

From: Karl Owen

Sent: 20 July 2026 06:53

To: Norwich to Tilbury

Subject: [REDACTED] - My email response to applicant's 17th July email to me

For the Examining Authority record - I attach a copy of my response to National Grid's External Affairs Manager, sent today. I ask that this be placed on the record alongside the note I submitted separately with [REDACTED] email of 17th July, 2026.

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for returning from leave. I wanted to write to you directly, copying [REDACTED], in response to her email, because there are several important points I feel I must address openly and in good faith — and because I believe you, having met us and heard our story, deserve to hear them directly.

First, I want to say again how much your personal apology meant to me — your acknowledgment that our earlier treatment fell short of what we should have experienced, and your assurance that your team are the good guys, was genuinely appreciated. I believed you then and I still do. It is in that spirit that I write now.

On the matter of strong words: I want to address this directly and factually. The incident referred to took place in 2023, when contractors arrived at our property unannounced, without the landowners' permission, and began operating heavy machinery on an active Great Crested Newt habitat — a protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. I had already notified National Grid in writing and at an open meeting about the presence of GCNs at this location before those contractors arrived. They came anyway. I recorded the encounter in its entirety. The words I used were to instruct those contractors to leave. You yourself apologised to me for how Fischer German treated me. Every subsequent interaction — the meeting with [REDACTED] in 2024, and the meeting with yourself, [REDACTED] — was conducted with courtesy and good faith. You witnessed that yourself. I am therefore surprised and deeply hurt to find a historical incident, in which the conduct was theirs rather than mine, now being referenced in the context of future engagement assessments.

I want to be absolutely clear: I pose no threat of any kind to any National Grid representative. I am a [REDACTED] fighting to protect his children. The suggestion that welfare assessments might be needed before meeting with me is without foundation, and I ask that it be removed from any assessment of future engagement with our family.

On [REDACTED] and the Equality Act: I must raise something I cannot leave unaddressed. [REDACTED] under the Equality Act 2010. This has been central to every representation I have made across the entire examination. [REDACTED] read her complete medical file during our meeting and acknowledged that it more than evidenced the serious and complex nature of her documented [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was not in the room. She has not read the file. And her email — which purports to respond comprehensively to our representations — contains no reference whatsoever to [REDACTED], to the Public Sector Equality Duty, or to the Equality Act 2010. Not one word. I need to ask you directly, [REDACTED]: has an Equality Impact Assessment specific to [REDACTED] circumstances been carried out? If so, when, by whom, and what did it conclude? These questions have been asked across multiple representations and remain unanswered.

On the 200 metre question: at the open hearings, a National Grid spokesperson stated that no property along the route is within 200 metres of the pylon alignment. National Grid's own documentation places pylon RG161 approximately 120 metres from [REDACTED].

From: Karl Owen

Sent: 20 July 2026 06:29

To: Norwich to Tilbury

Subject: Norwich to Tilbury DCO - Further Representation- Applicant Correspondence and Unresolved Matters- Karl Owen- [REDACTED]

NOTE TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY

Forwarding Applicant Correspondence — For the Examination Record

Karl Owen — Registered Interested Party [REDACTED]

Dear Examining Authority [REDACTED],

I am writing to place on the examination record a copy of an email received from [REDACTED], External Affairs Manager at National Grid Electricity Transmission plc, dated 17th July, 2026. The email is attached to this note in full.

I bring this correspondence to the Examining Authority's attention for the following specific reasons, each of which I respectfully ask the Examining Authority to consider before making its recommendation to the Secretary of State.

1. The complete absence of any reference to the Equality Act or the Public Sector Equality Duty

The email purports to respond comprehensively to my representations. My representations have placed the protected characteristics of my [REDACTED], and the Applicant's failure to discharge the Public Sector Equality Duty, at the centre of my case. The email contains no reference whatsoever to [REDACTED], to the Equality Act 2010, or to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The Examining Authority will be aware that these are not peripheral concerns but core legal obligations that the Applicant must demonstrate it has discharged before the Secretary of State can lawfully grant consent. Their complete absence from this correspondence is a matter I ask the Examining Authority to note and to require the Applicant to address directly.

