



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 (CAH3) - Day 1 - Part 1
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.

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:16:21

Gentlemen, it's now 10:00 in time for this hearing to begin. Before we go any further, can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly, and that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced?

00:00:19:21 - 00:00:42:27

Thank you. I'd like to welcome you all to this third compulsory acquisition hearing in relation to the application made by National Grid for an order to grant development consent for the Norwich to Tilbury project. My name is Kenneth Stone. I am a planning inspector and chartered town planner, and I'm joined by my colleague Matthew Sims, who I will ask you to introduce himself.

00:00:43:03 - 00:00:47:17

Good morning. My name is Matthew Sims. I'm a chartered civil engineer and also a planning inspector.

00:00:49:08 - 00:01:28:17

We are two members of the examining Authority that have been appointed by the Secretary to examine this application. The other three panel members, Mrs. Hunt, the lead member of the panel, Mr. Hockley and Mr. Butler are undertaking other related duties this morning, but will watch the recording of the proceedings online at a later date. Our role is to examine the application and to report to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and net zero, with a recommendation as to whether or not the development consent order should be made. I can confirm that all members of the examining authority have made formal declarations of interest, and there are no known conflicts of interest with regard to us examining the application.

00:01:29:05 - 00:01:33:17

Although there is one exception, and Mr. Sims will comment on that now.

00:01:33:26 - 00:02:13:06

Thank you, Mr. Stone. As I stated at the last compulsory acquisition hearing, and for the purposes of a particular part of the examination being the objection from the Essex Scouting Guy's International Jamboree, I've declared that I'm a scout leader and a member of the Scouts. However, my scouting roles, past and present, are not within or in any way related to Essex, nor are they relevant to the matters relating to the Essex International Jamboree. I have also no personal links, past or present, to scouting or leaders in Essex, nor the organising team of the Jamboree. Notwithstanding this, I have not and will not be involved in the examination or recommendation in relation to the objection from the Essex Scout and Guide International Jamboree or the related land.

00:02:15:12 - 00:02:45:24

Thank you. The Planning Inspectorate case team here today are represented by Sian Evans as a case manager, and she is being supported by Harrison Cowles as case officer. Remotely we have Louise Haraway and Jessica Dunlop. Please don't hesitate to talk to a member of the case team should you need any help during the event or with the technology. It is the case team who you should contact regarding any queries with the application process.

00:02:46:02 - 00:03:24:18

Today's hearing is being undertaken as a blended event, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue and some of you are joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that however you have decided to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate and you should also be aware that the meeting is being recorded. I'll turn to a few housekeeping matters. Please can everybody turn their mobile devices, phones, etc. off or turn them to silent? We've not been informed that there's any fire alarm testing today, so if the alarm goes off, it's for real.

00:03:24:22 - 00:03:56:04

And if you do need to exit the building, then it's out of the doors that you came in. Turn left and through the main doors and into the car park. Uh, no requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in the hearing. And if you do need assistance, please talk to the case team. Online participants should make sure that their cameras are switched off and microphones muted unless you are speaking. If at any point during the hearing you can't hear us or wish to speak to the examining authority.

00:03:56:06 - 00:04:28:10

Please could virtual attendees use the raised hand function on teams? And there may be there may be some delay for us to respond to and acknowledge this. There will be a short break around 90 minutes into the hearing, and we will conclude the hearing by 1 p.m., as we have a further ish hearing at 2:00. If any breaks are required before this, you should alert the case team and also if you need any extra support during the hearing. This should be directed to the case team who will alert the SEC.

00:04:30:20 - 00:05:05:11

And this event is being live streamed and recorded. And our letter of the 13th of January, referred to as the rule six letter, explained that because we retain and publish the digital recordings, they form a public record to which the General Data Protection Regulations apply. Planning Inspectorate publishes and retains recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. So if you're to participate in this meeting, it is important to understand that you'll be recorded and that you consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording.

00:05:08:27 - 00:05:19:05

We have been made aware that people may not wish to be filmed, and there is an area in the room for that. Or if you're online, just do not turn your camera on.

00:05:21:24 - 00:05:52:10

We will only ever ask for information to be placed in the public record. That is important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings. What we would ask is that you do not refer to private or confidential information in your submissions today, such as your address, financial circumstances or details of medical conditions. If you do feel the need to refer to something as private or confidential, please discuss this with the case team first to explore whether this could be submitted in writing and later Redacted.

00:05:53:18 - 00:06:26:00

We would like to reiterate what was said at the open floor hearing yesterday about behavior during the examination. We do not. We do understand that people have strong feelings about the proposed development, but it is important to recognize that we have a process to follow, as does the applicant. We ask for respect to be shown to each other throughout the hearing, as well as in subsequent written submissions. Please be polite to each other as everyone deserves the same level of respect, no matter what their involvement in this examination.

00:06:27:00 - 00:06:38:10

I'd also like to remind all speakers today that if any vexatious, frivolous, or libelous comments are made, you may be asked to stop speaking and such comments may be redacted from the recording.

00:06:40:28 - 00:06:53:02

We will go through the names of those additional affected persons and the affected persons who are participating in today in a moment. However, here I would like to confirm the arrangements for speaking

00:06:54:23 - 00:07:27:12

individual additional affected persons and or affected persons. Participants who are listed to speak and who are in the room. Please can you come up to the tables at the front here? When we ask at the beginning of agenda eight and four, take a seat in front of a microphone. Uh, unless you've asked not to be filmed. In which case, remain in your seat and the microphone will be brought to you. We will learn. Call each person in the order of the published list of speakers.

00:07:27:24 - 00:07:40:11

If you are in the room, please turn your microphone on at this point only. And for those online when we call your name, please switch your camera on and we will then ask you to begin speaking.

00:07:42:26 - 00:08:19:08

I set out in the agenda. Affected persons will have three minutes to update the SEC on progress with compulsory acquisition and temporary possession matters that have evolved during the examination and following any previous oral or written representations made to us, and after which the applicant will have the opportunity to reply and we may ask questions if we have any. We have a fixed timescale for the hearing, so we will ask that only updates are given rather than repeating or making your representations full representations to us.

00:08:20:08 - 00:08:52:29

We would therefore like to remind all participants in today's hearing to keep their responses as concise as possible, and to keep to the advertised agendas and not stray into any other matters which the SEC has not sought to ask questions on. If any participant in a hearing is affecting the efficient running of the event or taking up too much time in their submission, they will be invited to submit their comments in writing at the next deadline. We would also like to remind everyone that written comments have no less weight than those made verbally.

00:08:54:14 - 00:09:22:22

Agenda item five is primarily directed towards the applicant, and we will seek to understand progress being made and likely ongoing timescales for matters to be resolved or final positions to be confirmed. Agenda item six is again directed towards the applicant and will focus on a short discussion around a recent rule 17 request and any clarification. Does anyone have any questions about the technology or general housekeeping matters that I've just run through?

00:09:26:04 - 00:09:46:21

Not seeing anybody in the room and not seeing any hands up online. So I shall move on. This hearing will follow the agenda that was published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on the 15th of June, and which we republished on the 19th of June. That was Examination Library Reference Eve 009.

00:09:48:27 - 00:10:19:01

The agenda includes a a running order for the agenda of those affected persons who have notified us that they wish to make oral representations. This was updated in the republished agenda. The agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress if we feel necessary. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to.

00:10:19:07 - 00:10:37:21

But if the discussions cannot be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information required, then can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing?

00:10:39:17 - 00:10:47:01

When we take a break, those of you who are participating virtually will need to ensure your cameras and microphones are turned off during the break.

00:10:49:03 - 00:10:51:06

I will now move to introductions.

00:10:54:17 - 00:11:26:24

We would ask that each of the affected persons or their representatives, when they are called to participate and introduce themselves at that point stating your name, any tag that you wish to be addressed by and, if appropriate, who you represent. However, I'm now going to ask the applicant and its advisors to introduce themselves. So could you please introduce yourself stating your name? And if I could hear from him or whomever will lead the submissions today? And then if they just introduce who may make regular contributions.

00:11:27:25 - 00:11:47:00

Good morning sir. Thank you. My name is Heather Sergeant. Counsel for the applicant. I'll be leading discussions today. And, um, the people who are most likely to be supporting me and that are sitting to my left. So I'll just ask them to introduce themselves individually if that's acceptable to you. Thank you.

00:11:49:04 - 00:11:49:19

Abigail.

00:11:51:05 - 00:11:53:10

Abigail. Walters. Bryan. Cave. Leighton. Payson.

00:11:56:01 - 00:11:58:05

Stephen. Boughton. On behalf of the applicant.

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

Michael McKee. On behalf of the applicant.

00:12:04:00 - 00:12:05:27

John Galloway. On behalf of the applicant.

00:12:06:23 - 00:12:11:09

And on behalf of the applicant and Paul. And on behalf of the applicant.

00:12:13:01 - 00:12:21:22

And so there are a couple of people who are currently sitting in the second row. But if I ask them to introduce themselves as and when they speak, I hope that's acceptable to you. Thank you.

00:12:21:24 - 00:12:23:12

Yes, I think that would be helpful.

00:12:26:05 - 00:12:37:22

Uh, we've also requested that representatives of UCP attend. Uh, and could I ask that whomever will lead their discussions introduces themselves and any other representatives, please?

00:12:39:15 - 00:13:11:01

Yes. Good morning sir. My name is Mark Westmoreland Smith, King's Counsel. I'm at Francis Taylor Building and I appear on behalf of UK PM. I'm instructed by Francesca Moran, who's the principal solicitor property with the UK PM. And to my left I've got Rachel Rayner, who's the major project senior town planner at Capital Programmes with UK, and to my right, Arron Waters. He's a consent and stakeholder engagement manager.

