

## Schedule of Objections

| Objector and Agent  | Plot no's | Rights package (if applicable) | Issues/concerns raised in Objection  | NGET response  | Update as at 11 <sup>th</sup> November 2022   |
|---|-----------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <b>Ibstock Bricks (1996) Limited [and others] OBJ1</b><br><br><b>Represented by M. Banton of Gerald Eve</b> | 83        | Colour Plate Access Rights     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ibstock Bricks advise they hold an interest in plots 83, 84, 85, 86, 149, 150, 151, 152 and 153.</li> <li>NGET are seeking powers to acquire the freehold of these plots and deprive the landowner of occupation of them.</li> <li>The acquisition of part of their land will cause significant disruption, inconvenience, considerable capital costs and potentially increased operational costs.</li> </ul> | <p>Plot number 152 was not used in the Order and is marked "Number not used".</p> <p>NGET are only seeking rights (Colour Plate Access Rights or Colour Plate Rights) over the plots of land owned by Ibstock Bricks which should in practice have minimal impact.</p> <p>NGET seeks Colour Plate Access Rights and Colour Plate Rights over the plots in which Ibstock Bricks has an interest. The exercise of the access rights will involve NGET's appointed contractors taking access over the relevant plots (most likely on foot) in order to gain access to existing towers for the purpose of replacing Colour Plates.</p> | <p>NGET's appointed land agents, Fisher German, initially contacted the agent for Ibstock Bricks to advise of a misunderstanding, in that NGET only seeks to acquire rights over land owned by Ibstock Bricks, rather than the land itself. A full description of NGET's requirements was provided, and a formal response to the objection sent.</p> <p>Discussions during August and September 2022 further clarified the extent of rights required and impact. It is likely that the rights required over their eastern block of land will not affect any mineral</p> |
|   | 84        | Colour Plate Rights            |  |  |   |
|   | 85        | Colour Plate Access Rights     |  |  |   |
|   | 86        | Colour Plate Rights            |  |  |   |
|   | 149       | Colour Plate Rights            |  |  |   |
|   | 150       | Colour Plate Access Rights     |  |  |   |
|   | 151       | Colour Plate Rights            |  |  |   |
|   | [152]     | <i>Number not used</i>         |  |  |   |

|  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>Minor works may be required on the land in order to facilitate such access, such as vegetation clearance. These rights will be exercised on one occasion during the construction phase of the project and so the physical impact will be limited and temporary in nature.</p> <p>Colour Plate Rights are needed over some plots to enable appointed contractors to climb the existing towers to change the Colour Plates on them, ensuring a sufficient exclusion zone is in place around the tower to enable a safe operation and allow for emergency procedures if required. Once in place operatives will change the Colour Plates. This operation will need to take place during an electricity outage and be completed before the circuit can be re energised. This is a safety requirement of the National Grid to ensure the new circuits can be correctly identified after the addition of the new circuits to the system.</p> | <p>potential which was a concern raised by Istock Bricks.</p> <p>Revised terms for both parcels of land were sent on 14th September 2022, with follow-up emails concerning the impact of short-term rights. Istock Bricks agent indicated on 11 October that terms are agreed subject to agreement on the basis of professional fees and that he had been instructed to withdraw the objection. Revised terms were provided by return, and signed on 1 November. We await confirmation that the objection has been withdrawn, having advised the agent how to do this.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGET has not demonstrated that there is a sufficiently compelling case in the public interest to justify interfering their rights.</li> <li>• NGET already has sufficient rights over their land to enable NGET to undertake the proposed works without</li> </ul> | <p>It is essential for health and safety reasons for the Colour Plates to be replaced. Unless and until the Colour Plates are replaced it will not be possible for the important new infrastructure comprised in the Project to commence operation. While the works to replace the Colour Plates are relatively minor in nature it is essential that NGET have the ability to access the towers to change the Colour Plates at any time it is necessary to do so. It is therefore vital that NGET secures the rights it needs to enable it to lawfully replace the Colour Plates. NGET are committed to securing these voluntarily if at all possible.</p> <p>In respect of plots 83, 84, 85 and 86, NGET holds rights for the existing apparatus and access under historic/implied wayleaves. An offer has been made (July 2021) to convert these rights to a permanent easement. The critical nature (see above) and timing of the works (they must be carried out during scheduled electricity</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|

