



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 (CAH3) - Day 1 - Part 2
Date:	24 June 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

Simon Says

Transcript Export

<https://www.simonsaysai.com>

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:27:17 - 00:00:59:11

Okay. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, it is ten two. So the, uh, hearing is resumed. Uh, people have taken your seats again. Good. Thank you very much. So we've got up to the Langley's state on our running order list, and we've got two people speaking. Um, Charles Macklin and Jenny Macklin. You will each have three minutes each. If I could just ask, um, Charles McLean to make your comments first, and we will treat you as, um, one group, as it were.

00:00:59:13 - 00:01:18:22

So, Charles, if you do your three minutes first and then, um. Again, if you do your three minutes straight after that and then we'll ask the applicant for an update. Um, try to avoid any duplication or anything of that nature and use your time wisely. You have three minutes each. But first of all, Charles, just before I start.

00:01:18:24 - 00:01:23:09

Can am I allowed to speak on behalf of Jenny Macklin just to make sure there's no duplications?

00:01:24:02 - 00:01:24:19

Um.

00:01:26:14 - 00:01:40:09

I think in this case, because we've given you special permission, I think we'd either like to keep them separate or we'd just give you three minutes. Charles. I think we made a distinct. We made a distinction because you said there were two separate entities, and we would like to keep them at that place.

00:01:40:11 - 00:02:10:23

Okay, not a problem. Uh. Good morning. My name is Charlie McLean, and I'm here as the owner of the Langley's estate. Yesterday, I spoke about what I believe to be an abuse of power by National Grid. Today, I'd like to provide further detail focusing on the use of one seven, two notices. My first concern, um, relates to me that National Grid informed me that I was preparing a, um, 172 notice in relation to the intrusive licence on our land. The background is straightforward. I received the proposed licence on the 25th of February 26 and raised concerns regarding the boreholes.

00:02:11:00 - 00:02:42:00

Fisher German asked me to provide evidence, support my position, which I did promptly. I supplied evidence showing artificial fertilisers are more expensive than organic manure and that therefore the

proposed compensation did not properly reflect the impact of our farming operation. Since then, I've repeatedly sought answers. I've made numerous telephone calls and sent further correspondence. I've raised the issue directly of National Grid representatives at meetings following the last compulsory accession hearings, and again at meetings on the 21st of May and the 1st of June. Despite this, more than four months later, no one has answered the question.

00:02:42:02 - 00:03:15:06

Instead, on the 1st of June, Fisher of German informed me that section 172 notice had been prepared and National Grid confirm this on the 3rd of June. I find this deeply concerning the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and government guidance on compulsory purchase, emphasizes the importance of engagement with landowners and making genuine attempts to reach an agreement before serving a 172 notice. In my case, National Grid's response to a legitimate question is simply being that they are still investigating it. They have not provided an answer. Despite repeated requests, at no stage have I delayed or obstructed the process.

00:03:15:08 - 00:03:47:21

Whenever information has been requested from me, I respond to you the same day or the following day. I've even proposed a compromise by suggesting that the boreholes be removed from the licence until my concerns could be addressed. I made it clear that I would then be prepared to sign the licence. This suggestion was ignored and it still ignored the fact that boreholes are still going to be on the licence, as from the email at 926 this morning. I subsequently informed them that I'd be served 172 notice, despite my outstanding questions remaining unanswered. In my view, this sends a clear message to landowners.

00:03:47:23 - 00:04:21:23

If you ask difficult questions or challenge National Grid's position, you risk being threatened with statutory powers rather than receiving proper engagement. No notice has been served on me, but I continue to live with the uncertainty. It may be served at any time and I've just been informed by my agent. It's Monday, apparently is the day. And that's by Nick Parsons at Fischer German through a phone call yesterday. I do not believe that this is fair land. Owners should not be placed under pressure simply because they are seeking reasonable answers to legitimate concerns of affecting businesses. My second concern relates to the section 172 notice that was served on my tenant.

00:04:22:01 - 00:04:53:00

No notice was ever served on me as a landowner, despite the fact that National Grid's own land rights tracker correctly identifies me as the owner, and both National Grid and Fischer German hold my correct address. Furthermore, National Grid has not engaged with me regarding this license at all. This is particularly significant, but our tenants would have been in breach of the Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy had they signed the licence. What makes the situation even more concerning is that my ownership position was specifically drawn to fish Germans attention. On the 9th of June by my agent when they said they were serving the notice.

00:04:53:02 - 00:04:59:07

After checking internally first, German advised that they had nevertheless been instructed to proceed with serving the notice on the tenants.

00:04:59:13 - 00:05:01:15

For three minutes. If you'd like to summarize, please.

00:05:01:18 - 00:05:05:00

Um, can I let mum finish and then summarize afterwards?

00:05:05:02 - 00:05:18:10

Um, if it's a continuation of just the one applicant, one one response, then we asked for three minutes. The explanation was they were two separate plots, so they need to be separate explanations of updates, please.

00:05:18:12 - 00:05:49:18

Okay, well I'll finish this one then she can update the next one. Um, so with this one from my tenant, um, fish German have now actually confirmed in writing that it was uh, and I quote from 926 this morning, I can confirm that it's not deemed as validly served. They did not inform us. And everything and all. All night. All good. Um, sorry, I've lost my train of thought there, but. Oh. Um. Notices. Just don't follow correct procedure.

00:05:49:20 - 00:05:50:13

Thank you.

00:05:52:02 - 00:05:56:22

So, Mrs. McNamee, if you could give us an update on behalf of the land that you are representing us on.

00:05:56:24 - 00:06:30:03

Yeah. Good morning. My name is Jenny Macklin. On behalf of the Langley's, um, estate. So we just want to talk about how you deal with Fisher German and National Grid. So during the initial meetings with Fisher German at the start of the project, we were told if any of the temporary infrastructure proved beneficial to the farm, National Grid would seek the necessary planning permissions to allow it to remain in place permanently. However, as the project has progressed, National Grid appears to have changed its position and is now stating that due to planning requirements, all of the infrastructure must be temporary.

00:06:30:05 - 00:07:00:18

National grid have written to many local residents and published information on its website regarding how the proposed pre access works on our land. These proposals include constructions of six Falmouth accesses and a compound covering approximately eight hectares. These works are intended to facilitate the future delivery of the DCO project. However, as this information has only been published on National Grid's website and does not appear on the planning authorities website, I question whether the planning officers and decision makers are aware of what the National grid feels like.

00:07:00:20 - 00:07:40:09

This process is a done deal and the DCO will be granted. I objected the way these proposals are being handled, the only direct communication I've received or we've received beforehand was a telephone call from Fischer German asking whether we would support the proposals. Beyond that, we've received very little information directly from National Grid and instead become aware of many of the details through discussions with other local residents. As landowners, it's extremely frustrating to find that the planning applications are being promoted. On my land. On our land. While I appear to be amongst what we appear to be one of the last people to be properly informed about them, this does not reflect the collaborative approach that National Grid repeatedly claim that they are taking with landowners.

00:07:40:24 - 00:08:14:21

At the same time, National Grid continues to ignore our requests for certain elements of the proposed infrastructure to remain in place permanently, where they could provide clear benefit to the farm. This is despite assurances given at the outset of the project that such a request would be considered. National grid frequently states that wants to work constructively with landowners. However, experiences such as US inevitably undermine the confidence in that commitment. If landowners feel that decisions are being made without proper consultation and that their views are being not being genuinely considered, many will become reluctant to engage.

00:08:16:03 - 00:08:16:18

Sorry

00:08:17:23 - 00:08:55:07

in each case. Reasonable questions have gone unanswered. Legitimate concerns have not been addressed, and statutory powers have either been threatened or exercised, despite ongoing disputes and lack of proper communication. My concern is not only that what's happened so far, but what's going to happen in the future. If these experiences of landowners before development consent has been granted, then there's a genuine concern that the imbalance of power will become even greater should the project receive consent. I therefore ask the examining authority to give careful consideration to whether National Grid's conduct towards affected landowners reflects the standards of engagement and fairness expected under government policy and guidance.

00:08:57:13 - 00:08:58:16

Thank you very much.

00:09:01:21 - 00:09:07:06

Okay. Could we ask the applicant to respond to the issues that were raised in these?

