularly in relation to consultation and engagement with affected landowners. 6)We have been trying to address the issue of the proposed power lines crossing our farm with the applicant for three years. Despite this, we have received limited feedback and there has been no meaningful progress towards resolving our concerns. This demonstrates inadequate engagement, poor communication, and a failure to properly consult with those most directly affected. 7)Inadequate engagement and negotiation The applicant has not engaged with us in a constructive or meaningful way. Given the scale of the impact on our farm and business, we would have expected detailed discussions, proper negotiation, and genuine attempts to reduce or avoid the harm caused. This has not happened. I imagine many other businesses / farms have similar |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>8)Compensation concerns We have serious concerns about whether affected parties will receive fair, adequate, and timely compensation. The damage to our business and livelihood would be substantial, and to date there has been no communication from the applicant about how losses will be assessed, how compensation will be calculated, and when compensation would be paid.</p> <p>9)No heads of terms or voluntary agreement No heads of terms or voluntary agreement has been signed. This is due to the lack of meaningful engagement and negotiation by the applicant. The absence of agreed terms further demonstrates that the applicant has not properly addressed the impact of the project on our land and business.</p> <p>For these reasons, I object to the application. I ask that the Examining Authority gives significant weight to the severe impact on our farm, business, livelihood, and property rights, and requires the applicant to properly consider less intrusive alternatives before any consent is granted.</p> |
| Parkers Of Leicester Limited | 10218 | | All of the above | All | Both | <p>1. Introduction 1.1. These representations are made on behalf of Parkers of Leicester Limited ("POL") and Parker Strategic Land Limited ("PSL") (together, "our clients") in relation to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc ("National Grid")s application for a Development Consent Order for the Norwich to Tilbury Project (the "Project"). 1.2. POL owns land within the DCO redline boundary ("POL's Land"), identified under the following Land Plot numbers within the DCO Land Plans – Section E [APP-013]:E-2/116, E-2/117, E-2/119, E-2/120, E-2/121, E-2/123, E-2/124, E-2/125, E-2/126,E-2/127, E-2/128, E-3/1, E-3/2, E-3/3, E-3/4, E-3/5, E-3/8, E-3/9, E-3/10, E-3/11,E-3/12, E-3/15, E-3/23, E-3/27 and E-3/29. 1.3. POL's Land forms part of a wider site of approximately 553 hectares ("the Development Site") being promoted by PSL for residential-led mixed use development comprising up to 6,000 new homes and 40ha of employment land. The Development Site was recently identified by Braintree District Council as a preferred site in the Regulation 18 consultation on the emerging Braintree Local Plan. Our clients confirm that their objection to the interference with their land rights is maintained in its entirety.</p> <p>2. Summary of Objections 2.1. Our clients' objections were set out in full in their Relevant Representations. They are summarised below. Inadequate Justification for the Extent of the Order Limits and Compulsory Acquisition 2.2. The DCO application allows for Limits of Deviation ("LoD") representing the maximum locational flexibility for permanent infrastructure. On most land plots the LoD are of a standard width. However, on Plots 3/32, 3/31, 3/28, 3/23, and 3/29, the LoD and Order Limits are significantly wider than elsewhere. No adequate justification has been provided for why the Order Limits on POL's Land must be so wide or of such an unusual shape. Seeking powers with significant flexibility, without demonstrating why such flexibility is essential, is contrary to the fundamental principle that compulsory acquisition powers should only be sought over land demonstrably necessary for delivery of the Project. 2.3. These matters are directly relevant to Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008, which requires that compulsory acquisition of land is necessary for the purposes of the authorised development. In the absence of plot-specific justification, the applicant cannot demonstrate that the compulsory acquisition of such extensive rights over POL's Land is necessary. This is further at odds with the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance, Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition (September 2013) ("the Guidance"), which requires acquiring authorities to demonstrate that land take is the minimum required. 2.4. National Grid has stated it is satisfied that all land interests identified for compulsory acquisition and temporary possession are required. However, the Statement of Reasons provides only generic, high-level justification rather than plot-specific analysis. There is no detailed explanation of why each individual plot is necessary, whether less intrusive alternatives have been considered, or why the extent of land take is proportionate. This falls short of the Guidance. Failure to Demonstrate Compulsory Acquisition as a Last Resort 2.5. The Statement of Reasons fails to demonstrate that compulsory powers are genuinely a last resort as required by the Guidance. National Grid claims its preference is to secure land rights on a voluntary basis, yet the Statement of Reasons provides no evidence of meaningful negotiations with our clients, no detail on offers made or rejected, and no explanation of why voluntary agreement has not been reached. The Guidance requires acquiring authorities to demonstrate reasonable steps to acquire by agreement. The minimal engagement with our clients demonstrates that the applicant has not treated compulsory acquisition as a last resort.</p> |

| Your full name | Person with Interest in Land (PIL) Reference ID (see Land Rights Tracker which can be found in the examination library of the Norwich to Tilbury website reference REP4-051) | Do you object to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) of your land or rights over your land or any proposed interference with your existing land rights? | Do you object to CA, TP or both (select all that apply)? | On which plots listed in the Book of Reference (BoR) do you object to the interference of land rights? List each plot (e.g. A-1/1) or if applicable, type 'All' | Do you object to the interference of land rights by National Grid and/ or UK Power Networks? | Please summarise (in no more than 1500 words) the reason(s) for your objection to the interference of your land or rights, with reference to the relevant articles of the Planning Act 2008 (in particular) |