00:13:11:06 - 00:13:24:01

Thank you. And I should say, um, in terms of the agenda, we're obviously here to assist you as you need. Um, but it's, uh, agenda item five e that we have our EIR.

00:13:25:17 - 00:13:28:18

Yes. That's where we have our eye on as well.

00:13:34:03 - 00:14:04:15

Okay. Thank you very much. You will see from the agenda that item three relate to additional Affected persons who have newly entered the examination by virtue of the change request. One and two. No one has pre-registered to speak as an additional affected person. However, if you believe that you are an additional affected person or here as such. Would you please raise your hand and notify us if you wish to speak?

00:14:07:10 - 00:14:09:27

Could we get a microphone to that?

00:14:21:00 - 00:14:37:25

Morning. Jay Marshall, a severely affected landowner. Oddly, I have already submitted to, um. Deadline five a regarding interested party information, but we'd just like to add a few things at the end if permitted to do so, please.

00:14:37:27 - 00:14:52:00

Yeah, I think that you are pre-registered as an observer only, and I think that you are already unaffected person, not you. You have not been part of the change request additional land that was added. Is that correct?

00:14:52:02 - 00:15:04:00

Yeah. Although one of our fields now, um, is due to be surveyed and it wasn't in the original, um, uh, her boundary sort of boundary line, if you like.

00:15:04:06 - 00:15:13:06

So is it within the boundary line of the change request? 1 or 2. Is it is it additional land?

00:15:13:15 - 00:15:14:27

Additional land? Yes.

00:15:15:09 - 00:15:16:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:25:10 - 00:15:36:10

Okay. Thank you very much. I think in that case, as you're the only person that we have who is identified as an additional affected person, um, if you want to come forward to the front table now.

00:15:48:01 - 00:15:49:24

I just want to press the button.

00:15:52:19 - 00:15:53:04

All right.

00:15:55:04 - 00:15:56:15

So, um, as I mentioned.

00:15:56:24 - 00:15:57:19

Just a second.

00:16:03:11 - 00:16:04:10

Okay, great.

00:16:06:27 - 00:16:30:18

We're just going to move on. We will pick you up at agenda item three, which is the the item after the purpose of the hearing. But if you just stay there, then we'll call you at that point in time. But you are the only person in agenda item three that we're aware of. So just for the applicant's purposes. So if you prepare yourself, we'll call you shortly.

00:16:34:00 - 00:16:46:22

In terms of those who are on the list at X A, which is for agenda item four. Um, does the applicant have the list and can you put that on the screen?

00:16:50:27 - 00:17:07:22

So this is the list of people who we will hear from in agenda item four. Can everyone who is due to speak check that their name is on the list? Uh, I'll quickly run through these. There are a couple of changes for today from the latest published list. So we have.

00:17:10:19 - 00:17:23:27

Scottish Power, renewables. We have National highways. We have Northumbrian Water, we have blower homes. We have a through Writtle. We have Boxford Holdings, we have, um,

00:17:25:25 - 00:17:56:25

big Lanham, um, we have Paul Lanham, we have the Langley estate. Um, and we've got two speakers there, Charles McLean and Jenny McLean. We have Russell Matthews. We have Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon extension. We have the parish family. We have folk born estate. We have a farmer and Clyne. The Tritton farming partnership.

00:17:58:28 - 00:18:20:24

We have a village and not Mr. Walker. On behalf of various affected persons. And then Mr. Walker, on behalf of the Scouts International Jamboree. And then we have lower Thames crossings. There are a couple of people there I didn't call out who have informed us that they will not be here today.

00:18:22:27 - 00:18:29:00

Is there anybody else here today, online or in the room who would wish to speak on agenda item for.

00:18:36:07 - 00:18:40:27

I have a hand up. Which is. Yes.

00:18:40:29 - 00:18:47:25

Charles Tritton, chicken farming partnership. Yes. Just to say that, um. What? Virtual? Not in person?

00:18:48:04 - 00:18:55:07

Nope. Yes, we picked that up, but. Yes. Thank you. You don't see that at the appropriate time. We'll call you at that point.

00:18:56:25 - 00:18:57:27

Thank you very much.

00:19:02:03 - 00:19:03:24

Okay. So moving on.

00:19:06:28 - 00:19:43:10

Just to reiterate the point to all of our participants today, for the purposes of the recording, it would be enormously beneficial for us if each time you speak throughout the hearing, you could state your name and who you are representing. As I mentioned earlier, the event is being live streamed and recorded and will be available to view on the Norwich, the Tilbury page of the Inspector, its website and anyone watching on live stream or at a later date has the opportunity to make any comment about the matters covered today in writing for deadline six and that is Tuesday the 7th of July.

00:19:45:11 - 00:19:50:10

I'll now pastor Mr. Sims and he'll take us through the purpose of this catch.

00:19:50:23 - 00:20:26:22

Thank you very much. This is agenda item two. And I'm just going to briefly explain the purpose of the compulsory acquisition hearing. And then we'll come to Mrs. Marshall. So if you beg your patience just for a little bit longer, the application for the proposed development includes a request for an order granting development consent to authorize compulsory acquisition of land or compulsory acquisition of an interest in or right over land, or the temporary possession of land. The applicant has made a change request one and two, which have been accepted by the examining authority. These change requests have

resulted in additional land requiring additional compulsory acquisition and interest and temporary possession being sought.

00:20:27:01 - 00:21:03:05

This hearing is to enable the examining authority to hear and examine the objections of any additional affected persons. This hearing will help us to also consider the issues raised, and whether relevant legal and policy tests applicable to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession proposals have been met. Furthermore, the hearing also provides us the opportunity to obtain and examine details of the progress being made in respect of affected parties objections and previously raised with us and the progress of Crown land, statutory undertakers and other matters. The purpose of this hearing is to consider the matters of the agenda, which was originally published on the 15th of June and republished on the 19th of June.

00:21:03:07 - 00:21:34:29

It won't be appropriate to display documents that haven't previously been submitted as part of the examination, but if you propose to refer to a new document, that document will need to be submitted along with your written summary of oral submissions, so that it is formally entered into the examination, and other parties will then have the opportunity to view and comment upon it. If, during the course of the hearing we need to refer to a document, we will use the document reference in the Planning Inspectorate Examination library online. The objective of the hearing today is to develop the examining authority's understanding of the issues.

00:21:35:01 - 00:22:22:10

The expectation is that we, as the examining authority, will lead on questions, but there is a provision for direct questioning of affected persons should this be necessary, which will be at our discretion. Parties with an interest in land that is affected by a compulsory acquisition request are known as affected persons. All affected persons have been notified of this compulsory acquisition hearing. They have a right to be heard in relation to any objection about the effects of a compulsory acquisition request on their interest in land. In addition, following the submission of Change Request one and two, which the applicant proposed on the 27th of March and the Act examiner authority accepted into the examination on the 31st of March, additional affected persons may have entered the examination where they have been detailed as having land or land rights in respect of the change requests.

00:22:22:24 - 00:22:46:07

In line with the recommendation requirements of regulation 15 of the Infrastructure Planning Compulsory Acquisition Regulations 2010. These additional effective persons have also been notified of this hearing. At the appropriate time, we will call each of those persons who have registered to speak to address the examining authority with their points. At that time, I would ask you to introduce yourselves as to who you are and, if applicable, who you represent.

00:22:48:09 - 00:23:34:21

We will be examining the application of the compulsory acquisition rights in the context of the powers provided in the Planning Act 2008. A link to that legislation is available in the main National Infrastructure Planning website of the Planning Inspectorate. But in brief, we will need to test and advise

the Secretary of State on whether the land and rights are sought, are required to build or facilitate the development, whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land or rights to be acquired compulsorily, and whether it is sought, what is thought is legitimate, necessary, reasonable and proportionate. We will also be mindful of the advice set out by the government in its 2013 publication, Planning Act 2008 guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, which is also available from a link in the guidance section of the main National Infrastructure Planning website.

00:23:35:15 - 00:24:07:12

Our deliberations and decisions will also be guided by the relevant human rights legislation, including the European Convention on Human Rights, articles six and eight and the First Protocol of Article one. Ultimately, while considering whether to recommend or allow the application for compulsory acquisition powers respectively, both we and the Secretary of State will take great care to weigh any interference with human rights against the public interest associated with the benefits of the proposed development, and ensure that any interference is considered both necessary and proportionate.

00:24:08:07 - 00:24:40:19

It is for the applicant to demonstrate that all compulsory proposed compulsory acquisition powers that, as it seeks, are justified within this framework, that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition have been explored, and that there is a reasonable prospect of it having the funds available to implement any compulsory acquisition rights that may ultimately be granted by the Secretary of State in the time allowed within within any Development Consent Order. Whilst there is a clear and obvious link between our examination of the proposed development itself and our examination of the application for compulsory acquisition and temporary possession rights.

00:24:40:21 - 00:25:18:24

The two are tested on their own merits according to the case and whatever our ultimate recommendation to the Secretary of State, it is possible that they could grant development consent, but not some or any of the requested compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers. We should stress that we will form a view over the full course of the examination on each of the requests for compulsory acquisition powers, and whether or not there is a compelling case in the public interest, and not just on the submission and evidence put before us today. For the purposes of this hearing, we are assuming that the representatives of the applicant are reasonably familiar with the legislative policy and guidance framework, and with the process that the examining authority and Secretary of State will go through.

00:25:19:01 - 00:25:51:29

For those of you less used the compulsory acquisition hearings, we should explain that we may refer to a number of the principal documents from the application today, such as the Development Consent Order, Land Plans, works plans, Explanatory memorandum, statement of reasons, book of reference documents relating to both change requests one and two, a Crown Land Tracker, special category, land Tracker and schedule of effective persons objecting to canopy of their land and rights. All of these are available via the examination library on the project web page of the Planning Inspectorate.