2. The Equality Impact Assessment — still not evidenced

Across multiple representations I have asked the Applicant to confirm whether an Equality Impact Assessment specific to my daughter's circumstances was carried out, and if so when, by whom, and what it concluded. This email does not answer that question. My daughter's complete medical file was reviewed by a member of the Applicant's team during a meeting, who acknowledged its seriousness. The External Affairs Manager who authored this email was not present at that meeting and has not referenced the file or its contents anywhere in her correspondence. I ask the Examining Authority to require the Applicant to answer the EqIA question directly and on the record before the close of the examination.

3. The Suffolk 3 realignment — presented as improvement, confirmed as worsening

The email presents the Suffolk 3 realignment as a positive outcome for our household. I ask the Examining Authority to note that National Grid's own Suffolk 3 realignment report confirms that the nearest pylon moved closer to our home as a result of that change — not further away. This realignment was made after [REDACTED] were disclosed directly to the Applicant's Project Leader and his colleague. The framing in this email does not reflect that factual position.

4. The seasonal screening point

The email references vegetation to the north of our garden as providing screening for the nearest pylon. This vegetation is a deciduous hedgerow. It provides screening for approximately three months of the year. For the remaining nine months it is bare. I ask the Examining Authority to treat this mitigation claim with appropriate caution.

5. The conflation of Ofgem funding constraints with the PSED obligation

The email declines to fund the proposed annexe on the grounds of Ofgem price control constraints and the property being outside the DCO order limits. I accept these constraints as they relate to direct capital funding. However they do not answer the Public Sector Equality Duty question, which is not about funding a structure but about whether the Applicant has given due regard to the specific needs of a person with protected characteristics in its decision-making. The email conflates these two distinct questions. I ask the Examining Authority to note that the PSED obligation remains unanswered.

6. The failed site visit and the closing deadline

A site visit to [REDACTED] was arranged and subsequently cancelled. Despite repeated attempts to rearrange, no new date has been confirmed. The examination closes on 10 August 2026. The email confirms that the External Affairs Manager is now going on leave. I ask the Examining Authority to note that no Statement of Common Ground has been reached, that no face to face engagement has taken place at the property, and that this is not the result of any unwillingness on my part. I have been ready and willing to engage at every stage.

I remain committed to engaging constructively with the Applicant and with this examination. I ask the Examining Authority to ensure that the matters raised above are properly addressed before any recommendation is made to the Secretary of State.

Signed: Karl Owen

Karl Owen

Date: 17 July 2026

Email From [REDACTED] to Karl Owen 17th July. 2026

Dear Mr Owen,
Thank you again for your patience. I wanted to update you and explain that, because of the tight examination deadlines, we are going to struggle to meet with you before the end of the examination.
Please be assured, however, that we take your concerns and representations very seriously and we were pleased to be able to discuss this with you in person outside of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 on 24 June 2026 at the hearing venue. In our preparation to respond to your latest representation to the ExA at Deadline 6, the team reviewed our records of previous meetings along with the file you kindly shared with us, to ensure we had taken account of all the information available to us. As you may remember, following the visit to your home on 24 May 2024, we changed the alignment of the overhead line as a result of the discussions and your subsequent correspondence. I thought it would be helpful to clarify that the new alignment (Suffolk 3 realignment) means that the closest pylons would be marginally further away and that vegetation to the north of your garden appears to screen the pylon to the north better. The revised alignment also means the pylon to the south would be more to the side, so should no longer be in direct line of sight of the planned annexe to the east of your garden.
We also realigned the haul road to the west, which has resulted in this being further away from your home than previously, and should help with any visual or other impacts. While we won't have a detailed construction programme until a main contractor is on-board, any activities would not take place for the full duration of the construction period, instead there would be peaks and troughs of activity at various stages during the construction of the pylons and threading of the cables. We would, of course, communicate these in advance to help you plan ahead. I'd also like to reassure you that the DCO Order Limits (the edges of the site boundary) that are nearest to your the drive are there for visibility purposes - and not for construction. In addition, I wanted to confirm that access to your home via Lambert's Lane will be maintained at all times, as will access to the

Thickett.