00:09:10:03 - 00:09:43:03

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. I'll respond to, um, Miss Jenny McLean's points first, if I may. So, um, I think what's being referred to are the enabling works that are being brought forward under the separate Town and Country Planning Act consenting regime. So that is a separate regime. Those

works are not a matter for, um, your consideration. It's a separate application process with separate consultation requirements set down in statute, you know, and a separate engagement process.

00:09:43:07 - 00:10:16:00

But I would like to confirm that where the applicant is not assuming that, you know, it's going to get this DCO, it's really seeking to ensure that if this DCO is confirmed, then it's in a position to achieve the program that it needs to follow. And, you know, is not delayed by having to wait to then pursue the TCA works through the separate regime. So that's, um, our position on that point. Um, dealing then with Mr.

00:10:16:03 - 00:10:46:10

McLean's point, the recent section 172 notice was issued in error, as you heard. Um, no site notices or hand-delivered notices accompanied that. But it wasn't it wasn't possible to recall the erroneously issued notice in time. But as you've heard, um, we have confirmed, um, through our agents that the document that was sent out in error isn't considered served. And so, you know, we're not placing any continued reliance on that.

00:10:46:12 - 00:10:50:12

And on the survey point and section 172, more generally,

00:10:52:01 - 00:11:23:20

and the applicant's approach is to obtain survey access through voluntary agreement wherever possible. And, but where efforts are made and those are not successful, then there are, of course, the powers under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and section 172 that do exist to ensure that surveys can be undertaken and projects moved forward where it isn't possible to achieve voluntary agreement. And that approach is entirely lawful. And section 172 exists.

00:11:23:22 - 00:11:42:07

Of course, in contemplation that parties won't always be able to negotiate successfully in relation to surveys. And in terms of the facts in relation to the survey and the extent to which the applicant engaged with Mr. McMorran. That here, I'll look down the line.

00:11:44:00 - 00:11:47:12

Um, to Miss Tebbit, I think to respond to you on that. Thank you.

00:11:48:17 - 00:12:27:22

Lucy Tebbit, on behalf of the applicant, I just wanted to raise the on the matter of the boreholes. The applicant's understanding is that the regulations and legislation concerning boreholes and spreading of waste discharge apply only where boreholes are being conducted to extract and supply water for human consumption and the boreholes holes proposed by the applicant are for geotechnical analysis and not to extract water for human consumption. That being said, the technical specialist has been reviewing this and the applicant will respond formally in writing with our interpretation of the relevant legislation and regulations.

00:12:27:24 - 00:12:28:19

Thank you.

00:12:37:18 - 00:13:11:05

Am I allowed to respond to one of the points raised there? The fact that they said site notices are were not put up. If you currently want to drive down Chapel Lane, you will find said notice still on the pole as of 9:00 this morning and the fact they weren't hand-delivered. There is camera evidence that they were hand-delivered to the farm, so just saying they're not done in evidence was incorrect. And as long as the national grid have got it in writing from Anglian Water, that that is their proposal. As I have different from Angler Water which I've provided.

00:13:11:07 - 00:13:12:02

Thank you.

00:13:16:10 - 00:13:18:21

Okay. Thank you. You've heard that.

00:13:18:23 - 00:13:31:09

But I have a sergeant. So as I said, I think the substantive the substantive point in response is we're not seeking to rely on that notice as valid service. So no legal consequences will involve.

00:13:32:04 - 00:13:34:02

Just in terms of the

00:13:35:17 - 00:13:51:13

matter that Jenny Macklin raised in terms of the the TCP. And she says the local authorities haven't identified that yet. Have you submitted the applications yet, or are you just in the process of pre consultation before you submit the applications?

00:13:55:20 - 00:14:02:22

Nick Robinson Fisher Chairman, on behalf of the applicant, know no formal application has been made yet. This is purely a period of engagement with landowners.

00:14:02:24 - 00:14:03:14

Prior.

00:14:03:16 - 00:14:04:20

To submission. Yeah.

00:14:04:22 - 00:14:15:23

So so in terms of the local authority's website or the local authority identifying such applications, there wouldn't be there yet because no formal submission to be made on the Country Planning Act.

00:14:18:20 - 00:14:31:06

Thank you very much. Okay. If we can then move along. Um, Russell Matthews, if you can just turn on your microphone and you have three minutes. Thank you.

00:14:31:17 - 00:15:05:03

Good afternoon. My name is Russell Matthews. It's directly next door to the Gables farm, a property purchased by National Grid. My land interest falls within the order limit, and I object to the compulsory powers being sought. While important site specific matters remain unresolved. On the 18th of June, 2025. I received a letter from National Grid regarding voluntary negotiations for land interests affecting my property. On the 2nd of July, 2025.

00:15:05:05 - 00:15:38:24

During a team's meeting with National Grid representative. I was informed that the lane and the entrance to my property, there would be traffic lights inserted to allow for the Hall Road to cross Darrow Lane, not far from my property. This would obviously affect the entrance to my home, which also is to my business, and I ask the question as to how this could work because it's a single lane track.

00:15:39:01 - 00:15:48:01

So if the traffic lights were at the entrance to my property, where would the cars queue and be able to pass? Um,

00:15:49:20 - 00:16:26:09

to date, I've never received any answers on that question. So approximately a single track lane about one mile in length with no official passing points on it. A site meeting took place in July 2025 at my home with National Grid, Fisher, German and my appointed land agents, and following that meeting there were notes made from the meeting, which were sent to Fisher German to discuss various issues that had come up from that meeting.

00:16:27:12 - 00:16:59:14

There were lots of things that were discussed due to the ownership of the fields that abut my land, which National Grid bought, and the key things that we didn't receive answers to were the mitigation measures that requested to be considered, which were things like unfettered access to my property, acoustic barriers, dust suspension and other mitigation measures to protect both my home and my business from the impacts of the whole road.

00:17:00:19 - 00:17:11:01

Currently, no replies have been made through either that meeting or regarding the access to my property. Thank you.

00:17:12:20 - 00:17:13:23

Thank you very much.

00:17:17:02 - 00:17:19:15

And I turn to the applicant and to respond. Thank you.

00:17:20:01 - 00:17:54:00

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. Um, my understanding of the factual position, sir, is that, um. That there's a property named The Gables. Um, which is next to two fields. And those properties are owned by the applicant already. And the applicant already benefits from an existing private law access. Um, across Mr. Matthews's land. So my understanding is that the applicant is not, in fact, seeking any compulsory acquisition or temporary purchase rights.

00:17:54:08 - 00:18:13:10

Um, from Mr. Matthews. Um, nevertheless, we have been engaging with him. I understand there's a further meeting arranged for the 8th of July. I'll just look down the line to see if, um, Mr. Robinson is able to give you a little more detail on the facts behind the engagement that has been being undertaken. Thank you.

00:18:13:12 - 00:18:14:05

Thank you.

00:18:15:10 - 00:18:57:14

Nick Robinson Fisher, chairman, on behalf of the applicant, as Heather mentioned. Yep. Um, since version one of the head of terms were issued. as there was a subsoil interest in the adjoining highway that Mr. Matthews benefits from. This was subsequently reviewed and a version two was not issued to him, as he was unable to grant those rights as required, and so as such, no rights are being sort of a compulsory or temporary nature over his land. And further to the engagement piece. Yes, I recently spoke with the APS agent last week and confirmed a meeting on the 8th of July to essentially, hopefully underline the access issue that is currently ongoing.

00:18:58:01 - 00:18:58:20

Thank you.

00:19:00:19 - 00:19:20:14

Sure, if there's no CA and TP, which is the focus of this meeting, but there does seem to be an issue around access arrangement, construction, access and facilities. Who's taking that issue forward and addressing that matter to ensure that Mr. Matthews isn't prejudiced unnecessarily?

00:19:22:05 - 00:19:22:23

Stephen Boughton on.

00:19:23:00 - 00:19:24:03

Behalf of the applicant.

00:19:24:11 - 00:19:25:00

Yeah.

00:19:25:02 - 00:19:25:17

Just to.

00:19:25:19 - 00:19:26:14

Clarify, the access to the.