00:25:52:01 - 00:26:31:18

National Infrastructure web page. The land plans identify all relevant parcels of land and include a label for each. The cross-references to the Book of Reference. The Book of Reference includes a comprehensive table that lists each parcel of land, the power source, and everybody that has been identified with a legal interest in it. It was the applicant's responsibility to undertake diligent inquiry into the existence of all affected persons in advance of making the development consent application. The Statement of Reasons sets out in detail why the applicant believes there is a compelling case in the public interest for it to be granted compulsory acquisition powers in the draft Development Consent Order and that these are necessary, proportionate and justified.

00:26:31:24 - 00:27:02:12

These have been updated to include the additional land sought into the brought into the scheme through change request one and two. Finally, may we remind you that the focus of today's hearing is explicitly on matters in relation to the applicant's proposed compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers, and we will not be taking any submissions or evidence in any other aspects of the proposed development itself, including its merits or wider concerns. If you have other issues you wish these could should be submitted in writing by deadline seven on Tuesday the 7th of July.

00:27:03:17 - 00:27:35:21

Similarly, we cannot take evidence on the eligibility for or quantum of compensation that may be sought or awarded to any individual affected persons or the application of the compensation code, as this is strictly outside the scope of our Terms of Reference. To complete this preliminary item about the purpose of the hearing today. Maybe you will request that all additional effective persons and effective persons who make oral representations today, submit a follow up written summary of their oral submission after this hearing by deadline six and apologies, I said deadline seven a few moments ago.

00:27:35:23 - 00:28:11:03

It should be deadline six. My apologies for that. Which is Tuesday the 7th of July. Written submissions should be based on your representations today rather than any new material, but they can include more detail and corroborative or supporting evidence. For those of you who haven't attended a proceeding such as these, there is a necessary formality and we would ask you to refrain from interruptions that are most unhelpful to us, potentially disruptive, and those to those who are speaking and could, in some circumstances lead to an award of costs against the person responsible. Before I come to the substantive agenda, is there anything of a more general procedural nature that anyone wishes to raise?

00:28:14:03 - 00:28:18:11

Thank you. I will ask Mr. Stone to move on to agenda item three then. Thank you.

00:28:19:18 - 00:28:37:15

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, we're moving on to agenda item three, which is to deal with any additional affected persons. We have Mrs.. Mrs. Marshall who has, uh, indicated that she is an additional affected person. You come forward to the front. So when you have

00:28:39:03 - 00:28:51:18

settled yourself and are ready, if you would like to make your contributions, and would you ask that you contain this to no more than five minutes? Um, thank you very much.

00:28:51:23 - 00:29:31:13

Thank you. Um, as mentioned earlier, I am already an affected party and I have responded ahead of deadline. Five a but this, um, this, um, is about a parcel of land we have, which wasn't in the draft order limit previously, but we've been notified that it is now. And bearing in mind that the hearings are going to draw to a close on the 10th of August. Our concerns are that if survey work is now going to be carried out, where do we what position does that put us in later down the line when, um, starting with ecology, whatever they want to do.

00:29:31:15 - 00:30:03:03

We were really surprised that, um, that this, uh, this field was, uh, was included when it hadn't been before. And we've had survey work carried out on the farm for about 3 or 4 years now. Um, I think I'm also might be on the the end of the list, um, annex A, um, because I've not been to, um, public acquisition, um, um, hearing before because they've clashed with other hearings. Um, so would it be appropriate for me to just, um, follow on so that I'm done and dusted?

00:30:03:11 - 00:30:06:23

I think if you just carry on within your five minutes and just keep going.

00:30:06:25 - 00:30:44:05

Yeah. So this is just, um, this is just, um, um, a brief conclusion to what we've already sent in, but basically, my family has already responded as I mentioned. To date, we still have had no survey results. The heads of terms are currently unacceptable and still not fit for purpose in our eyes. We feel a profound sense of injustice in knowing that we may be forced to surrender rights over our property when alternative solutions, in our case, integrated offshore and underground HVDC.

00:30:44:07 - 00:31:18:24

Because we lose. We know we stand to lose about 80% of our farm. Um, you know, we realize that they haven't been fully explored, if at all. Um, for us, the potential compulsory acquisition of grade one BMV farmland represents not just a loss of land, but a loss of certainty, opportunity, peace of mind and a future to look forward to. We feel that you can't you can't just pick up a farm and move it elsewhere. It's something that you've built on for a long time and want to hand over to, you know, your family.

00:31:18:26 - 00:31:27:08

But we can't see that happening. And every day is, um, a bit of a nightmare because it's always at the back of our minds. Thank you.

00:31:29:15 - 00:31:30:21

Thank you very much.

00:31:32:23 - 00:31:35:25

Could I ask if the applicant would respond to. The point is, um.

00:31:35:27 - 00:31:59:21

Thank you, sir, I have a sergeant for the applicant. Um, so, as indicated, we won't be going over the, um, suggestions around offshore or HVDC as an alternative, because I know the examination is considered those other hearings. I'll just ask Mr. Robinson if there's anything he would like to respond on, specifically in relation to the suggestion that there's additional land that's come in through change requests, 1 or 2.

00:32:00:25 - 00:32:09:17

We're very happy to have some, um, visuals on the screen to help us if that would help. But don't let that hold you up because we're we are tight on time today.

00:32:09:19 - 00:32:38:02

Thank you. Nick Robinson Fisher, chairman, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think this largely relates to some additional land that's been requested for non-intrusive surveys only. Um, the land, uh, the AP doesn't own land that is involved with change request to. And it's actually further to the west. Um, and obviously the need for additional survey land is, um, a requirement that's set out and is much wider than the actual red line boundary of the, uh, the DCO. Thank you.

00:32:48:13 - 00:33:02:24

So in terms of the concerns that are being raised, that there's additional land if you're just doing survey work. Does that have any implications on their ownership of that land or actions that you may take further down the line?

00:33:03:29 - 00:33:17:23

Nick Robinson Fisher chairman, on behalf of the applicant. No, this is purely survey work. So there's no intention to, as far as I understand, to change the DCO in any way, shape or form from the existing proposed impact to the landholding at present. Thank you.

00:33:23:29 - 00:33:25:09

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:33:27:02 - 00:33:31:19

Thank you, Mr. Marshall. You can return today. Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:33:42:03 - 00:33:56:08

I believe that is all the people that we have who have indicated in terms of additional land. I'm not seeing any hands. So we shall move on to agenda item four, where we're seeking an update on progress from affected persons.

00:33:59:09 - 00:34:16:05

Please can those in the room who we have mentioned and are registered to speak now, come forward and take a seat around the table at the front. So when we call it the names earlier on, if you're in the room, can you please come up to the front table and take a seat in front of a microphone, please?

00:34:23:24 - 00:34:44:27

This is basically just to help us manage time so that you're all in position. We don't have to call you up one at a time and lose time. So if you can just take a seat in front of a microphone at a suitable place in front of a microphone, and just keep your microphones off. And when we do ask you to speak, just press the button in front of the microphone. But until then, um, uh, we'll just ask you to, to wait your turn. Thank you.

00:34:48:03 - 00:35:22:29

Okay. So, um, uh, as we've said, um, a couple of times in the introductions, this really is an update on progress. Uh, a number of you have spoken, um, previously, and we've had also representations as well. So we do understand your reasons for objection. So we do not need to hear those. Again, it's really just an opportunity to update us on progress with negotiations, heads of terms, etc. so I am going to first go to ScottishPower renewables who are on the line and Mr.

00:35:23:01 - 00:35:23:16

Innes.

00:35:24:24 - 00:36:24:15

Yes. Good morning sir. My name is Colin Innes and I represent, uh, East Anglia One limited uh, who own and operate the operational East Anglia one offshore wind farm, East Anglia three limited, who own and operate the under-construction East Anglia three offshore wind farm and ScottishPower renewables UK limited, who own land in and around the E3 proposals in relation to the substation. In terms of an update, um, we had an extensive team meeting with Njit last week, uh, where, um, I think it was a very constructive meeting And we made considerable progress in understanding and identifying potential solutions to the issues between the respective companies and Njit, and arising from that, it is anticipated that there are three likely outcomes.

00:36:24:17 - 00:36:57:02

One is there may be some amendments to the DCO and associated documentation to correct matters which have already raised in relation to the submissions that we've already made. Secondly, we're working with the applicant in relation to an interface agreement, which would be an agreement outside the context of our collective provisions to try and manage the interface between the projects. And in broad terms, those drawdown into two broad subject matters.

00:36:57:07 - 00:37:28:12

Um, the first is Bull and Lane, which is a critical access for both East Anglia one, um, which has Which already has, but has existing um, generation assets at the substation. And Bullen Lane is the only access. And similarly, East Anglia three also relies entirely on Bull and Lane for access. The DCO promotes extensive compulsory acquisition of land and rights and the ability to extend Prudence Lane.

00:37:28:21 - 00:38:05:03

Um, and indeed, we understand there may be some compulsory acquisition of the actual public highway. Um, all those are fine, provided we get adequate protection to ensure that we again, have our access maintained to the important national infrastructure. So what that's what we're proposing to deal with through the interface agreement. And the second main subject matter is the interface between the under-construction A3, which has a greater interface with, uh, this proposal than East Anglia one, which is really an access issue there's a greater scope for interaction.

00:38:05:05 - 00:38:36:27

Again, that would be dealt with in terms of the interface agreement. Um, also, given timing of the examination, it is proposed to at least prepare some protective provisions to cover off the position that if the interface agreement is not concluded by the conclusion of the examination, that there's a fallback position in that respect. Those have been drafted by, uh, on behalf of my clients, and we anticipate being in a position to forward those to the the applicant this week.