On the matter of funding of the proposed annexe, I wanted to make you aware of how we will respond to your representation to the ExA at Deadline 6. Essentially, two main considerations must be taken into account when deciding what is possible and proportionate in terms of support or mitigation we can offer:

1. National Grid's expenditure is governed by the price control framework regulated by Ofgem and is ultimately funded through charges paid by electricity consumers across Great Britain. 2. Your home and land are outside of the DCO Order limits, so we aren't able to offer to fund construction of a new structure on third-party land unconnected with the exercise of the National Grid's statutory functions as part of the project's DCO application. This is because expenditure must be justifiable as necessary and proportionate to the proposed development, applied consistently across all Affected Persons, to be recoverable through the price control and fair to the wider body of consumers who fund it.

We are, however, keen to provide support wherever we can on matters within our control, and this is more likely to focus on matters like the impact of the construction process, accesses, understanding what activities are happening when and understanding any impacts of these activities and possible mitigations. I also wanted to flag that in reviewing details of previous interactions and meetings with you, we spotted that you have at times used strong words with colleagues. While you mentioned a change of position from your perspective more recently in one of your emails to [REDACTED] and me, National Grid takes this very seriously and we have to consider safety and welfare when planning site visits and face to face engagement with members of the public and stakeholders. This may mean that in assessments for future engagement we may need to explore alternative arrangements to facilitate ongoing engagement in a way that is suitable and practicable for all parties.

We have sought to, and will continue to seek to engage constructively, and any change in our approach should not be taken as a reflection on any individual but rather on welfare assessments we must carry out as a normal part of our work. I would like to reassure you again that we are committed to engaging with you and supporting you and your family going forward.

I am going on leave at the end of this week, returning in early August. I have copied in [REDACTED] who will be around while I am away if you have any further concerns or questions.

With best wishes,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

External Affairs Manager
Strategic Infrastructure
nationalgrid

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Karl Owen

Sent: 09 July 2026 11:56

To: Norwich to Tilbury

Subject: Norwich to Tilbury DCO – Further Supplementary Representation – (Karl Owen [REDACTED])

Further to my previous submissions please find attached two further representations for the examination record. I would be grateful if these could be accepted as supplementary material ahead of the close of the examination on 10th August 2026.

STATEMENT OF ACOUSTIC AND ATMOSPHERIC IMPACT

Norwich to Tilbury Development Consent Order

Karl Owen — Registered Interested Party

1. What This Place Is — Before

sits alone on flat, open mid-Suffolk farmland, surrounded by fields, mature hedgerows, and trees. To the north and east, mature hedgerows and trees enclose the property. To the west, Lambert's Lane runs behind a mature hedgerow along its western side. The cottage is centuries old. It is the only dwelling in its immediate landscape.

The general ambience of this place is one of total silence, filled with the sounds of nature. Birds. Wind in the trees. The creak of branches. Vehicles are sporadic — an occasional car or van on Lambert's Lane, a tractor spraying crops in season. Pedestrians and horse riders pass rarely, and when they do, the topography of this place does something remarkable: it creates a natural acoustic funnel.

Standing at on a still day, you can hear clearly the conversation of pedestrians or the clip-clop of hooves 100 metres away — as though they were standing beside you. Whispered conversations carry like someone speaking directly into your ear. The flat, open landscape, the mature enclosing vegetation, and the absence of competing noise create an acoustic environment of extraordinary sensitivity and stillness. When the prevailing south-westerly wind blows up from the Gipping Valley, that sensitivity only increases.