00:19:26:16 - 00:19:51:00

Land in question is just to access the land in the ownership of the national grid. Electricity transmission. The access is not required for temporary use or construction. Use at all is not included within the red line boundary. So we're just trying to, um, clear up where that access exactly lays on the ground, just so we can be clear between both parties, but the access is not required as part of the project.

00:20:05:20 - 00:20:40:19

Okay. And in terms of the written submissions, following on from these, you confirm what the nature of that process is or that that that interest is, is that where so that you can confirm that there's no interest in terms of his landholdings, or that you do not need that access. I suppose where I'm concerned about, from what I've just heard, there is the introduction of traffic lights and things of that nature on a single carriageway road. If I assume you're doing that for reasons to to facilitate your construction access.

00:20:42:21 - 00:21:02:01

And so have a sergeant for the applicant. Thank you. Yeah. We'll set all of this out in, in writing and after this hearing and particularly confirm, you know, that we don't need compulsory acquisition or temporary purchase powers. And also explain what powers we would be looking to rely on in relation to any traffic lights and things of that nature.

00:21:02:03 - 00:21:03:13

Thank you. Thank you.

00:21:12:09 - 00:21:14:24

Okay. Thank you very much. If we.

00:21:18:14 - 00:21:20:01

Can I ask a question?

00:21:20:06 - 00:21:36:06

Sorry. I think what we're looking for is updates from the parties and things of that nature. If you need to engage further, I'm sure outside the actual hearing, you can you can speak to them and ask them a question directly. Okay. And I'm sure they will facilitate that discussion.

00:21:36:08 - 00:21:39:16

Because I don't think they've answered the question. You see that's the problem.

00:21:39:18 - 00:21:40:08

Yeah.

00:21:40:20 - 00:21:41:20

Okay. Fine.

00:21:42:23 - 00:21:43:13

Okay.

00:21:46:23 - 00:21:59:17

If I can move on then we have Sheringham Shoal and Dungeon Extensions project. Um, I think I have a mr. McGeady. Are you online?

00:22:09:16 - 00:22:41:15

Uh. Good morning sir. Can you hear me? Yes. Paula McGeady. Yes. Um, I Parliament giddy Burgess salmon appealing for Equinor new energy limited on behalf of Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Extensions Project Company Limited. Thank you. And as you're aware, the project has an extant DCO which was granted in April 2024, which includes a number of powers of compulsory acquisition which have been registered, and with the local land charges registered under section 134.

00:22:41:17 - 00:23:12:12

Notice those include powers in the area of overlap with this application. The project has also secured options over two of the plots in the area of overlap, and has agreed heads of terms for further six, with draft options issued. However, the progression of voluntary agreements is being impeded because there is no clear framework in place for how overlapping powers of compulsory acquisition will operate, and we cannot explain to landowners how the two schemes will work together in practice at this time.

00:23:15:02 - 00:23:52:07

We would note the interrelationship report rep for 296 identifies only various interfaces between the projects. We consider that some of these give rise to conflicts, including of compulsory powers. Our projects cable corridor overlaps with National Grid's access and working area for pylon RG 006, and we consider that the acquisition of rights and use of temporary position in that area needs to be coordinated and controlled. National grid's proposed lightning strike protection for that pylon also infringes considerably into our cable corridor.

00:23:52:09 - 00:24:34:20

To the extent that wouldn't be possible for us to fit the link box in that location any longer. We have asked the National Grid to try and provide us with some more details of that protection and what it would mean

for our cables, but they are telling us they are unable to do so at this time. There are a number of issues for which a solution has been agreed in principle, but for which National Grid have not yet made the changes to the examination documents which are necessary to secure those. Those include amendments to where they currently propose permanent landscaping over our permanent access to our substation, changes to landscape planting over our 400 kilovolt cables, and relocation of some attenuation points within their order limits.

00:24:35:04 - 00:24:37:17

We require those changes to be secured.

00:24:39:19 - 00:25:16:16

Our client's objections are resolvable if suitable protections are progressed and put in place. However, protect provisions, the side agreement and the document changes are not yet agreed. The parties are working together and we do intend to continue to do so. We note that the draft side agreement is with us. The technical meeting necessary to inform changes to that was held on the 19th of June, and we therefore hope to be able to return that in short order. However, our client is concerned about the time remaining in the examination, and therefore also intends to submit its preferred potato provisions to you at the next deadline.

00:25:17:00 - 00:25:28:14

At this time, the project maintains its objection to the rights which are sought by National Grid, overlapping with its project as they threaten the deliverability of its consented project. Thank you.

00:25:30:06 - 00:25:31:10

Thank you very much.

00:25:36:07 - 00:25:40:12

Applicant. Have you any response to the issues raised there, please?

00:25:41:07 - 00:26:13:03

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant. Um, for the applicant. So, um, on behalf of the applicant, sent an initial draft side agreement and further amended protective provisions to Burgess Salman on the 29th of May. My understanding is we're still waiting for a response on the main documents, and it would be very useful from our perspective if that could be provided. We do acknowledge, though, that there are, of course, the substantive Points, um, raised by the affected.

00:26:13:05 - 00:26:51:21

Um. Sorry. Raised by the party, which we're we're working through. Um, but nevertheless, it would be useful for us if we could have their comments on the main documents back whilst that's ongoing, so that we can try and move everything forward in terms of the more substantive points. Um, and the pylon RG 006, um, that we are seeking to amend that pylon location as requested. We're currently um, checking with Great grid um project the contractor to see whether we can confirm that movement, um, outside of the Equinor order limits.

00:26:51:23 - 00:27:27:10

And then the intention would be once we know the position on that, to include an obligation in the side agreement, which would commit to placing that pylon in a specific location, if that's something that, um, ultimately we're able to confirm that we can do, Um. On the lightning strike point. And the latest information I have is that we provided further information on that on the 18th of June, I understand, and then a technical call was held on the 19th of June. I'll just turn to Mr. McKee and to see if he's able to provide you with more detailed updates on the sort of technical matters that have been raised.

00:27:27:12 - 00:27:28:06

Thank you.

00:27:30:01 - 00:27:31:22

Michael McKee, for the applicant.

00:27:31:24 - 00:27:33:07

Um, yes.

00:27:33:10 - 00:27:58:24

As Miss Sargeant noted, the relocation of RG 006 currently going through our change control process with a detailed design contract that removes the pylon location and from the cables with as well as the concerns around the joint bear equally, the Earth mountain is centred around the pylon location, so with the movement of the tower that should remove any concerns around the Earth mountain light and strikes to their cables with.

00:27:59:01 - 00:27:59:19

Thank you.

00:28:05:00 - 00:28:07:05

Thank you very much. Sorry, I was.

00:28:07:07 - 00:28:07:22

A.

00:28:08:02 - 00:28:17:22

Little bit confused by a comment that you made there, where you talked about the movement of the pylon outside the order limits. Did I understand that?

00:28:17:24 - 00:28:23:22

Right, sir? So outside of the affected person's order limits, not outside of our order limits.

00:28:23:24 - 00:28:27:12

Not. Not okay. Not outside of allowed. No no no no.

00:28:27:14 - 00:28:28:22

Absolutely not sir. Sorry.

00:28:28:24 - 00:28:30:12

No. Thank you.

00:28:34:14 - 00:28:35:16

Thank you very much.

00:28:37:11 - 00:28:39:24

Okay, let's move along. Um.

00:28:42:00 - 00:28:51:05

The next couple I've got down as no shoes to. The next person I have is, uh, fork Bourne Estates, Mr. Fisher.

00:28:55:18 - 00:29:32:18

Good afternoon, Jeremy Fisher. The football estate, the pylon scheme we're talking about, Um has proposes to put 11 pylons 97 to 1 one three, with significant hall roads and construction activity and undergrounding. In addition to the already six pylons on the Pelham Bay railway line, which God bless the National Grid have now served the CPO notice on them as well, because they wanted to change that lot as well. Those CPO notices, of course, have aren't identical to the present ones we're talking about, and we'll now have to look again at that.

00:29:33:22 - 00:29:34:12

Um.

00:29:38:12 - 00:30:09:15

Update. At the last hearing I attended, I pressed, um, you to find out about the authorization of National Grid to be able to compulsorily purchase land for their being per purpose purposes. Um, being clearly national thought about it. Um, Counsel at that stage said, yes, I haven't got the right person here. I'll write to you. They haven't. We know nothing about this. We know that they want it.