00:38:37:13 - 00:38:40:18

Thank you. You can start summing up, please, Mr. Innes. That would be helpful. Yeah.

00:38:40:27 - 00:39:16:12

Um, so that's finally those are the that's the update. I've just got two further matters. Um. First of all, there's a part eight matter which is defined in the book of reference, uh, as, uh, not including land, not including the right for temporary possession. And it's really a matter of probably, perhaps for this afternoon, but we don't intend to just come back to this one minor point, but it's just that it does not cover the current DCO draft. It does not cover a temporary possession still covered in representations. Yes. And finally, in relation to statutory undertakers, that's your next item on the agenda.

00:39:16:14 - 00:39:22:05

I don't propose to come back on, on our position because I've set it out, if that's okay.

00:39:22:18 - 00:39:30:08

Thank you very much. Mr. Reid. Does the applicant have any thing to respond to in terms of Mr. and Mrs. comments?

00:39:31:29 - 00:40:04:00

I have a sergeant picking up again. Um, sir, in substance, not much to add. Um from what Mr.. In his said around the constructive discussions that have been ongoing and um you know we're obviously hopeful that that will continue. Um on the two substantive points, our position on Bullen Lane is that access will be maintained at all times during construction and operation of the project, um, in accordance with Avon's existing land rights. And that's something that will be secured in the legal agreement. and then in relation to the interactions with E3.

00:40:04:06 - 00:40:25:17

And my understanding is that that's a matter that relates to landscaping. And the proposal is that the applicant will commit to replacing any E3 landscaping that's removed by the project. And then essentially what's proposed is that the maintenance of that will be the responsibility of E3. So discussions are ongoing on that substantive point as well.

00:40:25:19 - 00:40:31:29

Thank you. So likely to be seen in the interface agreement or the perception positions at least. Okay. Thank you very much.

00:40:32:21 - 00:40:56:12

Could I just ask for a little bit of clarity on timescales that you're expecting, given that we are, and you'll hear us say this on a number of occasions during during this morning, seven weeks from the end of the examination or thereabouts. What's your anticipated timescale for this? And are we going to get something before the end of the examination?

00:40:59:21 - 00:41:18:23

I think we would hope to be able to conclude the side agreement at some point between D6 and D7, and put it into place around that time frame. Um, and with the protective provisions, obviously, we're waiting for them from, um, the affected parties. So at this point they're still with us.

00:41:18:25 - 00:41:19:10

Then

00:41:21:08 - 00:41:32:07

are we likely to get those at a similar timescale? I know you're waiting for them, but is it still the intention to try and get those buy D6 or D7, the protective provisions?

00:41:34:17 - 00:41:43:07

I think since we haven't had them yet, that it would be difficult to put them in the order at D6, but we would be anticipating putting them in the order at D7, we do need to receive them.

00:41:44:07 - 00:41:50:19

Just on that point, Mr. Innes, if you're still there. Do you have a timescale for putting those protective provisions to the applicant this week?

00:41:50:21 - 00:41:54:08

So calling up the three parties this week, sir. Thank you.

00:41:54:15 - 00:42:01:00

Great to hear. Thanks very much. Okay. Thank you. Okay, so we'll move on to National Highways and Mrs. Russell.

00:42:06:03 - 00:42:07:01

Good morning.

00:42:08:03 - 00:42:08:27

Good morning.

00:42:10:08 - 00:42:12:00

There we go. Um,

00:42:13:21 - 00:42:21:26

my name is Julie Russell. I'm a solicitor at Gowling w CLG, and I'm here to represent national highways as strategic highways.

00:42:21:29 - 00:42:34:02

Just just just. Mrs. Russell, just before you go on, just to let you know, we've lost visuals on all of our screens so we can still hear you, but just in case we look a bit blank. Um, we can't see you, but please carry on.

00:42:34:05 - 00:43:06:01

Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Sir. Um. National highways object to the powers being sought over approximately 154 plots of land owned or occupied by it. For the purposes of its statutory undertaking. Compulsory acquisition powers may only be used in accordance with the statutory framework as set out in National Highways. Previous submissions to date. National Highways grounds of objection are as follows. Firstly, that the compulsory acquisition of operational land is not necessary. Discussions in this regard are ongoing.

00:43:06:05 - 00:43:41:17

However, it is expected that agreement can be reached with the reach to that the applicant need not obtain compulsory powers over the SRN or land controlled by National Highways. The relevant works are either already authorised by the DCO, subject to protective provisions, or access can be secured. Three protective provisions and agreement. Secondly, the acquisition of rights is not necessary. National highway subject to the acquisition of rights, principally for overhead lines and underground cabling.

00:43:41:26 - 00:44:14:07

Most affected plots are operational highway forming part of the SRN in relation to overhead lines. The applicant has already an adequate statutory route. The Electricity Act permits. Overhead line works over land dedicated to public use with the consent of the street authority. Such consent not to be unreasonably withheld. Article 11 of the DCO Marri mirrors the Electricity Act. Provisions for street works and street works include the placing of apparatus.

00:44:14:25 - 00:44:56:02

Section 105 of the New Roads and Street Works Act confirms that references to works in a highway include works under, over, across, along or upon it. Further article three of the DCO also authorizes

construction and retention of the authorised development, including overhead lines. And there are and there are powers in the New Roads and Street Works Act that regulates the exercise of the rights. We say that the those provisions provide a complete and workable statutory framework for installing and maintaining apparatus in under and over the public highway.

00:44:56:09 - 00:45:34:14

They're designed to regulate utilities, interaction with highways while protecting national highways. Responsibility for the safe operation and management of the SRN National highways understand that the applicant does not wish to rely on those public law powers, and instead seeks an easement. The applicant's proposed approach would convert the, um, a public regulatory issue into the acquisition of private rights over public highway land, granting rights in airspace that is also subject to the statutory rights of other undertakers.

00:45:34:23 - 00:45:52:23

This is objectionable in principle. Moreover, on Yorkshire Green, it's understood the project team have accepted that the installation and retention will proceed, will proceed and rights in the DCO Electricity Act and Knaresborough with no easement being pursued.

00:45:53:08 - 00:45:58:19

Well, you'll I you'll see. All your time and your three minutes is up. If you could start something brilliant to conclusion.

00:45:58:21 - 00:45:59:09

Thank you.

00:45:59:11 - 00:46:29:25

That's fine. We're an underground cable. May require an easement because the proposed cable depth falls within the subsoil. National highways is prepared to grant such an easement by agreement, and discussions are ongoing to you to conclude, National Highways objection is that the statutory tests of necessity, proportionality and without detriment are not satisfied. The applicant can achieve its objectives through existing statutory powers, protective provisions and voluntary agreement.

00:46:30:06 - 00:46:31:07

Thank you very much.

00:46:33:08 - 00:46:36:27

Can I ask the applicant to respond on those matters, please?

00:46:37:15 - 00:47:08:05

Thank you sir, have a sergeant for the applicant. So on the first point, um, identified by Miss Russell, we're in agreement with her that, um, in relation to class one land take within the boundaries of the adopted strategic road network. And the applicant doesn't need to acquire this land as it's in. It's within the

adopted highway boundary. It was included originally in order to ensure that we would be able to dedicate the land that we needed for adoption and then transfer it to National Highways if required.

00:47:08:07 - 00:47:45:02

But where that land had already been adopted, then we agree that that's not necessary. So at that point in substance, I think we are agreed and can be resolved. The point around the overhead lines is an issue that's still in dispute. Um, so the applicant's position is that the the DCO powers and the street works statutory provisions that Miss Russell referred to and ensure that for things like protective interventions for scaffolds and enabling works for abnormal loads and so on, and all of that can be facilitated as part of the project.

00:47:45:04 - 00:48:26:01

So we have no objection to the reliance on Statutory Regimes for the Temporary Construction and Maintenance of Street Works, activities that are necessary to protect the strategic road networks. And that's our view of what occurs where the statutory regime is designed to apply to. But it isn't a lands rights regime for nationally significant infrastructure projects. And we do find support for our position in the Secretary of State's decision on the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant relocation project, um, where essentially the Secretary of State accepted the argument that an easement was justified.

00:48:26:03 - 00:49:00:20

So we rely on that, um, as part of our case. Um, furthermore, we it's not our understanding miss Russell referred to what is in practice happening on the Yorkshire Green Project. Um, in terms of the DCO that was confirmed, as I understand it, with an easement, and it's not our understanding that factually something else is happening on the ground, but that is the point we need to investigate further. But we certainly don't accept sitting here this morning that the project team on Yorkshire Green is taking the approach that National Highways are contending for.

00:49:01:01 - 00:49:23:02

The other point on that, sir, is that National Highways were previously invoking section 50 of the act, whereas they're now invoking different sections of Nersa. And that's been a recent change in the analysis that we've been given from National Highways. So we still need to interrogate. I think that aspect of their argument in more detail. And so as matters stand, that that point isn't agreed.

00:49:23:06 - 00:50:15:22

Okay. Thank you. Um, if in your written submissions, you could put a bit more about Cambridge because my recollection of that, um, is not that extensive, but I think there was a particularly deep, um, uh, pipeline that was questioned at that time about, um, about the application of CCA in terms of the, the, the strategic road network. So a little bit more information if you're relying on that one. So um, matter. Um, because I'm a tiny bit familiar with it. Um, the other question, you know, you you mentioned about the, the issues of rights that you might not be able to rely on in terms of the Electricity Act, but in terms of the new Roads and Street Works Act and the Highways Act, what rights are you concerned that you're not going to be able to get from the application of those statutory instruments already? Um, that Mrs.