This family has lived in this acoustic environment for thirty years. It is not background noise they have tuned out. It is the texture of their daily lives — the silence that lets them hear the birds, the wind, and each other. It is, for not merely pleasant but essential.

2. What This Place Will Become — After

When construction begins, this acoustic world will be destroyed. Not reduced. Not diminished. Destroyed — for the duration of a construction programme lasting up to three years, and permanently altered thereafter by the operational noise of 400kV overhead transmission lines.

The construction of major infrastructure of this scale generates continuous, high-intensity noise: piling, excavation, concrete delivery, crane operations, HGV reversing alarms, generator noise, and the constant movement of heavy plant. These sounds, alien to this landscape, will arrive at amplified by the same acoustic funnel that currently carries birdsong. The prevailing south-westerly wind — funnelling up from the Gipping Valley and blowing directly toward the cottage from the adjacent construction site to the west — will carry dust and noise straight to the property with no natural barrier between them.

This family cannot run their dishwasher in the evening — the noise is too disturbing for . They are being asked to live,

for up to three years, with piling rigs, reversing alarms, and HGV movements as the soundtrack to every waking hour.

3. The Existing Pylons — What 400kV Actually Sounds and Feels Like

Most people have never stood directly beneath a 400kV overhead transmission line. The resident of [REDACTED] has — regularly. Walking into the village of Mendlesham along Hoggars Road, the route passes directly beneath the existing 1950s 400kV alignment — pylons of approximately 30 metres in height, part of the line visible from the eastern view from [REDACTED]

In certain conditions — rain, hot and humid weather — those pylons hum, fizz, and crackle with the sound of 400,000 volts of electricity. You feel the hairs on the back of your neck stand up. It is an unnerving, visceral experience — the audible sound of industrialisation in a peaceful countryside environment. Your pace quickens involuntarily. You want to be away from it.

Those pylons are approximately 30 metres tall. The Norwich to Tilbury pylons are approximately 55 metres tall — nearly twice the height. They are also designed with a capacity for up to 700kV — nearly double the current operational voltage. This is built into the engineering specification. The probability of this higher voltage being used at some point in the infrastructure's lifetime is, by definition, greater than zero. If and when it is, the acoustic and electromagnetic impact on [REDACTED] will be substantially greater than what is currently being represented to the Examining Authority. This question deserves a specific and transparent answer from the Applicant.

4. The Visual Reality — A Chocolate Box Cottage and a Metal Monstrosity

Driving along the main road into Mendlesham — the same road the resident drives every school morning to take his youngest son to catch the school bus — the route passes under the existing overhead line. Looking to the right as you drive beneath it, you can see a solitary farmhouse surrounded by fields, with an existing pylon sitting alongside it. The house is dwarfed by the structure. It is a bizarre and deeply uncomfortable juxtaposition — a picturesque, quintessential English country home beside a stark, alien industrial structure that has no relationship to the landscape around it.

That existing pylon is approximately 30 metres tall. The pylon that will stand closest to [REDACTED] will be approximately 55 metres tall — nearly twice as high. From every direction from which [REDACTED] can be seen across the flat open Suffolk landscape, that pylon will appear to rise over and out of the cottage, dominating the previously open Suffolk sky, running ten times higher than the cottage itself. An ancient chocolate box Suffolk dwelling, centuries old, beneath a metal monstrosity of modern man.

That image — that permanent, irreversible transformation of how this home sits in its landscape — is what this family is being asked to accept. Not for the duration of construction. Forever.

5. The Physical Vulnerability of the Cottage

██████████ is a centuries-old rural dwelling whose physical fabric offers minimal protection against the noise and dust this project will generate. Some windows are simple wooden frames with single panes of glass that are approximately 100 years old. The double-glazed windows are basic units installed over 15 years ago, long past their effective working life, with degraded seals. The house accumulates dust and pollen at a remarkable rate — its age means it has gaps, voids, and spaces in old dusty loft spaces through which particulates travel freely.