|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>3. Continuing Inadequacy of Engagement</p> <p>3.1. The applicant's engagement with our clients has been, and remains, wholly inadequate. Despite the Project having been in planning for a number of years, the applicant has made minimal effort to engage with POL regarding the impact on POL's Land and the Development Site. Our clients have been seeking to engage with National Grid since July 2024 on the potential conflict between the Project and the Development Site.</p> <p>3.2. Since submitting their Relevant Representations, our clients have continued to seek constructive engagement with National Grid on pylon alignment, mitigation and the interface between the Project and the Development Site. No meaningful progress has been made. National Grid has not engaged substantively with our clients' specific concerns, and no Statement of Common Ground has been entered into. This is in stark contrast to the approach taken towards other affected parties – as demonstrated by the detailed Statement of Common Ground with Blackwater Aggregates (Bradwell Quarry). Our clients are entitled to equivalent engagement and have received none.</p> <p>3.3. The absence of meaningful engagement further demonstrates that the test under the Guidance – that compulsory acquisition must be a genuine last resort – has not been met.</p> <p>4. National Grid's Proposed Southward Realignment of the Overhead Line and its Prejudicial Impact on the Development Site</p> <p>4.1. Our clients wish to draw the Examining Authority's attention to a further development that has arisen during the course of the examination, which materially worsens the position for our clients and reinforces their objection.</p> <p>4.2. As confirmed in National Grid's Draft Statement of Common Ground with Blackwater Aggregates (Bradwell Quarry) (document reference 8.3.27, Revision B, Deadline 4), the applicant has committed to an alternative route scenario that moves pylons TB085 and TB086 further to the south, with TB084 positioned closer to the Order Limits. The applicant has stated that it has committed to this alternative option and will now progress with it as the preferred scenario.</p> <p>4.3. This realignment has been made to accommodate the interests of Blackwater Aggregates in relation to the Bradwell Quarry Monks Farm site at Kelvedon, which Blackwater Aggregates seeks to develop for the extraction of sand and gravel. The mineral rights at Monks Farm are owned by Blackwater Aggregates, and the Monks Farm extension is understood to be area A8 (Essex County Council mineral planning department reference site A47).</p> <p>4.4. The alternative scenario adjusts the overhead line between TB084 and TB087, moving pylons further south within the Order Limits, with the stated purpose of reducing mineral sterilisation within the quarry area.</p> <p>4.5. Our clients object strongly to this approach for the following reasons.</p> <p>4.6. First, the southward movement of the overhead line centre line within the Order Limits means that the pylons will have a greater impact on POL's Land and the Development Site, which lies to the south. This directly increases the sterilisation of the Development Site and worsens the interference with our clients' land rights compared to the position as originally proposed.</p> <p>4.7. Second, the realignment is being made principally to protect the interests of Gent Fairhead & Co Limited and Blackwater Aggregates in respect of emerging mineral interests at Monks Farm, Kelvedon. However, the extraction of sand and gravel at Monks Farm is not yet identified in the Minerals Local Plan (being only an emerging allocation at present) and subject to mineral planning consent being granted.</p> <p>4.8. This means that the mineral extraction interest at Monks Farm has no formal planning status. Yet, the Development Site was voted by Braintree District Council's Local Plan Sub-Committee on 6 October 2025 to be included in the Regulation 18 consultation on the emerging Braintree Local Plan, which identifies it as a potential strategic site for future growth. Braintree are also now moving towards a draft Regulation 19 Local Plan that includes the Development Site. 4.9. Third, and critically, the emerging housing allocation on the Development Site should in fact be given greater weight than the mineral interests at Monks Farm, not less. The Development Site represents a critical component of the housing land supply in the emerging Braintree Local Plan. It will be essential to meeting identified local housing need during the plan period. The delivery of up to 5,000 homes on a highly sustainable site adjacent to the railway line and Kelvedon station addresses a national imperative to deliver new housing. National planning policy gives significant weight to housing delivery.</p> <p>4.10. By contrast, the Monks Farm mineral interests, whilst of local importance, carries no greater planning status than the Development Site. National Grid's decision to prefer the mineral interest over the housing allocation interest, in a manner that increases the interference with our clients' land rights, is wrong in principle and unjustified on the evidence. It represents the same double standard that our clients have previously objected to: the applicant applies a double standard by providing detailed analysis and mitigation for some emerging allocations whilst either ignoring or, in this case, actively prejudicing others.</p> <p>4.11. Our clients therefore call upon the Examining Authority to scrutinise National Grid's approach to this realignment as part of its consideration of whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the interference with our clients' land rights under Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008, and to give proper and proportionate weight to the significance of the Development Site as an emerging allocation for a major strategic housing development.</p> |
| Arqiva Limited | 10301 | | | | | <p>I write in response to your letter of 1st June requesting that Arqiva Limited complete the electronic form provided before deadline 5a and ongoing discussions between Arqiva Limited and representatives of the developer in respect of the matters raised in my objection letter of 11th May 2026 (REP4-347).</p> <p>I wish to update the Planning Inspectorate that Arqiva's Technical Safeguarding Team has now discussed their concerns with representatives from the Norwich to Tilbury Project. Arqiva are expecting the developer to consider how the project impacts their network and suggest potential ways in which impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>Subject to the conclusion of this discussion, it is the intention that a Statement of Common Ground is provided to the Examination before Deadline 7 (21st July). I would be grateful if you could pass this update to the relevant examining Planning Inspector and I anticipate providing a further update in the coming days.</p> |
| Susan Wardale | 8927 | Yes | Compulsory Acquisition of land, Compulsory Acquisition of rights | A-4/67 | Both | <p>Whole scheme should be underground Alternatives have not been considered Less intrusive options exist Viability of the project There has been inadequate engagement or negotiation</p> |