00:50:15:24 - 00:50:18:08

Russell and National Highways say that you can.

00:50:18:20 - 00:50:37:15

I think, um, have a silent applicant. That's the piece of the analysis that we're still sort of working through in it. Previously, our concern with section 50, I think, was that that would be terminal and three months notice. So I think we're still in the process of just bottoming out the legal analysis and seeing if we can move matters forward.

00:50:37:26 - 00:51:10:06

I think, as um, Mr. Stone suggested, I think seeing if we can move matters forward with less than seven weeks to go, I think is quite a difficult position for us to be in at the moment, because there's a substantial amount of, of strategic road network that is subject to some sort of, um, rights acquisition. And if that is going to be changed into either white, you know, class, white land or something, I think it needs to be we need to understand that quite soon, because we're going to have to make a determination on whether those rights are applicable.

00:51:10:08 - 00:51:23:00

So I think some some movement and some updates by, um, deadline six in terms of a better position, I think would be, um, would be required for us to be able to move on our determination.

00:51:25:09 - 00:51:55:18

Walters for the applicant. Um, I don't think either, um, US or National Highways would feel that it needed any class rating of land. It would be dealt with, um, on the basis of protected provisions. And so possibly there may be two different versions of protected provisions which would, um, the applicant set and the national highway set. However, we are continuing to discuss regularly and have regular pro-active and helpful meetings with National Highways.

00:51:55:20 - 00:52:09:26

Notwithstanding, this current point is still outstanding, and I think the intention between the parties is to try to schedule something for Tuesday and Wednesday next week to work through this, so we are regularly meeting with them when we do hope to find a resolution to this situation.

00:52:09:28 - 00:52:17:19

Thank you very much. Um, haven't really got time to come back to you, Mrs. Russell, but unless you've got anything you desperately need to respond to.

00:52:17:24 - 00:52:51:12

Only just one point, please. In relation to, um, Cambridge wastewater. Um, I haven't looked at that DCO, but, um, it's my understanding that it relates to a pipeline, and it's our position that we don't have an issue in relation to granting an easement for, um, the underground cable. Um, it's just the easement for that overhead line, which I'm not sure is necessarily covered in Cambridge wastewater, but I need to have a look at that to see, um, you know, whether that where that leaves us.

00:52:51:24 - 00:52:52:09

Okay.

00:52:52:11 - 00:53:17:19

Thank you very much. Thank you. That's very kind. Um, for those of you that are online and going to speak, you'll notice that it's new to us as well. You've now got a timer that I think Mrs. Russell found when it hit three minutes and her train of thought. So we are trying to keep the time. So, um, so people will know online when you're three minutes is coming up. So. Thank you, Mrs. Russell. Um, we'll move on to Northumbrian Water. And, um, if you could turn your camera on.

00:53:26:09 - 00:54:04:15

Good morning. My name is Caroline Gordon, and I'm authorized to speak on behalf of Northumbrian Water Limited. We are an appointed statutory water undertaker for parts of Essex and Suffolk and Wells continued objection in this matter is based on three principal concerns. One, we have had insufficient time to assess the impacts of CR one and CR2, having only received the relevant land data on the 16th of June. Two the applicant has not demonstrated why it is necessary to acquire land relating to access to Little Walton Pumping Station and three.

00:54:04:17 - 00:54:40:08

Despite our best efforts, protective provisions are yet to be agreed with the applicant. Turning to the project impacts. The scheme affects a number of our operational assets. Early assessment indicates that CR one alone impacts at least four water mains, including strategic mains. If these were interfered with, over 37,000 households and businesses would be affected, which illustrates the potential scale of disruption. However, our assessment is ongoing in relation to Little Walton Pumping Station.

00:54:40:18 - 00:55:22:01

This station is a critical operational asset. While the applicant has indicated that one plot F3 96 will be reclassified as class eight. It is crucial that parcels F3 91 and F3 93 are also reclassified as class eight. These adjoining parcels are vital operational importance, as the asset cannot function without a secure and reliable access over these parcels. To be clear, SWL is seeking relief through a reclassification of all three parcels, which are F3 91, F3 93 and F3 96 as class eight land.

00:55:23:27 - 00:55:54:03

At present, there are no agreed protective provisions between SWL and the applicant. Because of this, NWR cannot confirm that the compulsory acquisition of land or rights would not cause serious detriment to our ability to carry out our statutory duties. The applicant introduced cost sharing into the protective provisions on the 8th of June. This approach resembles that under the new Roads and Street Works Act. This is a serious concern.

00:55:54:28 - 00:56:32:07

It has always been agreed that any interference of our assets must follow section 185 of the Water Industry Act, that provides for a statutory form of compensation and does not allow for cost sharing. As

drafted, the applicant's proposed protective provisions are inconsistent and May 1st give rise to disputes to cause delays to or hinder the delivery of the project, and three cause serious detriment to SWL carrying out its statutory undertaking, contrary to sections one, two, seven and 138 of the Planning Act.

00:56:33:04 - 00:56:35:08

Unless you if you conclude, please now?

00:56:35:10 - 00:56:36:09

Thank you. Okay.

00:56:36:14 - 00:56:57:27

Unless the applicant revises its position on cost sharing or provides a reason justification addressing the significant legal issues raised, it cannot progress. Negotiations on protective provisions with SWL subject to agreement being reached on all issues. Northumbrian water must maintain its objection to the order. Thank you.

00:56:58:04 - 00:56:59:01

Thank you.

00:56:59:14 - 00:57:11:06

Um. I've been told that, uh, for those of you online, the timer is now not being used. So we're back to back to plan A in terms of updating you on how the time is going. But, um, I'll now ask the applicant to respond.

00:57:11:08 - 00:57:11:27

Thank you.

00:57:12:14 - 00:57:20:12

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. So, um, the background to this is that, um, I think shortly before the last compulsory

00:57:22:10 - 00:57:55:02

purchase hearing, we'd been informed by, um, this affected person's solicitors that essentially they were waiting to see what was happening with Sealink, and then it would, you know, they would follow through from that. Um, so we, uh, on the 8th of June, sent back an updated APA and protective provisions that brought everything together and reflected where matters had got to on the Sealink project. Um, we also at that point offered to separate out the Little Wolf and pumping station so that that aspect could be taken forward, um, independently whilst we were discussing everything else.

00:57:55:06 - 00:58:25:24

Um, that offer of a separate agreement for the pumping station was rejected by the affected persons solicitors. I mean, our our position on the pumping station is that we can maintain access at all times. So

we've been seeking to essentially split that out and move that forward. Um, we offered that again last week. That, um, approach wasn't accepted for a second time. Um, the latest position is that we sent through draft APA and protected provisions on the 8th of June.

00:58:25:26 - 00:58:56:15

Those are still with the affected person for comment. Um, in terms of where we see this going, and we're not clear yet. Actually, there was a reference at the beginning of the submissions to the change requests. We're not clear yet, actually, what that is supposed to be in crystallized terms, but we will interrogate for the potential interactions. Our initial response is that there's no reason why any interactions, if there are such, can't be addressed substantively in the same way that all the other interactions in the project have been.

00:58:56:17 - 00:59:29:25

So we don't see that as likely to cause any insuperable difficulty. And the from our perspective, the real outstanding substantive point of dispute is around the betterment and the, you know, the cost sharing provisions. And we are confident in our position. It's the same approach that we've taken with many other affected persons. And so ultimately, if that can't be resolved, we anticipate that we would be putting forward, you know, our draft of the protected provisions for your consideration. But we will obviously continue to try and work to an agreement with this affected person.

00:59:29:27 - 00:59:30:12

Okay.

00:59:30:14 - 00:59:44:08

Just a couple of things. So Northumbria, Mr. Gordon mentioned this at the open floor hearing yesterday about the cost sharing. Can I just be clear? Is this. Is this cost sharing, uh, issue purely related to betterment, or is it more than that?

00:59:44:27 - 01:00:07:10

Um, it's not just betterment as I understand it. So it's also I have a side note from the applicant and it's also, um, anticipated costs. So essentially where there's unspent funds, how rapidly those are returned to the applicant and that so there are two issues. The first is betterment and then the second is in anticipated costs.

01:00:07:21 - 01:00:19:04

Okay. Thank you. And if those matters can't be resolved there'll be sorry they're being looked at to be resolved within the protective provisions. That would be part of the DCO.

01:00:20:07 - 01:00:20:24

That's correct.

01:00:20:26 - 01:00:32:18

And just in terms of timescale, where are we with the, the, the to and fro and with the protective provisions? Um, you've had you've submitted on the 8th of June and not had a response. Is that your position?

01:00:38:04 - 01:00:42:04

I think we may have sent them last week, I think, but anyway, we're waiting for a response.

01:00:42:06 - 01:00:51:14

So, Mrs. Gordon, is that is that the position for Northumbrian Water that you've had the protective position sent to your native June and then sent last week, but are yet to respond?

01:00:53:07 - 01:01:01:28

Yes, we have responded. We're waiting for response from, um, the applicant solicitors on the matters arising.

01:01:02:14 - 01:01:12:10

Okay. If we can. Rather than spending some more time now if Northumbrian Water believe they've resend replied and you don't think you've had them, can we just clear that up behind the scenes, please?

01:01:14:04 - 01:01:21:13

Um, I have a sergeant. I'm sorry. I thought, um, that they said they hadn't replied to us.

01:01:22:18 - 01:01:30:10

Yeah, I think Mrs. Gordon said. Could you just be confirmed, Mrs. Gordon, that you believe you have replied to the latest set of protective provisions.

01:01:30:12 - 01:01:38:09

They have had a response to the draft 8th of June. Yeah, and we want an explanation on the cost sharing. So that's what we're waiting for.