|  |   |                           |  |  |  |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|
|  |   |                           | <p>the need for the proposed CPO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No offer has been made to purchase their leasehold interest so it cannot be said that compulsory purchase powers are required on the grounds that it is not possible to acquire the interest by agreement.</li> </ul> | <p>outages) requires NGET to have more certainty of access than under historic or implied rights, hence the need to protect its position by including the required rights within the Order.</p> <p>In respect of plots 149, 150, 151 and 153 NGET holds rights for the existing apparatus on a 1967 deed of easement. The access route to the apparatus NGET has historically been directed to use by Ibstock Bricks falls outside these rights and an offer has been made (February 2022) to vary the deed to include these rights.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Swynson Limited OBJ 2</b></p> <p><b>Represented by James</b></p> | 2 | Arcing Horn Rights        | <p>Raises concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the size of the working area on plot 7, particularly the area extending into the</li> </ul>   | <p>NGET is seeking to acquire "Working Area Rights" over plot 7 to enable it to carry out works to the towers and "Construction Access Rights" over plot 8 to enable NGET to take access over</p>  | <p>NGET's appointed land agents, Fisher German, and Swynson Limited's and East Sussex National's appointed land agent exchanged emails in May 2022 concerning the acquisition of</p> |
|  | 3 | Arcing Horn Access Rights |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | Arcing Horn Rights        |  |  |  |

|   |                       |                            |  |   |   |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| <b>White of Savills</b>   | 5                     | Arcing Horn Access Rights  | <p>fairway, and the duration for which it will be used; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the location of the proposed construction access route across plot 8 and its proximity to a tee box and greens comprised in the golf course.</li> </ul> | <p>land during and for the purposes of construction of the Project.</p> <p>The working area around pylon 071 is required to enable reconductoring of the overhead lines on the existing towers. This working area has been designed to enable the safest and most efficient method for the works to be carried out, whilst still allowing flexibility for the appointed contractor to utilise their preferred working methods. Key to the size and shape of the working area required, is the positions required for winches to pull conductors along the overhead line; one of the winch positions will need to be close to or on the course due to the minimum working distance (of the machines from the live wire) required by health and safety protocols. Once NGET's contractors enter on the land, they will identify the specific working methods that will be adopted and NGET will liaise with Swynson Limited and East Sussex National further to</p> | <p>rights on the golf course, with an indicative image provided showing how the temporary rights would lay over the course. Project team representatives and Fisher German subsequently met with the landowner, leaseholder and their agent on site on 5th October 2022 to discuss the works and land requirements in more detail and seek to mitigate any impact.</p> <p>A proposal was discussed which would limit the occupation of the course for the purposes of the Project, with the intention that the affected hole could remain in play at least in some form, thereby mitigating the impact on players and management of the course. This would be subject to the main contractor confirming that the reconfigured layout of the work area, which would utilise land to the north, would</p> |
|   | 6                     | Arcing Horn Rights         |  |   |   |
|   | 7                     | Working Area Rights        |  |   |   |
|   | 8                     | Construction Access Rights |  |   |   |
|   | 1 (Table 2 interest)  | Arcing Horn Access Rights  |  |   |   |
|   | 9 (Table 2 interest)  | Construction Access Rights |  |   |   |
|   | 11 (Table 2 interest) | Construction Access Rights |  |   |   |
| <b>East Sussex National OBJ 3 Represented by James White of Savills</b> | 1                     | Arcing Horn Access Rights  |  |   |   |
|   | 2                     | Arcing Horn Rights         |  |   |   |
|   | 3                     | Arcing Horn Access Rights  |  |   |   |
|   | 4                     | Arcing Horn Rights         |  |   |   |

|  |                         |                            |  |  |   |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
|  | 5                       | Arcing Horn Access Rights  |  | minimise any interference as far as practicable.   | not impact on working methods and safety too severely.  |
|  | 6                       | Arcing Horn Rights         |  |  |   |
|  | 7                       | Working Area Rights        |  |  |   |
|  | 8                       | Construction Access Rights |  |  |   |
|  | 9<br>(Table 2 interest) | Construction Access Rights |  | <p>NGET is committed to working with Swynson Limited and East Sussex National now to alleviate concerns regarding the impact of the working area and construction access route, upon the operation of the golf course. NGET is keen to discuss potential ways of mitigating the impact of the works through appropriate screening and (where possible) adjustments to the working area layout and access route.</p> <p>It is expected that the part of plot 7 overlapping the golf course will be required for a relatively short period of time approximately 3 to 4 months.</p> <p>NGET's appointed land agents, Fisher German, have been liaising with Swynson Limited's and East Sussex National's land agent to arrange a meeting to discuss all of this on site, along with NGET's engineers. It would</p> | <p>The proposed alternative site layout (critically the conductor pulling locations) was checked with the preferred contractor during a further site visit on 13 October. The preferred contractor confirmed the alternative layout was suitable so plans were prepared and issued. The parties have agreed to seek to agree terms by the end of October to allow the objection to the Order to be removed prior to the proposed hearings. An aerial overview plan was provided on 20 October for the landowner's/occupier's agent to check the revised extent of land affected on the course, so that terms may be agreed. Heads of Terms and plans for an option for a lease were issued to the agent on 1 November. The agents</p> |