The prevailing south-westerly wind blows directly from the construction site toward the cottage. There is no natural barrier between the two. Construction dust — concrete particles, excavated soil, diesel particulates — will be carried on that wind directly into and onto the property throughout the construction period. For a household that already manages dust accumulation at an unusual rate due to the building's age and construction, the additional dust load from an adjacent major construction site will be significant, sustained, and harmful.

6. The Occupier Disturbance Case — A Breakdown

We are seeking occupier disturbance ██████████ for the following specific heads of loss, each of which is directly caused by this project:

- Loss of quiet enjoyment — six occupants, up to three years of continuous construction noise in an environment whose ██████████ is silence. This is not an abstract loss. It is the destruction of the acoustic world this family has inhabited for thirty years.
- Loss of outdoor amenity — the garden, fields, and open landscape that surround the cottage will be inaccessible or unusable as a construction site for extended periods. For a family with seven dogs and four children, this is a concrete and daily loss.
- Dust intrusion — construction dust carried on the prevailing south-westerly wind directly into a centuries-old cottage with single pane windows, degraded seals, and open loft voids. Cleaning, health impacts, and damage to contents.
- ██████████ — for whom the acoustic environment of this place is not merely pleasant but clinically necessary, and for whom construction noise will trigger genuine and documented ██████████.
- Permanent loss of amenity — the pylons are permanent. The acoustic impact of 400kV lines in still air is permanent. The visual domination of the horizon in every direction is permanent. The occupier disturbance compensation must reflect not only the construction period but the permanent reduction in the quality of life of everyone who will ever live in this home.
- Generational impact — ██████████ is held on a lifelong peppercorn tenancy that will pass to the next generation. The permanent impact of this infrastructure on a family home that will be lived in for generations compounds the disturbance beyond what any single occupier generation experiences.

- Seven dogs — continuous distress, disorientation, and safety risk from three years of construction activity on a property where working dogs are trained to respond to strangers and occasionally run free in adjacent fields that will become an active HGV site.

These are not abstract inconveniences. They are specific, documented, and in several cases permanent losses suffered by a real family in their permanent generational home. £40,000 across six people and three years — approximately £2,200 per person per year — is a modest and proportionate ask for what this project takes from them.

Signed: Karl Owen_____

Karl Owen

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Karl Owen.

Date: 13 June 2026

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

Enforced Incarceration, Access Deprivation, and Occupier Disturbance

Norwich to Tilbury Development Consent Order

Karl Owen — Registered Interested Party

1. The Examining Authority's Site Visit — 30 April 2026

On 30 April 2026 members of the Planning Inspectorate conducted a site visit which included a drive past [REDACTED] along Stonham Road and Lambert's Lane. The Examining Authority has therefore seen with its own eyes the single-track nature of these roads, their proximity to the property, the isolated rural setting of the cottage, and the complete absence of any alternative access route. The Examining Authority does not need to take these matters on trust — it has visited the location. Everything that follows in this statement was visible from that visit.

2. The Prison at [REDACTED] — Enforced Incarceration

The nearest shops, train stations, schools, and medical facilities are a minimum of ten minutes' drive from [REDACTED]. The cottage is completely rural, surrounded by fields, with no amenities within walking distance. The nearest village is at least a mile away. Road access along Lambert's Lane and Stonham Road is not a convenience — it is a lifeline. It is the only connection this family has to the outside world.

The Applicant's proposals make Lambert's Lane and Stonham Road haul roads for the construction programme — for a period of up to three years, and potentially longer. Major infrastructure projects of this scale routinely overrun their estimated programmes. During that period, access along those roads will be at National Grid's discretion. The family will be able to leave their home, and return to it, only when National Grid's construction operations permit.