01:01:43:00 - 01:01:50:12

My understanding is that the well, the request was essentially that we change our position on the cost sharing and the betterment which we want to.

01:01:50:14 - 01:01:53:03

Do, and maybe that may be a response, but not of we're confident.

01:01:53:05 - 01:01:53:20

Of.

01:01:53:22 - 01:02:20:08

Where we are. Complete response. Okay. Um, let's see if we can continue those discussions, please. And, um, we look forward to having an update. Um, a deadline in terms of where those protective provisions are, because I think that's sounds like it's quite important. And also, uh, where we are on those three parcels of land that are important to the pumping station. Okay. Thank you. Um, uh, Mrs. Gordon. Um, we're going to move on to Bloor Homes. And, uh, is Mr. Fowler available, please?

01:02:21:25 - 01:03:00:27

Good morning, sir. Yes, Mrs. Vicky Fowler, I'm a partner at Gowling w CLG representing Bloor Homes. I am also supported today by Katherine Mumbai, who's a director of RTS Property consultancy. Although I expect to do all the talking so so in terms of our our three minute update, um, the the scope of Bloor Homes objection relates to three land parcels at Chadwell Saint Mary. And you'll recall Bloor has an option over that land and is promoting a planning application for the development of up to 1500 dwellings together with education, health and retail.

01:03:01:12 - 01:03:38:03

Taken at face value, the land plans suggest a fundamental constraint to the blower scheme, including the removal of the access to a strategic housing site. So. So Bloor objected to the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers, unless the extent of those were reduced in size, changed wholly to temporary or regulated by a binding legal agreement. And so I'm pleased to confirm by way of updates that National Grid and Bloor Homes have now agreed to regulate the compulsory acquisition by agreement, and Bloor have received a draft of that that agreement and there has been discussions on it.

01:03:38:18 - 01:04:11:14

So through that agreement, there should be collaboration and coordination to resolve the overarching issues during the construction, operation and maintenance of both National Grids project and the housing development. Um, so in particular, there should be safeguarded areas that will enable the schemes to be developed alongside each other. Um, and also an understanding that restrictions on built development in certain areas are not intended to stop Bloor getting on with enabling enabling works.

01:04:11:22 - 01:04:43:09

Uh, so there also be collaboration over the access arrangements, both permanent and temporary, so that the permanent access route will be varied to route through the Bloor scheme. Um, but discussions need to continue in terms of the broad location for the construction access. Um, and Bloor continue to look for that to be pushed as far north as possible and close to the pylons. So? So, no. Now that agreement is in circulation. Um, Bloor do just need negotiations to proceed in earnest.

01:04:43:11 - 01:05:07:14

And we understand that the aim is to get that agreed by deadline six. And if if that agreement can be completed, then Bloor will be able to withdraw its objection. And that will be updated in the statement of Common Ground at deadline seven. So. So, so we're we're, we're we're hopeful that matters will be resolved. And so that completes the update on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited.

01:05:08:04 - 01:05:14:03

Thank you very much. Um does the applicant have any need to respond or just agree.

01:05:15:13 - 01:05:29:27

Um, have a sergeant for the applicant? Very briefly, sir. I'm very grateful to Miss Fowler for that. Um, useful update. Um, I understand there was a meeting held on Monday. Um, we are looking to issue a revised draft of the legal agreement as soon as we can this week.

01:05:31:03 - 01:05:41:09

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Fowler. That's a great update. Thank you very much. So we'll move straight on to AR. You all who are online.

01:05:45:16 - 01:06:26:11

Good morning, Sir Chris Jones, uh, counsel for AI. You recall with Michelle Lawler. Perkins, the head of law, uh, at Aru, this is our update in relation to matters and progress. Um, in a nutshell, sir, are you seeking simultaneously the safe, ongoing operation of its educational facility with the desired construction of the project. And at this present time, there's next to zero practical progress in relation to the resolution of real, important matters. Uh, the end get progress to resolution remains, uh, Jurassic with respect to them and a UK PM appears ephemeral at frankly most.

01:06:26:13 - 01:07:11:06

The requirements sought by Aru to ensure the safe operation of its educational establishment and protective provisions remain justified more than ever, sir, and the desired land interferences by and get. And in fact UK pm remain unjustified and we refer to our previous submissions which will update in due course for deadline six. In relation to a summary update of the matters. Sir, you will recall that AI Writtle is a functioning further and higher education establishment, therefore, teaching 16 to 18 year olds in the public interest as part of Anglia Ruskin University and integral to which is a 90 strong herd of horses as well as outside teaching areas.

01:07:11:24 - 01:07:48:16

By contrast, Net is a national organisation and nationally resourced. It seeks consent for a statutory instrument on the terms of a Rochdale envelope whose interior is necessarily devoid of detail and as part of that, simultaneously seeks a permanent access through Aria's educational establishment. And as far as we understand the current position and may contract to, remains to be appointed at this time. So your questions recently properly recognised that there is a very real question mark over whether compulsory acquisition and land interference of.

01:07:48:18 - 01:08:24:24

Are you buying? It was actually justified by both National Grid, let alone by UK pm. Njit has asserted justification its recent responses and understand there's radio silence still from UK pm. However, it remains the case that the examining authorities question remains unanswered and will respond in detail with further evidence at deadline six. So, in relation to micro sighting and micro shocks, it appears now, by way of update common ground with nuggets that Micah shocks will occur in relation to AI.

01:08:24:26 - 01:08:56:08

You land as a result of its proposed overhead cables, and that in turn horses will be affected and in turn students will also therefore be affected. A requirement to microsite um to exclude overhead lines crossing over a through land therefore remains justified and of course urgent. Appreciate the lines with n gates Rochdale envelope sort because um conversely n get cannot have its flexible box cake and eat it.

01:08:56:10 - 01:08:59:14

Flexibility of course cuts both ways.

01:08:59:16 - 01:09:02:09

That's your three minutes are up. So if you could conclude please.

01:09:02:11 - 01:09:30:12

Thank you sir. In relation to progress, progress does remain Jurassic. And whilst Aru continues with open arms to seek practical resolution of these matters, I think there's. The next meeting is proposed on 16th July. That's, of course, very close to the end of the examination period. So we would strongly encourage you to encourage the applicant and UK PM to put their foot on the gas, please, to resolve these matters soonest. Thank you sir.

01:09:30:17 - 01:09:36:05

Thank you. I think they've heard your points there so I'll ask the applicant's response. Thank you, Mr. Schwartz.

01:09:37:00 - 01:10:03:05

Sir. Thank you. Have a sergeant for the applicant. I understand I have just had a post. It passed to me, but I understand there has been a recent development on this one that I'll ask Miss Kirstin Simpson to introduce herself and speak to you about first. And then I believe that Miss Hayley Tripp is also, um, attending virtually. So I'll ask her just to respond on the point about micro shocks. Okay. Thank you.

01:10:03:07 - 01:10:10:16

So and, um, just to to warn you, KPN, you've been mentioned, so it might be worth a response. Just to give you a heads up.

01:10:11:17 - 01:10:46:14

Thank you. Sir. So, um, Mr. Simpson, Um, Kirsten Simpson for the applicant. So with regards to plot 842, which is the temporary access through the college for the erection of scaffolding, we proposed several alternative options to Essex County Council and discussed this with them on the 4th of June. We've just had confirmation back from them this morning that they are comfortable with the alternative proposals of option one and two, which is for mean access, is directly off Uni Green. We anticipate that this means we can confirm that we no longer need plot 842 for access through the college.

01:10:46:16 - 01:10:50:22

We'll just have to do some double checking on that and look how would secure that.

01:10:50:24 - 01:11:06:09

Just for confirmation so I don't have to find it in my in many land plans at the moment is 842 the entire temporary access from um, uh, from the, from the both sides of the road, the L-shape. Is that the entirety.

01:11:06:24 - 01:11:10:12

Of Kiss and Simpson? For the applicant, it's the access through the college from cow watering lane.

01:11:10:14 - 01:11:10:29

To the.

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

Waterline.

01:11:11:18 - 01:11:12:09

So. Yeah.

01:11:13:14 - 01:11:27:16

Can I just understand how you anticipate doing that in terms will then become classy at land so that it's not required for CA? Or will you be excluded from the red line?

01:11:27:26 - 01:11:28:11

Okay.

01:11:28:13 - 01:11:31:29

So some of the applicant then we anticipate it will be changed to class eight.

01:11:35:27 - 01:11:37:06

Thank you for that update.

01:11:37:17 - 01:11:48:10

Thank you sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. If I could just invite Miss Tripp. Yes. You switched the camera on. If she could just, um, respond. If there's anything that she'd like to add on that on the micro shocks point, please. Thank you.

01:11:48:23 - 01:11:51:28

Thank you. Um, Hayley Tripp, on behalf of the applicant.

01:11:52:00 - 01:12:40:05

Um, we responded to the point on micro shocks in rep 5-193. Um, the government has a code of practice, a voluntary code of practice, which sets out ways in which electricity companies should manage micro shock issues. Um, the first is to reduce electric fields at source to below five kilovolts per meter. National

grids have applied this design over span TB 65 to 1, TB one six 5 to 1 six six, and to reduce the electric field significantly below that five kilovolts per meter, and which is the measures that government feel are appropriate to protect against micro shock issues.

01:12:42:22 - 01:12:43:10

Okay.

01:12:43:12 - 01:12:44:06

Thank you.

01:12:44:27 - 01:12:50:28

It's helpful. And um, lastly, I think just for UK PM, if there's anything you'd like to respond to.

01:12:53:22 - 01:13:40:28

No. So what I can say though, in terms of necessity, this is a point where an 11 kV line crosses at 90 degrees to the proposed development, and there is therefore a requirement for UK pm to underground at that line. That is the reason for which rights are sought over and aayu's land. We also need access, but our position on access is derivative on Engels position, and it seems that access has been the issue that's been of highest concern in relation to the meetings we've had with Aru.