00:30:09:17 - 00:30:41:17

Having said that, I understand that at 530 last night, my agent got a telephone call to say good news. We want a little less. Um, that doesn't deal with a principle about taking land for BMG when we're offering to provide it elsewhere on the estate more conveniently or indeed. There's the UK land Bank. Benjy is only if it's a last purchase. Seems to me to be only a last resort, and we're only a few weeks away from the end of this inquiry, and we know nothing about that.

00:30:42:06 - 00:31:13:12

Turning to upgrade. Sorry, an update on the discussions we have had. I was one of many people who winced furiously at the last occasion by the lack of engagement from National Grid. Well, I'm delighted that we've had one meeting. Um, we have gone around these dates with National Grid and Fischer German again. We have gone through the submissions we made in July 2025 and shown them every little bit of it. They've taken photographs.

00:31:13:18 - 00:31:45:23

They've. We've asked them to provide detailed maps so we can show them. But everyone always seems to bring the iPad, which no one can quite understand. And we, um, heard very, very little back about the specific details until 545 last night when we got a telephone call to say that, um, apart from the being issue, they would not make any movements on any of the line routes towers, even the ones that are on our own land and affect no one else. They'll not make any move on the hall roads.

00:31:46:00 - 00:32:03:07

They'll not make any move on the entrances, on the existing roads due to highways considerations. They'll not move any of the compounds. They may bring National Grid engineers out to explain why they will not move anything. In effect, the man from Del Monte said no. So we are then in the story.

00:32:03:09 - 00:32:08:10

Could I just ask you to start wrapping up? Just. Thank you. Draw your two. Conclusion.

00:32:08:12 - 00:32:09:10

Thank you. Um.

00:32:10:10 - 00:32:45:08

I endorsed the, um, comments from the Langley's estate about the fact that we were told we could keep whole roads if they were helpful, if we engage with them. That's now said to be no longer possible. Um, in relation to, um, that my final point, I would say that, um, they want us to leave. They want to say certain issues should be left to a design stage, but want us to sign heads of terms in the meantime, given the engagement so far, why on earth would we? We will.

00:32:45:14 - 00:32:51:17

There's no point in cooperating if people will not engage with us or even discuss it with us.

00:32:52:01 - 00:32:53:02

Um, okay.

00:32:53:04 - 00:32:54:14

Thank you. I'll end there.

00:32:54:18 - 00:32:57:14

Thank you very much. Applicant.

00:32:57:16 - 00:32:58:23

Have you got any.

00:32:59:03 - 00:32:59:18

Comments on.

00:32:59:20 - 00:33:00:10

That?

00:33:00:24 - 00:33:35:04

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. Um, so on the level of engagement, um, since the last, um, what's in ch two? The last hearing, um, a site meeting has taken place on the 2nd of June. There have also been, um, telephone calls. And, of course, as one would expect. Um, email correspondence. So I am going to ask Miss Tebbutt shortly, just to provide you with some more detail on the extent of the engagement since the last hearing. Um, so I'll turn to her first, and then after Miss Tebbutt, I'm going to ask Mr.

00:33:35:06 - 00:33:39:17

Royston, um, to respond on the point raised in relation to BNG. If I may.

00:33:39:20 - 00:33:52:24

Just in terms of time, can we just have the submission of, um, uh, you know, engagement submitted at the, um, deadline? Six, please. We just don't have time for a lot now. We've got half an hour and for a lot to get through, so.

00:33:53:07 - 00:33:58:15

We'll provide that in writing. And then if I can just ask Mr. Easton to respond on the BNG point, then thank you.

00:34:00:12 - 00:34:48:23

Paul Easton for the applicant and the general approach to around the sort of cable ceiling ends and substations has been to take the whole field on the assumption that there's often relatively small and awkward shapes left in using that those areas as biodiversity net gain in the, um, example in there first said, well, we have the cable lands either side of the pylon line on the estate. Um, the, the requirement to have we need some land for sort of landscape screen plant screening. Um, we are able to on review and following the, um, the feedback we have looked at whether that being land can be requirement can be met elsewhere and we think that can be so we it's I think it amounts to around three hectares potentially that um we can provide for to return to agricultural use.

00:34:49:02 - 00:34:57:19

Um still need to work up the detail with that detailed design of quite how much we need for landscape planting, but around three hectares will will be returned.

00:35:01:21 - 00:35:02:11

Okay.

00:35:02:13 - 00:35:04:13

Thank you. Thank you.

00:35:08:05 - 00:35:13:20

Can we now move to the next party, which is Palmer and Klein, Mr. Warner.

00:35:21:11 - 00:35:54:17

Good afternoon. My name is Mark Warner of Arden. I'm speaking for Palmer and Klein. So quick recap of the business. This is Palmer. And Klein have a fuel recycling business at Ongar Hall Farm. A byproduct of that process is millions of litres of waste water per annum. That waste water is a controlled waste. It is spread on grazing land at Onkar Hall Farm. There's just over 100 acres under what is a very strictly controlled permit process, where permit has to be applied to the Environment Agency every year.

00:35:55:05 - 00:36:26:13

It's an annual application, and it fixes the area on which wastewater can be spread at the date of application every year. The impact of the scheme. A conservative estimate over half the farm will be unusable for spreading during construction period. And we've become aware there's a very urgent issue, which is a borehole proposed for surveys would require an area of at least five acres of exclusion for 12 months, due to the risk of the wastewater getting into the groundwater system.

00:36:26:15 - 00:37:03:16

And the consequence of this will be millions of litres of water that will need to be tankard offsite and cost by Palmer and Klein, and that will have a cash flow impact, which could be business critical. So the needs that we are seeking to work with the applicant to get to is to agree mitigation measures to provide certainty at the permit application stage to maximize the area of land available for spreading, but also an advanced payment mechanism to avoid the cash flow issues I referred to earlier. Having to tank a millions of litres of water off site, and implicit in the delay implicit in making a claim under the compensation code.

00:37:03:18 - 00:37:35:13

So this is not a quantum of compensation matter, but a mechanism to mitigate financial impact. It's a mitigation and not a compensation issue. Engagement with the applicant has been quite challenging. Over three years. We have had engagement, we have had meetings, but we haven't made substantive progress. We were recently assured that a mitigation what recently we were a few months ago showed that mitigation and advanced payment measures were being progressed through the commitments register, and that a formal position on that will be provided by the end of May.

00:37:35:18 - 00:38:19:06

We don't have an agreement, we don't have a commitment. We are having meetings with the applicant and those and very recently we have agreed a series of meetings, which is obviously positive, but that we urgently need substance, particularly because of the borehole issue. So my request to the Planning Inspectorate, to the examining authority and to the applicant is that I've suggested to the applicant, as it's pointed out, there is a very limited time before the end of the examination. And so I suggested in outline to the applicant that we agree a timetable of engagement and a target date for agreeing a commitment and that be taken as an action by through the DCA examination process.

00:38:19:16 - 00:38:38:17

We'll then have a process by which both parties can work to and be accountable to. This is an approach was adopted by the examining authority on the A48 DCO examination promoted by National Highways after compulsory acquisition hearing two, and it contributed to agreement of heads of terms being agreed by the end of examination.

00:38:38:21 - 00:38:41:23

So thank you very much. Can I ask you just to wind up, please?

00:38:43:02 - 00:38:51:21

That's. That's all. I think it's a very reasonable mechanism. It's been used before, and hopefully it'll get us to a tangible outcome that will be in the interest of all parties. Thank you.

00:38:52:00 - 00:38:52:18

Thank you.

00:38:53:24 - 00:38:57:20

And applicant, can I just get your quick responses on that one?

00:38:57:21 - 00:39:30:06

Um thank you sir. I have a sergeant for the applicant. So there has been quite extensive engagement since the last hearing with this AP, but we'll set that out in writing to save time. Um, I'm aware that, um, Mr. Warner sent over some documentation, I understand, on Monday, which is currently under review. I'll just turn to, um, Miss Tebbutt, if I may, to just, um, bring you completely up to date in terms of, um, future meetings and the timetabled engagement going forward, please.

00:39:30:08 - 00:39:31:00

Thank you.