This is, in practical terms, enforced incarceration. National Grid holds the keys to this family's access to the outside world. They decide when the family is released and when they may return. They have chosen — through three successive decisions to relocate the haul road, each time bringing it closer to the only access route — to place this family in this position. The family did not choose it. They committed no act that justifies it. They are being held, for up to three years or more, because of decisions made by a large organisation that has not once offered to meet with them.

The household consists of five adults and one child in his most formative years. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. A third is a young woman completing a design degree who will return home this summer to begin her working life. These are not abstractions. These are people — real, named, documented — who will spend years unable to come and go freely from their own home because of choices made by an organisation that has unlimited legal resources and has chosen not to engage with them.

3. Three Moves of the Haul Road — A Chronology of Choices

It is important to understand that this family's predicament is not the result of geographical necessity. It is the result of choices — specifically, three successive decisions by the Applicant to relocate the haul road, each of which has materially worsened the family's position:

- The original haul road ran through the eastern part of the property, directly adjacent to the outbuilding identified as the annexe site for the family's [REDACTED].
- Following the resident's direct representations to National Grid Project Leader [REDACTED] — in the presence of Suffolk County Councillor [REDACTED] — the haul road was moved to the western side of the property, adjacent to Lambert's Lane. At the same time, the nearest pylon was moved closer to the cottage, as confirmed in the Suffolk 3 realignment report.
- The haul road has since been moved again — onto Lambert's Lane itself, the road the family uses a minimum of sixteen times daily for work, school, medical appointments, and everyday life.

Each move was a choice. The Applicant chose, three times, where to place the haul road. Three times, those choices have worsened the impact on the only family with no alternative access. The family did not choose this. The Applicant did.

4. David and Goliath — The Inequality of Arms

National Grid is one of the largest infrastructure companies in the world. It has unlimited legal resources, a permanent team of planning and legal specialists, and years of experience navigating Development Consent Order examinations. The resident of [REDACTED] is a private individual with no legal representation, no planning expertise, and no prior experience of this process.

The resident did not know the haul road had been moved for the third time until very recently. Information that was publicly available in the examination documents was not communicated to him directly. He has had to educate himself about Holford Rules, Public Sector Equality Duties, DCO examination procedures, and biodiversity net gain — while simultaneously caring for a household that includes a [REDACTED], managing an ancient woodland, and fighting to protect a home his family has lived in for thirty years.

The Applicant's Project Leader told this resident to his face that the Holford Rules were just guidelines. The rules that exist specifically to protect people in this resident's position were dismissed, casually, by the very person responsible for applying them. That dismissal was not an accident. It reflects an institutional confidence that comes from knowing you have unlimited resources and your opponent has none.

The Examining Authority exists precisely to provide a level of protection to people in this position. The resident asks the Examining Authority to consider whether, in all the circumstances of this case, the Applicant has behaved in a manner consistent with its legal obligations and its duty to engage constructively with affected communities — or whether it has relied on its superior resources to avoid doing so.

5. No Engagement — No Meeting — No Mitigation Offered

Despite being explicitly informed, in person, by this resident of the following matters — the resident has not received a single offer of a meeting from the Applicant, nor any mitigation proposal of any kind:

- A [REDACTED] under the Equality Act 2010
- Self-harm resulting in permanent scarring directly connected to this proposal
- Fear for a family member's life expressed directly to the Project Leader
- Severance from the household's only source of heat
- A haul road on the only access road to the property
- Acknowledged breaches of the Holford Rules at this location
- A child in his most formative years facing three years of construction disruption
- A planned annexe for a person with [REDACTED] made urgently necessary by this proposal

The Applicant has known all of these facts. It has chosen, at every stage, not to engage. That is not an oversight. It is a decision. And it is a decision that the Examining Authority should weigh carefully when considering whether the Applicant has discharged its obligations under EN-5, the Equality Act, and the general duty to engage constructively with affected communities.