01:13:41:00 - 01:14:11:10

And it sounds like that is resolved, and we will just follow the access solution that N get develops. We had a meeting towards the end of April where that was a key issue raised. There's been subsequent correspondent and as was indicated, there is a meeting in the diary for July the 16th of July. So, um, we have been And engaged with a crew.

01:14:11:12 - 01:14:13:18

And there's a further meeting to go.

01:14:13:23 - 01:14:14:16

Thank you.

01:14:14:18 - 01:14:19:12

That's very good. So, Mr. Schwartz, if you could put your camera back on, uh, if that's okay with you.

01:14:19:23 - 01:14:20:26

Thank you very much, sir.

01:14:20:28 - 01:14:26:16

So, um, potentially some good news that you may not have known until this very morning.

01:14:27:08 - 01:14:37:27

Uh, about 30s ago. So as you were taken out to basically some in previous hearings as well. Thanks. Uh, we'll take that away and then we'll respond in due course to the deadline. Six. Thank you for assistance, sir.

01:14:38:04 - 01:15:04:14

Excellent. I hope that, um, that is a good resolution that has come about by some what seems like some hard work on both parties. So, um, that's good to hear from our point of view. And I just want to reiterate, reiterate the point Mr. Schwartz made that, um, the middle of July is perilously close to the end of the examination. So if there is any opportunity, I know there's lots of meetings happening and lots of people to arrange. Uh, Mr. Schwartz sounds like, um, he's ready for an earlier meeting, if possible.

01:15:04:26 - 01:15:06:20

Thank you very much, sir. Good morning.

01:15:06:23 - 01:15:07:09

Good morning to.

01:15:07:11 - 01:15:07:26

You.

01:15:08:03 - 01:15:14:02

Thank you. We'll go straight on to Boxford, Suffolk Holdings, please. So I believe Mr. Chandler is here online.

01:15:15:00 - 01:15:15:26

Indeed.

01:15:16:05 - 01:15:18:23

You have three minutes. Please go straight ahead.

01:15:18:25 - 01:15:19:10

Yeah.

01:15:19:12 - 01:15:19:27

Good morning.

01:15:19:29 - 01:15:22:02

Chair. Members of the Examining Authority.

01:15:22:06 - 01:15:55:20

Um, my name is Mark Chandler. Uh, I'm speaking this morning on behalf of Box of Suffolk Holdings Limited. Uh, Boxford, Suffolk Farms Limited and Peak Fruit Limited. Um, this obviously representation

is made in addition to the to the previous ones. Um, update on engagement. Uh, a meeting with representatives from National Grid and Fish chairman is held at Peak Fruit on the 10th of June. Um, during this meeting, specific matters were discussed, namely alignment, uh, working methodology and timing.

01:15:55:26 - 01:16:23:04

Um, it should be made known that the applicant was unable to provide detailed information. Um, that allows the sort of business to plan accordingly in advance of construction. Um, a letter email has been received from Mr. Reston, a representative of the applicant dated the 22nd of June. Uh, this has provided some basic information and confirmed a willingness to work with my clients. Um, however,

01:16:24:22 - 01:16:54:27

there's still a huge amount of detail lacking, um, which I've. I've sort of. I'll go on to summarize in a minute. Um, it also should be noted that the latest set of heads of terms still imposes various restrictions on the growing of blueberries and other crops. Uh, so, uh, in terms of those specific, um, issues relating to the clients, um, the economic loss relating to the removal of the blueberry plantation is yet to be fully accepted by the applicants.

01:16:55:05 - 01:17:30:17

Um, we previously raised concerns in respect of working methodologies, reinstatement and soil quality. And whilst there has been acceptance from the applicant. Acceptance from the applicant to consider soil sampling prior to construction. There is still a significant amount of information to be provided to ensure that there is no long term economic or productivity impact. Um, we move on to the reservoir and risk in terms of water quality. Um, we've previously raised the importance of the reservoir that sits immediately adjacent to the ward limits.

01:17:30:23 - 01:18:06:23

Uh, to date, whilst there's been another acceptance to review current water quality and commit to the monitoring of water quality going forwards. Um, we're still awaiting detail as to how the applicant and their contractor will mitigate risks, um, associated with interruptions to the to this vital piece of infrastructure, um, during the construction phase. Um, the mitigation contained within the code of construction practice. And so a resource plan still doesn't adequately address our concerns in that regard.

01:18:07:08 - 01:18:39:08

Um, so to conclude, um. Chair, insufficient detail has been provided since the last hearing. Thus, my client cannot plan effectively and the risk to the business remains substantial. Um, discussions are ongoing with with retail customers. Um, but at this point in time, the vagaries surrounding the scheme and more specifically, the construction, uh, make it very difficult to ensure that we can satisfy, uh, the requirements of the retail customers there.

01:18:39:10 - 01:18:46:16

Um. Thank you. So I think there's been some progress made. Um, but there's a lot of ground still to cover.

01:18:47:05 - 01:18:56:18

Thank you very much. That is your time up. So I think that was a conclusion to your your your update. Okay. Thank you, Miss Jardin. Um, if I could ask the applicant for any comments, please.

01:18:57:08 - 01:19:28:16

Thank you. Sir. Have a sergeant for the applicant. Um, just to emphasize, of course, at the context for this. You know, we entirely appreciate that the AP understandably requires as much sort of certainty and detail as possible. But obviously the context here is that, you know, we're not at the end of the detailed design stage yet. And so, um, there is ultimately a limit to the sort of detail of information that we can provide. Um, and that's just, you know, the ordinary course of events on a, on a project like this.

01:19:28:18 - 01:19:49:14

Um, there is, though, I think, as, um, Mr. Chandler mentioned, a further meetings being organized, but with a construction contractor on site to endeavor to provide, you know, as much helpful information as as we can. I'll turn to I'm not sure if it's Mr. Robinson or Mr. Easton. Mr. Easton, just to give you some more detail on that aspect, please, sir. Thank you.

01:19:50:22 - 01:19:51:07

Yes.

01:19:51:09 - 01:20:26:20

Paul Royston, for the applicant. Um, as Mr. Chandler notes, we had a very productive meeting. Um, sort of useful share of information. I think one of the things we have fed back on is that there was concern to think about the immediate urgency of needing to respond. I think we've now clarified that the programme of works means that there's no, um, that the activities can continue through to September 28th. So there's a sort of a bit more breathing space in terms of time. We are working up following the meeting adjusted plans, we shared the detail we had available.

01:20:26:22 - 01:20:45:02

The adjusted plans are being developed and we'll be showing those in due course in ahead of the the meetings that are being discussed to continue those those that progress and through the discussions had identified a number of potential mitigations to reduce the the impact.

01:20:45:22 - 01:21:06:26

Thank you very much. And thank you very much, Mr. Chandra as well. So we move on to Dick Langham, who's in the room as, say, Mr. Langham, we did hear you at the open floor hearing yesterday, and you did talk at the last open floor hearing. So, as just a reminder, we are looking for an update on where things are in terms of progress, in terms of compulsory acquisition. Um, and um, you have three minutes if you'd like to turn on your microphone, which you have already done.

01:21:06:28 - 01:21:07:18

Thank you.

01:21:07:21 - 01:21:42:09

Hello, my name is Dick Lanham. I'm affected. Land owner at Kings Farm. Uh, my objection today is not to the national Tilbury project itself. My objections is the acquisition of the rights to access permanent proposed over the land. In particular, I do not believe. National grid has demonstrated that the interference with our land rights is necessary or proportionate. The proposed access route would pass through our residential entrance and come within feet of our family home. The rights being sought would interfere with the use, enjoyment of our property, affect our privacy, security and impact the operations of our family business.

01:21:42:16 - 01:22:18:10

They would also create ongoing biosecurity concerns and affect the management of our livestock and agricultural land. Those impacts are significant. The key issue is, is, however, is that there is an alternative. For approximately two years, we've identified and promoted an alternative access route, which would avoid residential entrance and substantially reduce the impact on our home and our farming business. We have repeatedly raised this alternative with National Grid and Fisher German and provided maps. Despite this, we have received, and we've never received a satisfactory explanation as to why alternative route cannot be accepted and why.

01:22:18:12 - 01:22:51:18

Rights for our home and farm are required instead. In our view, that is the central question before examination authority. We are not saying National Grid cannot accept or cannot access the land. We are asking why they need to access it through our home and our farm, where a less harmful alternative exists. The compulsory acquisition test requires the applicant to demonstrate that the rights are necessary, and there is compelling case in the public interest. There is a less harmful alternative is this. We believe that the applicant must explain why the great interference with the private rights is justified.

01:22:51:23 - 01:23:33:22

We do not believe that explanation has been provided. The route proposed by National Grid creates substantial impacts on our home and our family and our farming business. The alternative route would significantly reduce this impact while still allowing access to the land. For that reason, we do not believe the proposed interference with our lands. Sorry. For that reason, we do not believe the proposed interference with our land rights is even necessary or proportionate. At previous meetings in Ipswich. We raised our concerns about the proposed access. National grid produced a map for your information, showing that there was showing that their proposed intentions were for the were for the route, stating that is only for occasional access.

01:23:33:27 - 01:24:08:24

On completion of the projects for routine maintenance and such. My latest heads of terms dated to 26th April is different. I have never seen that map before and I've asked for it and I even asked for a copy of it. But due to National Grid's form, I've received nothing. That was eight weeks and one day ago, and it's all in the minutes of that last meeting me asking for that map. So my question to you is, is your decision making based on the information provided to you by National Grid or information provided by us to you from National Grid? Because what I'm getting at the moment is they're telling you one thing.