00:39:32:12 - 00:40:06:15

Lucy Tebbutt, on behalf of the applicant. Um, thank you to Mr. Warner for supplying details of the contaminants in the wastewater product. And we we look forward to having regular touchpoints and communications on the construction program, as well as our meeting this Friday and in a couple of weeks on site with the EA to, um, bottom out any of these issues. And I'm happy to have the scheduled

engagement, as you suggested. We also will look to rapidly progress the advanced payment compensation mechanism by way of a side letter.

00:40:06:17 - 00:40:07:14

Thank you.

00:40:08:18 - 00:40:09:21

Thank you very much.

00:40:13:06 - 00:40:19:16

Moving along then, can we hear from the Tritton farming partnership, Charles Tritton?

00:40:21:11 - 00:40:52:03

Thank you very much. Um, Charles Tritton, on behalf of Tritton Farming Partnership LLP and related parties. This is an update. There are two recent significant changes which are affecting TFP and Brett. They were shared with us a week ago, 17th of June, and they remain preliminary and subject to change. They are significant. One is the movement of the pylons to route B to reduce the sterilisation.

00:40:52:05 - 00:41:22:23

The mineral site at Lyons, Horwood. And the second is the reintroduction of the Chelmsford North East bypass, which has been known since inception, which has subsequent design changes on our land. In addition, there's a detailed analysis of lines here which shows it is not all ancient woodland. These changes are acknowledged and in general welcomed, but we do need more details as the plans are incomplete and preliminary and subject to change.

00:41:23:17 - 00:41:54:24

We need discussions about reducing the red corridor, the height and location of pylons. Apparently the taller the Hall road temporary and permanent accesses, we need them, as does pins to evaluate and make decisions in a very tight time frame. For example, the DCO red corridor was previously widened to enable route B. The reduction class eight is less than it should be, um, and needs to be shrunk more.

00:41:55:11 - 00:42:34:04

There's a large area surrounding the proposed A1 31 roundabout, which is some distance from the pylon route. It's an area of strategic and high commercial value to us for minerals, farming, housing and alternative. We see no reason why that should be there. And indeed National Grid have said they don't require it for permanent rights. But it's on the map, the preliminary map. There's a new permanent rights access from this roundabout. This should be temporary and should travel instead down the new bypass directly to the pylons as it minimises sterilizations.

00:42:35:18 - 00:43:15:20

A new permanent right from Goodman's Lane has been established. We welcome that in principles. Um, and but it does reduce the need for redundant permanent rights which remain on the preliminary map, which, uh, National Grid, I'm sure would agree, are no longer necessary. Um, they ran through the

mineral site. They ran through the farmyard next to a listed house. Um. Etcetera. Unnecessary. Now our interactions. We're worried that we're not going to be able to agree as much as we would like by deadline seven with pins, unless the designs and interactions from National Grid increase quickly.

00:43:16:08 - 00:43:46:04

They have asked us for final comments to be in by the end of this week. However, as I said earlier, these are preliminary and subject to change. Um, just to add head to terms remain in the state and possible design and TFP has also been notified of a TCP planning application, we would rather spend the time, um, actually solving some of these segues. Thank you very much for your time. Oh, other. There are other areas, but little progress or update.

00:43:46:20 - 00:43:53:21

Thank you. Thank you very much. Could we just turn to the applicant then for any comment on what they've heard?

00:43:54:15 - 00:44:13:23

Thank you sir, I have a sergeant for the applicant. Um, as was just noted, um, we are hoping to receive the, uh, comments on the statement of Common Ground back from them this week. I'll turn to Mr. Daniel Winslow, um, for a response on the more detailed points that were raised by the speaker. Thank you.

00:44:15:01 - 00:44:45:08

On behalf of the applicant, um, I think given the meeting we had last week, uh, started last week in regards to sharing the scenario B design, uh, which is the first time you could share that with you. I think we remain committed from that meeting to work through, um, some of the issues you raised there in regards to trying to find solutions. Um, I'm sure you agree that at the moment we just we're just in the case of, uh, we work in elements such as the construction hall Road, uh, those permanent access routes for for either line, maintenance, for future access.

00:44:45:10 - 00:44:58:10

And again, looking at trying to reduce the stabilization of the quarry as well by moving the pylons away from the site. So I think we remain committed to doing that. It's just we need to obviously work through that with more detailed design.

00:45:00:14 - 00:45:04:02

That would be in the terms of micro siting of the pylons within the red line.

00:45:06:00 - 00:45:08:09

Okay. So perfect applicant. That is correct. Yes.

00:45:09:00 - 00:45:10:10

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:45:13:03 - 00:45:34:03

Thank you. Can we then can we then move on to, uh, Mr. Walker of Worley and not if you deal with your first three minutes where you're picking up a various affected parties. And I assume it's just going to be a general Overview and as we say, focused on just an update on where things are at.

00:45:35:00 - 00:45:35:15

Yes.

00:45:35:17 - 00:46:14:03

Good afternoon Inspector. My name is Paul Walker. I'm director of religion, not. I also speak on behalf of other agents, including Clark and Simpson, Brooks, Lini and Durrance. Myself and the fellow agents act for a significant number of landowners affected by the scheme as a whole. I just wish to update the examination regarding ongoing negotiations and the position as we are currently seeing it. The concern remains straightforward. National grid, in our opinion, have not yet demonstrated any meaningful engagement, specific justifications or reasonable attempts to reach private agreement that should be expected before compulsory powers are granted.

00:46:14:17 - 00:46:48:20

There have been many meetings and communications. We acknowledge that certainly we can't deny. However, meetings alone do not amount to progress. Many landowners are left with the impression that National Grid is proceeding on the assumption compulsory powers will follow. By way of example, the agents met with National Grid and fishermen on the 4th of June to discuss first version three of the heads of terms. Despite previous discussions which have been ongoing, we found ourselves raising the same concerns again. Few changes have been made, and we don't really have very good explanations as to the rejections.

00:46:49:04 - 00:47:20:19

It's accepted that negotiations progressed with the threat of compulsory purchase in the back. But we have no timetable, no timetable for version four, as no meeting has yet been timetabled. It was also the first time that we saw the deed of easement and the rights that it contains. These rights appear significantly wider than necessary, including restricted rights on access and new restrictions on no vegetation at all of them one metre within the vicinity of the pylons. This will directly interfere with normal cropping such as oilseed rape, maize, etc.,

00:47:20:21 - 00:47:52:01

something that we were unaware of and feels excessive. We also still have no heads of terms from UK power networks, despite initial discussions taking place in April. In those regards in that regard, many clients are simply unaware of the impacts. In our view, the degree of interference with private land rights being sought is not properly justified or demonstrated yet. And I use the word yet on an individual basis. There remain significant unknowns. Technical information.

00:47:52:03 - 00:48:23:23

Heads of terms. Easement terms, accommodation words. Timescales. Operational safety such as clearances, underlines have yet to be clarified and set out in a committed, clear way. As a result, many affected parties are need to clarify now. Sorry. As a result, many parties need clarity now so that they can make informed commercial decisions regarding their businesses development plans, future operations to manage their way through the scheme and mitigate losses.

00:48:24:08 - 00:48:45:08

Greater cooperation will help avoid landowners being left in limbo or forced to make decisions. Today, not really knowing whether National Grid will later challenge those decisions or refuse to recognise the resulting losses. More recently, I took a call from a senior National Grid representative asking what I could do or what could be done to move towards agreement. I replied.

00:48:45:10 - 00:48:46:00

I just ask.

00:48:46:02 - 00:48:46:17

You to start wrapping.

00:48:46:19 - 00:48:47:09

Up.

00:48:47:11 - 00:49:18:03

I will. You got another paragraph, I replied from the landowner's perspective. The simplest solution would be for National Grid to reconsider the scheme altogether and move move away. More realistically, however, I emphasize National Grid needs to provide certainty, respond properly to issues raised, and demonstrate genuine flexibility and a clear desire to reach agreement. Committing to accommodation works agreeing aspects such as advance compensation provisions also provides confidence. I think until we have that, I remain of the view as many of our clients and my fellow agents do.

00:49:18:05 - 00:49:27:13

That National Grid continue to demonstrate are unable to demonstrate any genuine desire to reach agreement, a fundamental principle of the DCO process. Thank you.