6. What We Are Asking For — The Occupier Disturbance Case

We are seeking occupier disturbance compensation of £40,000. This figure — approximately £2,200 per person per year across six occupants and three years — is modest given the totality of what this family will endure. We set out below the specific heads of loss it is intended to address:

- Enforced restriction of access — the practical loss of the freedom to come and go from your own home freely, for up to three years, at the discretion of a third party who has shown no inclination to engage constructively with this family's needs

- Loss of quiet enjoyment — the destruction of the acoustic environment of a home whose defining [REDACTED], for a household that includes [REDACTED]
- Loss of outdoor amenity — the garden, fields, and open landscape rendered inaccessible or unusable during construction, for a family with seven dogs and four children
- Dust intrusion — construction dust carried on the prevailing south-westerly wind directly into a centuries-old cottage with single pane windows, degraded seals, and open loft voids
- Permanent loss of amenity — pylons visible in 330 degrees of previously open landscape, audible in still air, permanent for the lifetimes of everyone who will ever live in this generational family home
- Psychological and emotional impact — on five adults and one child, [REDACTED] — noise, dust, visual intrusion, disruption of routine, presence of strangers — clinically significant triggers
- The generational dimension — the impact is not confined to the current occupiers' lifetimes but extends to the children and grandchildren who will inherit this home under the terms of the lifelong peppercorn tenancy

[REDACTED] is not what this family deserves. It is what they are asking for. They are asking for it because they are realistic about the inequality of arms in this process, because they approach it in good faith, and because they believe that even a large organisation with unlimited resources has an obligation to recognise the human cost of its decisions on the people who cannot avoid them.

Signed: _____

Karl Owen

[REDACTED]

Date: 13 June 2026

7. For the Speech — 23 June 2026

The following passage is suggested for use when speaking at the hearing on 23 June 2026. It should be delivered slowly, calmly, and with the complete confidence of someone who knows every word of it to be true:

"I want to describe something to the Examining Authority that I think deserves to be said plainly. For up to three years — possibly longer, because major infrastructure projects routinely overrun — my family will not be able to leave our home, or return to it, without National Grid's permission. Lambert's Lane and Stonham Road are our only access to the outside world. The nearest shop, school, doctor, and train station are all at least ten minutes' drive away. When those roads become haul roads, National Grid holds the keys. They decide when we are released and when we may come home. They have chosen this — through three successive decisions to move the haul road, each time bringing it closer to our only exit. We did not choose it. We committed no offence that justifies it. We are simply a family who have lived in their home for thirty years, and we are being placed under a form of house arrest — for years, at the discretion of an organisation that has unlimited legal resources, has acknowledged breaking its own rules to our faces, and has not once offered to meet with us. I am asking the Examining Authority today: what has this family done to deserve this? And if the answer is nothing — then what is the Applicant prepared to do about it?"

Pause after the final question. Do not fill the silence. Let the inspector — and the room — sit with it.

From: Karl Owen

Sent: 09 July 2026 11:24

To: Norwich to Tilbury

Subject: [REDACTED] Interested Party No. [REDACTED]

Dear Harrison

I am writing as a registered Interested Party ([REDACTED]) in the Norwich to Tilbury examination.

I wish to place on the record that I have been actively seeking to arrange a meeting with the Applicant's community impact team, with a view to reaching a Statement of Common Ground ahead of Deadline 7 on 21 July 2026. That meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 7th July 2026 but did not take place due to circumstances beyond my control, one of the impact team experiencing a punctured tyre which prevented him from making the appointment.

I have contacted the Applicant's caseworker today to request that the meeting be rescheduled as a matter of urgency given the approaching deadline. I ask the Examining Authority to note that any delay in reaching a Statement of Common Ground is not of my making, and I remain ready and willing to meet the Applicant at the earliest opportunity.

I wish to flag that I have further representations to submit and would be grateful to know whether these can be accepted into the examination record.

Yours sincerely

Karl Owen