01:24:08:26 - 01:24:17:28

But as affected landowners, I'm not alone in this telling us something else. Why is that? This whole process is meant to be transparent. Transparent?

01:24:18:00 - 01:24:20:00

That's your time up. Mr.. No it's not.

01:24:20:12 - 01:24:33:12

Not sharing information. Thank you. Not sharing information to affected parties in my eyes isn't very, very transparent. Why? It's a legal requirement to share with the affected landowners that the real intentions and scope of the land being used for.

01:24:33:22 - 01:24:34:14

The not withholding.

01:24:34:16 - 01:24:36:09

Information. One second.

01:24:36:14 - 01:24:41:09

No, please. We've we've asked you for an update, and you've given us information that you've previously given us.

01:24:41:11 - 01:24:43:21

So I've had no updates whatsoever.

01:24:43:23 - 01:25:15:08

Thank you. That's that's that's helpful in terms of understanding where you are. Um, because we have had those submissions from you before. We do understand your position, but the updates was the important thing for today. Um, can I ask the applicant to respond again and please, uh, you know, again, we've we've heard Mr. Lennon's, um, objections before and information on updates and in particular, um, the, the, the issue about what's in the heads of terms, which is different to what has been submitted within the examination, which um, which I think I understand.

01:25:16:16 - 01:25:48:15

Um, so I have a sergeant for the applicant. Thank you. Yes. I wasn't proposing to go back over the arguments around the potential for an alternative, and we discussed those at the last hearing, I believe. Um, so in terms of a general update, um, there is ongoing engagement between, um, the applicant and, um, the AP and the land aid, and, you know, our land agents to, um, identify appropriate biosecurity measures and to consider accommodation works and special measures to mitigate the impact of the turkey and the cattle enterprises.

01:25:48:17 - 01:26:07:03

We're currently awaiting cost estimates in relation to the biosecurity measures, and also in relation to supplemental cattle feeding requirements. And at the farm I'll turn to Mr. James, going to respond to your specific query around the heads of terms that was raised by Mr. Latham, if I may. Thank you.

01:26:08:04 - 01:26:10:18

James, going on behalf of the applicant. Just to confirm.

01:26:10:20 - 01:26:13:00

There have been ongoing discussions with.

01:26:13:02 - 01:26:13:17

The.

01:26:13:19 - 01:26:40:07

Applicants. Sorry, the APRS agent, the most recent meeting on the heads of terms was the 4th of June. And we continue to discuss the drafting of those heads of terms with a view to removing the ambiguity as it pertains to the AP's concerns around what rights are actually being sought. But just to reconfirm what was discussed at Ca2, we are only seeking permanent rights of access, not a temporary right for construction works for it.

01:26:40:12 - 01:27:04:27

That is my understanding. So I think reducing that ambiguity, that clearly is a continual concern to the land, I think is really, really important to allow them to understand the actual situation and to allow us to to potentially, hopefully see a withdrawal of an objection. And thank you for the confirmation again, that it is not construction access. It is a temporary access after construction. So thank you for that confirmation.

01:27:04:29 - 01:27:29:21

Sorry, could I just ask as well the subtle point it's made that what's in front of the examination and what's in front of the lambs, which we haven't got any eyes on or any visibility on. How can we see what is there so that we can get an understanding of what's being said?

01:27:33:27 - 01:27:40:11

James, going on behalf of the applicant, um, just to clarify, are you referring to the plans and what is actually being provided to.

01:27:41:05 - 01:28:15:23

The heads of terms? Um, in what they're saying? Is that what has been told to the examination? Is that what you've just reiterated and what we understand? But what they have in front of them in terms of legal documentation. They are interpreting and saying something different. I don't know if that's interpretation. It's an ambiguity. But we as an examining authority haven't seen those terms. So we don't know whether or not that's a misunderstanding and misrepresentation or whether there is that degree of ambiguity.

01:28:15:25 - 01:28:21:11

And we've got no way of making an adjudication or a judgment about that.

01:28:21:13 - 01:28:32:06

And so having the applicant, I see exactly the point you raised. And if we could just think about internally what the best way is to reassure the expert.

01:28:32:08 - 01:28:38:24

I don't expect that you're going to provide us with the heads of terms or with with the agreement, but if you do, that might be helpful.

01:28:38:26 - 01:28:41:25

Well, may I'll ask that question, sir. And if we.

01:28:41:27 - 01:28:44:27

Maybe that you could provide us with a summary of exactly something of that.

01:28:44:29 - 01:29:22:22

Nature. We will certainly be able to provide you with, um, confirmation. Well, I'll ask the question and see what we can provide. Um, and see that it's as full as possible so that you, you have as full an understanding as possible of what, um, the lands have been being given. In addition, because I the position is set out in writing in the examination documents, but I see the, the need to reassure yourselves that there isn't a discrepancy in the documentation that's being sent to the AP. So we'll see what we can do. But we'll certainly provide something, um, as, as full as possible to, um, bottom out that potential query.

01:29:22:24 - 01:29:23:15

Thank you.

01:29:24:00 - 01:29:30:05

Mister Mickleham. You had your hand up. We are very tight on time, so this really needs to be very specific to what's been discussed and very quick.

01:29:30:12 - 01:29:30:27

Yeah. Sorry.

01:29:30:29 - 01:29:40:15

Charlie Macklem from Langley. And say if it's helpful, I'm happy to include my whole heads of terms to the whole of Langley's estate for you guys at the next deadline, so you can read it if National Grid will not provide it.

01:29:41:18 - 01:29:43:24

Thank you for the offer. We'll leave that to your discretion.

01:29:45:12 - 01:30:03:18

Thank you very much. We're going to move on to Paul Lanham, and then we're going to have a 15 minute break. And again, Mr. Lanham, a really, really just do need an update on progress with discussions about compulsory acquisition. We have heard your submissions before, so please, we will only have three minutes. So if you can start now. Thank you.

01:30:05:21 - 01:30:08:21

Thank you. Good morning and thank you for this.

01:30:08:23 - 01:30:38:23

Opportunity to speak. My name is Paul Lanham and I'm a landowner at Dukes Farm. My injection today is to the Norwich and Tilbury project itself. My objection relates to the acquisition of rights and access agreements proposed over my land. I do not believe National Grid has demonstrated that the infrastructure with more land rights is necessary or proportionate. The rights being sold would have consequences far beyond the area of land directly affected.

01:30:39:10 - 01:31:25:22

The proposed access route would pass through the entrance to our home and through our working farmyard. It would interfere with the operation of our farming business and affect the way we are able to use and enjoy our property. The impacts of the business are severe. The proposed access arrangements passed within very close proximity to our poultry enterprise and create significant biosecurity concerns. The poultry enterprise operates under strict requirements, and an increase in third party access through the farm gates creates which would creates risks which would threaten the continued viability of that part of the business.

01:31:26:25 - 01:31:59:11

The proposal also affects the grazing land used by our cattle enterprise. The loss and disruption of that land would significantly affect livestock management and the future viability of the Castle enterprise. In addition, the proposed pylons and overhead lines would have a major impact on our fishing lake business. Taken together, the proposals threaten all three of the farms principal income streams. In our view, that level of interference is extraordinary.

01:31:59:19 - 01:32:40:23

The most important point, however, is that the less harmful alternative exists. For approximately two years, we have identified and promoted an alternative access route that would significantly reduce the impacts on our home and farm business. We have repeatedly raised that alternative with National Grid and Fisher German. Despite this, we have never received a satisfactory explanation as to why that alternative has not been adopted. The compulsory acquisition test of our national grid to demonstrate necessity and a compelling case in the public interest where a less harmful alternative exists.

01:32:40:25 - 01:33:24:09

We believe. National grid must explain why the greater interference with private rights is justified. We do not believe that explanation has been provided. We're not saying that National Grid cannot access the land. We are asking why they need to do so in a way that threatens our home and business and farm that we have spent more than 50 years building. For these reasons, we respectfully ask the examining authority to carefully consider whether the proposed acquisitions of rights affecting Duke's farm is necessary, proportionate and justified, and whether the alternative route that we have suggested should be instead be adopted.

01:33:24:23 - 01:33:25:13

Thank you.

01:33:25:23 - 01:33:34:19

Thank you very much, Mr. Lanham. And can I, um, can I just get in terms of an update, is it very similar to, um, uh, Mr. Lanham junior?

01:33:35:09 - 01:33:35:24

Yes.

01:33:35:26 - 01:33:37:05

No. Okay. Thank you very much. I thought.

01:33:37:07 - 01:33:37:22

That.

01:33:37:24 - 01:33:48:19

Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Um, is there anything in addition to what you answered to to, um, the first Mr. Lanham, uh, in terms of your response that you'd like to add in addition to, um, uh, to Paul Lanham.

01:33:48:28 - 01:33:56:05

Um, have a sergeant for the applicant. Uh, no, thank you, sir. I'm grateful to Mr. Paul Lanham for his summary of his position. And but there's nothing that we wish to add.

01:33:56:07 - 01:34:28:24

Thank you. Thank you very much. Uh, thank you very much, both of you. Um, uh, we are going to take now a 15 minute break, so we'll be back at 1150. If my sons do do me justice. Um, Mr.. And Mr. Lanham. Um, there's no need for you to return to the front desk if you want to remain in the seats after we come back. That's absolutely fine. But you're you don't need to turn. Those of you that did turn up, thank you very much. We weren't quite sure as and when you would need to be speaking. So you will need to come back in 15 minutes and retake your seats. And we will try very, very hard to keep to this time.

01:34:28:26 - 01:34:33:16

So we still got a lot to cover. So we will see you at 10 to 12 in this meeting is adjourned.