00:49:28:09 - 00:49:29:04

Thank you.

00:49:30:01 - 00:49:59:06

I'm very conscious that we're moving on, and we do have a hard deadline to get to. So I'm going to sort of suggest that as that was a generalist and not individual things, that you take away the issues that Mr. Walker raised there and respond to those in writing at the next deadline. Um, I'm very conscious that things need to be moved forward and progressed, and that there are obviously a substantive number of land interests that he's representing. But if you've got any general comments

00:50:01:00 - 00:50:01:18

and.

00:50:02:10 - 00:50:40:06

Sir, have us, thank you very much, we will respond in writing and we you won't be surprised to hear don't agree with that characterization of, you know, the inadequacy of our engagement. Um, I was I mean, the factual points around the fact that we have been having Meetings, um, are accepted. I mean, those meetings have been, you know, half day. Full day meetings. They've been, um, substantial. But, um, I think, sir, if I may, I anticipate we will run out of time. But, um, if there is a time left when we come to the sort of board of agenda item around the progress of negotiations generally, then if there's time, I can say a bit more.

00:50:40:08 - 00:50:43:08

Otherwise, we'll set it all out in writing. Thank you.

00:50:43:10 - 00:50:44:01

Thank you very.

00:50:44:03 - 00:50:44:18

Much.

00:50:49:13 - 00:50:58:14

Okay, Mr. Walker, you are have another three minutes. On behalf of Essex Scout and Guidelines or Guide International Jamboree.

00:50:58:23 - 00:51:21:08

I'm going to save you some a few minutes. Um, we received heads of terms yesterday, um, with substantive changes which the event need to go away and review. Um, those look promising. Um, we're moving towards an agreement. Uh, but until such, until there is such an agreement, obviously the scale and guides objection remains.

00:51:23:01 - 00:51:23:16

Good.

00:51:23:18 - 00:51:35:03

That's good news. Applicant. Anything? That's excellent. Okay, so then the final individual participant that we have is Lower Thames Crossing.

00:51:39:04 - 00:52:13:04

Thank you sir. Um, my name is Monica Wagler and I'm, um, appearing on behalf of the Lower Thames Crossing project. Um, I've heard what you've said about not repeatedly repeating previously raised

concerns. So I'll try not to do that. Um, but just for a bit of context, um, our primary concerns relate to the significant spatial and temporal interactions between the projects. Um, and just to provide a bit further context, there are over 700 interfacing plots between the project. Um, and their interactions are still being considered, uh, by the team.

00:52:13:07 - 00:53:03:08

So in terms of an update, Um, the applicant and the LCS technical teams have been meeting regularly to discuss the issues and with the aim of working towards a side agreement. Um, it has now become apparent, however, due to a lack of detail, an agreement between the parties are unlikely to be reached before the end of examination, and it is therefore the LCS intention to submit into examination protective provisions in favour of the LTC project in order to safeguard its position in relation to the consented LTC project, LTC will be seeking prior approval for NTT works in the area of the interface between the projects, and it would invite the examining authority to include these in its recommended DCO should the applicant's project be consented.

00:53:03:17 - 00:53:18:12

Um. The LTC anticipates being able to share a draft of these at deadline six on the 7th of July. Um, short and sweet, but that is our update. Um, I hope that's helpful to you.

00:53:19:14 - 00:53:26:07

That's very helpful. At least we understand your position. And that's where we want to get to. And the applicant. You've heard what they've said.

00:53:26:09 - 00:53:56:11

I have, sir, have a sergeant for the applicant. Thank you very much. Um, so we will continue to work with LTC, obviously to secure agreement on as many points as possible. Um, we won't be in a position, realistically to agree to their request for prior approvals. So, um, I anticipate that where we will end up is that, um, both parties will submit the protective provisions that they contend for, and then, um, we'll have to leave the matter with yourself to decide. Ultimately.

00:53:57:06 - 00:54:33:01

That's not a good position to be at, but at least if it's realistic position, if we've got both parties set to protect the provisions and at least we can adjudicate on that. Thank you very much. Thank you. So that concludes all those who had wished to appear before us relating to agenda item four. I know we're a little bit behind. Well, a good bit behind where we had expected to be. Um, so I'm now going to suggest that we will ask for updates on agenda items A, B, and D in writing at deadline six.

00:54:33:18 - 00:54:52:07

Uh, as we want to ensure the time for an update on progress with affected persons was usefully used. Um, and as we have UK PM here, we don't want to miss out on, uh, giving them an opportunity to speak to us. So we are going to move directly to UK pm.

00:54:52:24 - 00:54:58:06

Uh, so if you gentlemen ladies were happy to move back, you're welcome to do that now.

00:55:02:24 - 00:55:37:04

Okay. So, um, so, uh, compulsory acquisition hearing two. We discussed at length the separate negotiations that were being conducted by UK PM and we are pleased to have the representative of UK PM here today. We will be asking the applicant and UK PM for an update on this matter in a moment, but we would just like to make a few observations. We'll come to the recent rule 17 letter we sent to affected persons at any moment, but we've noticed that a number of responses have stated that no heads of terms have been sent by UK pm. We've also reviewed the updated Lands Rights tracker submitted at deadline five in particular the tab for UK PM negotiations.

00:55:37:06 - 00:56:09:13

This does suggest that negotiations may not be progressing as we might have expected, and that the comments about lack of heads of terms could well be the case. We would like to remind the application that this is your application, and we're seeking assurances from you about the application of CA guidance. And if it is the case that heads of terms have not yet or only recently been issued by UK PM. This is quite a serious matter for us, with less than seven weeks of the examination remaining. Given, the CA guidance requires that all potential alternatives to CA are explored with CIA as a last resort.

00:56:09:15 - 00:56:40:03

How should we, as the examining authority, report to the Secretary of State in respect of matters where there appears to be limited or very, very late engagement given, in particular the engagement information in relation to UK PM. Finally, for now, for both the applicant and UK PM. How do you propose to continue negotiations up to and after the close of the examination? So we are taking this as quite a serious matter, having reviewed the Land Rights Tracker and we would like an update on that now please, if possible.

00:56:41:00 - 00:57:12:09

Um, sir, have a sergeant for the applicant. I'll just address you briefly, and then I'll hand over, if I may, to Mr. Westmoreland Smith, um, to speak on behalf of UK pm. So, um, the, the, the sort of appearance, um, of the position in terms of the absence of heads of terms is explained by the fact that, um, putting it as shortly as I can, UK PM's engagement and the negotiation strategy doesn't follow the same sequencing as in Get, so heads of terms for UK PM come along later in the process.

00:57:12:16 - 00:57:55:13

And that's just the way they, you know, undertake their engagement. We don't have any concerns around their approach being less appropriate than ours. Obviously it's open to different undertakers to engage. However they see it as being most effective. Um, but it just happens that UK pm follow a different sequencing. So there has been engagement from UK pm. You'll hear the details of that from them in a moment. But um, we appreciate on the face of it, it looks as though they're very far behind, you know, where the applicant has got to when if you're purely focusing on how have heads of terms been issued or not, but the substance of the position is that that comes at a later point in the process for UK PM than it does for, um, the applicant.

00:57:55:15 - 00:57:56:10

I hope that's.

00:57:56:12 - 00:57:57:06

Yeah. I mean.

00:57:57:08 - 00:58:40:08

You said that last time and it explains a situation, but it doesn't explain how we as examiners authority View your application for compulsory acquisition with you know, I appreciate that your different companies and you may have a different process, but that's incredibly unhelpful when you've got one process that is ultimately very important, which is the DCO process. And and to say that it's okay for UK PM on your behalf because it is your DCO to and this is directly from your land rights tracker to send out emails at the end of middle of an end of May asking for engagement, when at that stage there was still only a few months left of the examination.

00:58:40:10 - 00:59:26:06

It's very difficult for us to understand, um, take just a oh, it's sequencing as an explanation for that lack of engagement when the the guidance is very, very clear about the DCO application and the need for that alternative to DCO of compulsory acquisition to have been explored fully and and, you know, I'll be I'll be frank for us at the moment, Mr. Stone and I, we. We are struggling to understand how that process has been fully, um, committed to by UK pen in your application as, as National Grid and, um, you're welcome to answer my point again now about how we address that to the Secretary of State, because we wouldn't be able to say, oh, it's sequencing issues and UK PM just have a different sequencing.

00:59:26:08 - 00:59:39:00

That's all right, isn't it? I need something more about why that engagement. And you you're welcome to to respond to that again now or put it fully in writing. But we do need you know, it will be good to have some some coverage from UK pen as well as I here.

00:59:39:02 - 00:59:44:15

Certainly. So sorry I'm not I'm not suggesting at all that you would simply advise the Secretary of State.

00:59:44:17 - 00:59:45:17

That the answer.

00:59:45:22 - 01:00:16:24

No, sir. But um, so our, our, our stance on this is that UK pen have been engaging, I think from an early date. Um, I believe it was March. Mr. Westmoreland Smith will confirm, I'm sure, but they have started their engagement several months ago, and there are various steps in that process that then will lead ultimately to the issuing of heads of terms. So I'm not going to give their evidence on where in that process they are. But I think process is going along. So we ultimately will be.

01:00:17:01 - 01:00:49:12

We entirely accept that it's our application and we can't escape needing to, you know, comply fully with the requirements of the guidance by just simply saying, well, it's not as it's UK PM, we entirely take that on our shoulders. It's for us to satisfy you on that. But I hope once you've heard from UK PM, I am going to be quiet now and let them speak and I think, I hope you will feel more reassured that they are moving along through the process, and then you will be in a position ultimately to be satisfied that both grid and UK PM have made sufficient attempts to engage.

01:00:49:14 - 01:01:14:05

I will move to you, but I think just in terms of your response, I will be looking for Mr. Stone and I will be looking for something very substantial in your deadline submission about this. I know you gave some stuff, some information last time, but I cannot it cannot rely on the sequencing of UK and it's different to us. This is your application. It's very it's quite a serious matter for us. I don't know whether Mr. Stone wants to say anything before we go to UK pm.

01:01:14:13 - 01:01:15:09

No, I think let's hear.

01:01:15:11 - 01:01:16:15

Yes, let's go again.

01:01:16:17 - 01:01:22:02

Thank you. Very patient. Oh, there you have. Let's hear from them first of all. Then we can make some further comments.

01:01:22:20 - 01:02:13:13

Thank you very much, says Mark Westmoreland Smith for UK PM. Um, you have already identified, um, the starting point. Um, this is an Get application. And in the result, we are in a slightly unusual role and are here to facilitate and get project in two ways. Um, firstly by providing Connections with regards to which and get are our customer, and also to provide diversions to our existing apparatus in order to allow the project to, um, proceed.

01:02:14:10 - 01:02:48:10

Um, so it's important to acknowledge that role because that explains some of the timings here. So we entered into what's called a design services agreement, uh, in November of 2025. That's when that agreement was, um, completed. That relates to design services for Norwich to Tilbury. It related to funding for some of the works that we'd be required to do.

01:02:48:22 - 01:03:35:18

It also required us to undertake, um, Negotiations with landowners. So at that point, once it was signed, we were in receipt of funds. We instructed Dalle Corps McLaren to carry out, uh, negotiations with landowners. And as you know, they're a firm of chartered surveyors specializing in utilities and

infrastructure and well experienced in this, um, arena. And and having done the necessary, uh, land referencing work, we, uh, initiated initial contact with letters in on the 25th of March, 2026.

01:03:36:08 - 01:04:26:24

And our land um, acquisition strategy comprises five stages. We send out initial letters, uh, then we, uh, follow up to non-responsive parties. as a second stage. Then there's a secondary follow up, a door knock, and then, um, we issue heads of terms, and the broad approach is almost the inverse of um n gets in that we like to have the engagement with a landowner, understand their needs, and then put together a more bespoke heads of terms that reflect the individual circumstances of the landowners.

01:04:27:01 - 01:04:57:24

Historically, we found that, um, effective. The alternative route is just to send out the heads of terms early, um, and in some ways that's helpful in these circumstances because you can show the numbers of heads of terms. But holistically, we're comfortable with our process. The fact that there are two different processes, um, is unsurprising. Different corporate bodies take different routes. Both, um, are legitimate.

01:04:59:03 - 01:05:34:06

Um, where where are we? Um, now, we have identified 244 landowners that would be affected by the UK PM works. We've set out sent out those initial letters to 225 of them. Um, the um, missing, um, few, um, relate to unregistered land, um, where the landowner is not known.

01:05:34:18 - 01:06:10:24

We had and to say if your friends, we will obviously put these numbers in our written submissions and any relevant update by the time of the next, um, deadline. So we had 113 responses to those initial letters, we sent out 110 second letters, to which we got 49 replies. At 58 third letters, 17 replies um went door knocking to 31 further where we had responses on 13 occasions.

01:06:11:01 - 01:06:50:13

So in all, um, we've had 100 engagement with 192 of the 244 landowners, and of which 19 are unknown. So, uh, 192 realistically out of the, uh, two, two fives, um, we've held meetings with 65 of, um, the landowners, and we've got another 115, uh, meetings, um, in the diary, and we'll update as we have those meetings.

01:06:50:18 - 01:07:40:18

And and so we are making progress. Um, and um, that is um in train. And we're also put in place, um, bi weekly meetings with Njit between their lands teams to provide the opportunity to ensure that the two teams are aligned in relation to overlapping landowners. So, uh, landowners where both ingot and UK are seeking um rights in order that there is the necessary coordination so that, um, the burden on the landowner is, um, limited and you don't get one party coming and knocking on the door straight after the other.

01:07:41:07 - 01:08:14:20

Um, so there is that, uh, Coordination, and we've had a number of joint meetings to date, and they're the ones proposed. You've had the Lands Rights Tracker, which we are obviously guardians of insofar as it relates to, um, UK pen. Um, and we provided that to get and it was included in rep 5075 and obviously that is um, a document that is live and updated as it goes along.

01:08:14:22 - 01:08:43:03

And so you'll get updates of that at the ensuing, um, deadlines. So we acknowledge we started in at a later position once we'd signed the contracts with Njit. Um, but we are, um, making good progress and active engagement. Um, and obviously, we'll confirm those numbers in, writing.

01:08:44:07 - 01:09:22:09

Thank you very much. And, um, it's helpful to have the explanation about the, um, the opposite way round, which is why we don't see heads of terms mentioned on your. Nevertheless. Nevertheless, with still 150 meetings in the diary, with seven weeks to go, our consensus still still remains that we are very concerned about the progress in this regard. And if there are, if there are no heads of terms being sent, you know, by the end of this examination potentially, and I don't know whether there will be or not, the chances of us understanding whether there's agreed and therefore objections are withdrawn.

01:09:22:11 - 01:09:28:00

Is, is, um, is a limited opportunity for that. So, um,

01:09:29:21 - 01:09:37:04

it's helpful, but it's not necessarily reassuring for us. Uh, I'll ask Mr. Stone if he's got any comments.

01:09:38:15 - 01:10:05:17

Two short questions, I suppose, is what? What timescale are you working to? We know you're working to the end of the examination. Or are you working to Secretary's decision or are you working too? Well, we'll get compulsory acquisition powers anyway, and we'll continue to negotiate right up until we exercise those powers. Well, what we just want obviously, we want everything in place by the end of the examination, but are you working to that?

01:10:06:02 - 01:10:39:12

Um, it won't be realistic that we have signed agreements with all of the landowners from whom we might need rights. So we are going. We are working currently and for the foreseeable future, to try and come to voluntary arrangements with all the affected landowners. And it would only be obviously in the last resort that we would use compulsory purchase powers. But it is a matter of twin tracking.

01:10:39:18 - 01:10:50:17

Working hard to get to the pollen tree, but seeking the compulsory as a, um, as a necessary backstop if we can't come to voluntary agreement.

01:10:50:24 - 01:11:22:20

And the other question, I suppose, is you've given us a number of figures there about engaging with people and issuing heads of terms. I didn't hear any. Whether you've completed any heads of terms or where you're in a position to think that you might complete that. So you've identified 244 plots. Is there an anticipation that you you may get to a position where you will have a number? And what what would that number be of, uh, heads of terms that you might.

01:11:22:22 - 01:11:23:12

Agree it.

01:11:23:14 - 01:12:04:00

Would be, um, difficult for me to give you that number now, and probably dangerous because it wouldn't have enough, um, substance, um, behind it. Um, I didn't say we'd issued heads of terms because we haven't because of the structure of the process. What I did admit to say is that where we have failed to get engagement and traction with parties, then we default back to the right. Let's issue heads of terms, and we will be able to do that in, in short order, because we either have had that traction by now or not.

01:12:04:07 - 01:12:14:03

And so we certainly will have done that. Um, yeah. By by deadline seven I'm told.

01:12:15:02 - 01:12:16:11

Is that basically our.

01:12:16:13 - 01:12:17:03

Last.

01:12:17:16 - 01:12:18:08

Deadline?

01:12:18:10 - 01:12:19:07

Yeah. Yeah.

01:12:19:09 - 01:12:45:06

I mean, I think, I think the position as Mr. Sims has sort of set out is that we're in the the end game of the examination. We're just this is the last set of hearings that we're at. We're in a process where we're wanting to ensure that we will have as much information in front of us to enable us to report as best we can to the Secretary of State. I'm sure you're aware that the Secretary State does not

01:12:46:21 - 01:13:32:03

like what I would like, or probably more than that, does not want a to receive a recommendation from us with a lot of caveats in it. And we need to have information which is sufficient to enable us to at least adjudicate on matters. Even if we don't have final positions, then we need to be in a position where we understand the parties on either sides position, so that when we can at least come to a reasonable sense of

conclusion on the basis of evidence in front of us and what we're seeing, or is sufficient explanation and evidence to at least give us something that we can then put into that adjudication.

01:13:32:14 - 01:13:49:01

So I think whenever what we're looking for at the next deadline is an explanation of the processes that you're going through, how those dovetail with each other, how you expect those engagements to carry on up until the end of the examination. And even, as.

01:13:49:03 - 01:13:49:18

You.

01:13:49:20 - 01:14:09:16

Have indicated, beyond the end of the examination, and to use compulsory acquisition as a last resort, and that negotiations will continue. But I, I suspect what we what we're looking for is that level of information and evidence in front of us that we can then report on properly.

01:14:10:07 - 01:14:40:19

So if I may just I can see the time and I will be very brief. But, um, if we had more time, I would have given you something of a similar overview in terms of the applicants and, you know, anticipated timetable. And we will we will, as I said, we'll come back to you in writing on this because we sort of skipped the review, um, in the interest of time. and we'll ensure that we provide a sort of program that also. Will work on it jointly with UK PM, so that you can understand how both parties anticipate the steps unfolding.

01:14:40:21 - 01:15:11:21

But, um, you are correct in that we also anticipate entirely that we will continue to negotiate, you know, to take negotiations forward past the end of the examination and indeed for as long as we need to, until we reach the point, whenever that may be, where actually we reach an impasse and then we will need compulsory powers. Um, just and this will all be set out in writing. But just a couple of points. Um, the person from religion not mentioned, v4 of heads of terms. We're not going to be issuing any more template versions.

01:15:11:23 - 01:15:45:02

We're working. What we've been working on is, um, our version three, and we're going to be we're anticipating having that populated on a landowner specific basis and then sent out before the close of the examination. And then, um, we've already where we where we're able to because, as you know, we've been trying to respond to individual requests for accommodations and, you know, shifting things slightly and so on and so forth, where we've been able to make progress on that.

01:15:45:04 - 01:16:24:06

We have already begun the transition from the sort of template based approach that we take towards a more landowner specific agreement. So that process has started and will, once the V3 have gone out, will then shift more fully to a more landowner specific set of, um, provisions for everybody. Um, but yeah,

just to make the point and as I said, you'll get this in writing, but it doesn't come as a surprise. We like you, KPN, and as is ordinarily the case, will because we have to in accordance with the guidance and the statutes, we will continue to negotiate sort of irrespective really, of the examination deadlines or indeed the Secretary of State's deadline.

01:16:24:08 - 01:16:30:01

We will continue to negotiate until we really can't, and then we will need to fall back on compulsory purchase powers.

01:16:34:10 - 01:17:14:15

Okay. Thank you. I think we just urge you to continue. Um, yeah. And, um, that's, uh, thank you for that. Um, and thank you for coming up again. Um, we have overrun, uh, we have been given leave for a couple of minutes of overrun. So I will just mention agenda item six and the rule 17 letter that went out to the, um, uh, affected persons, and then the further rule 17 letter that came to the applicant only at the end of last week. We appreciate it's, um, only just a ride with you. We're not going to have a discussion about it. Just simply wanted to say that, um, we are looking for a proper a substantive new reply to each of the, um, uh, comments and not just hyperlinks and to to other.

01:17:14:17 - 01:17:27:07

We want to be able to see it in that document, not, um, not have to go searching for it in various other documents. So that's just one thing we wanted to mention. And just in case you had any questions, just an opportunity to, um, to ask them here.

01:17:27:17 - 01:17:50:24

Um, just in response to that indication. Thank you, sir. Sergeant, for the applicant. Um, that's very helpful. We we haven't had so much time to look at this yet, but I am informed and I have not looked at it at all, I should say. But I am informed that some of the submissions are essentially repetition of points that are already before you. Would you wish us to respond to those or are you?

01:17:51:01 - 01:17:57:19

Yes, I would prefer we prefer you to do the copy and paste of of what you've said before, rather than us to go and search for them, please.

01:17:57:22 - 01:18:05:18

That's that's as I anticipated. But I had assumed that you're hoping to then have really in one place from the apex there.

01:18:05:20 - 01:18:06:11

Case.

01:18:06:13 - 01:18:07:03

A thread.

01:18:07:05 - 01:18:07:20

Of and then.

01:18:07:22 - 01:18:08:12

In each one.

01:18:08:14 - 01:18:18:18

Yes. One position. That's understood, sir. And I'll take that away. We'll discuss it. And if there's any concern around, we will obviously get on with it as soon as we can. But if there's any concern around deadlines, then we'll.

01:18:19:09 - 01:18:40:18

For us, there is just the two of us rather than a bank of of people that are working on this to try and keep finding what you've said before. Through hyperlinks, etc. is very, very difficult for us and very time consuming with the time limits that we have. So we would ask you to do the copy and pasting of what you said before, so that we can see that objection tracker actually being filled out, rather than links back to another. Previous comment.

01:18:40:22 - 01:18:41:13

That.

01:18:41:15 - 01:18:58:10

That's where I thought the suggestion may have come from, if I may. And that's all understood. So as I said, we'll, um, finish going through the responses and, um, we'll get on it as soon as we can. If there are concerns around deadline will raise them with you via the, um, via pins.

01:18:58:12 - 01:18:59:05

Thank you.

01:18:59:16 - 01:19:07:22

Thank you very much. So I'll move on to the closing up. So, uh, are there any other matters that anybody wishes to raise with today that hasn't been covered?

01:19:09:24 - 01:19:10:15

Sorry. Can I.

01:19:10:17 - 01:19:11:07

Just.

01:19:11:09 - 01:19:25:03

Just doesn't get lost in the background. Those other matters that we've skipped past in the agenda, in terms of the Crown land and in terms of the statutory undertakers. If you just respond to those updates in writing at.

01:19:25:05 - 01:19:26:03

The next one. Thank you sir.

01:19:26:05 - 01:19:26:20

To confirm.

01:19:26:22 - 01:19:27:12

That.

01:19:27:14 - 01:19:34:07

Have a silent applicant. We shall do. I can tell you that on Crown land. I think that is actually resolved. So that will be some good news, at least on that.

01:19:34:09 - 01:20:06:06

Thank you. So agenda item eight. We're going to close now. Can I remind everyone that any written submission summary of all cases be put to the hearing and any documents that have been requested should be submitted by deadline six on Tuesday, the 7th of July. This is the last compulsory acquisition hearing we'll be holding this afternoon at 2 p.m. will be an issue specific hearing three relating to the Draft Development Consent order. So some of you may be returning then with a shortened lunch break, I apologize. Um, all that leads me to say is thank you to everyone for attending and your participation in this hearing and all previous compulsory acquisition hearings you may have attended.

01:20:06:08 - 01:20:14:18

Your submissions have been most helpful. The time is now 110 and this compulsory acquisition hearing three is now closed. Thank you very much.