|  |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | <p>be most helpful if a meeting could be arranged as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Objection also raised concerns regarding engagement with Fisher German prior to the making of the Order. Fisher German have explained to East Sussex National that the working area included in the Order has been designed to enable the safest and most efficient method for the requisite works to be carried out. The precise details of the layout and use of the working area, such as the duration of works and number and frequency of vehicles taking access to it, will be finalised by the main works contractor, and that contractor has not yet been selected/appointed.</p> <p>While NGET cannot pre-empt the contractor's exact methods or requirements, NGET believe there is scope to discuss reasonable mitigation measures at this stage.</p> | <p>spoke on 9 November, with provisional agreement of terms subject to agreeing a rent for the work area.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

|  |    |                                     |  |   |   |
|--|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
|  |    |                                     |  | <p>NGET remain committed to resolving the concerns regarding the construction of the Project and to reaching a voluntary agreement Swynson Limited and East Sussex National in order to secure the rights it needs for the Project.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Ridgewood Holdings Limited OBJ 4</b></p> <p><b>Represented by James Ashcroft</b></p> | 33 | Working Area Rights                 | <p>No objection to the scheme in principle but object to the compulsory purchase of the freehold of plots 58a and 58b for ecological mitigation.</p> <p>Object on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compulsory purchase of plots 58a and 58b is not 'required' for the stated purpose</li> </ul> | <p>A large proportion of the land on which the NGET, GSP and SPEN substations will be constructed (Plot 35) comprises habitat suitable for protected species including great crested newt (GCN), common reptiles, hazel dormice, breeding birds, badgers and foraging bats. The construction of the new substations will result in the loss of the majority of these habitats. Off-site land (Plots 58a and 58b) is required to compensate for the loss of these habitats and mitigate the impacts on the aforementioned protected species.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation is to provide alternative, or compensatory habitat suitable for the protected species. Given that the habitat to be lost (9.3ha)</p> | <p>Following delays while the objector appointed a new land agent, NGET's appointed land agent, Fisher German met with Mr Ashcroft and his agent on 29 September 2022 to review the position and advised that NGET would be willing to consider acquiring the alternative mitigation land proposed, subject to Natural England agreeing to vary the protected species licences granted, and further being able to discharge conditions of the planning permission for the development relating to ecological mitigation based on this alternative land.</p> |
|  | 35 | <b>Freehold</b>                     |  |   |   |
|  | 37 | Construction Compound Rights        |  |   |   |
|  | 43 | Construction Access Rights          |  |   |   |
|  | 46 | Drainage Rights                     |  |   |   |
|  | 48 | Ecological Mitigation Rights        |  |   |   |
|  | 49 | Overhead Line Rights                |  |   |   |
|  | 50 | Ecological Mitigation Access Rights |  |   |   |



|  |     |  |  |  |   |
|--|-----|--|--|--|---|
|  | 51  | Working Area Rights                                  |  | <p>exceeds the site area to be provided as compensatory habitat (8.3ha), the quantitative loss must be addressed through qualitative improvements, or 'enhancements' to plots 58a/b.</p> <p>The creation of compensatory habitat on plots 58a/b is required in order to deliver the Project, as a result of the requirements of the planning permission and protected species licences secured from Natural England.</p> <p>The planning permission obtained for construction of the substations included a pre-commencement condition relating to ecology. In order to discharge that condition, an ecological mitigation and management strategy was prepared and approved by the local planning authority in April 2022. NGET has also secured a protected species licence from Natural England to carry out works on Plot 35 that would otherwise constitute an offence under wildlife legislation. In order to secure the licence, NGET has</p> | <p>It was made clear that the mitigation land originally identified by NGET as suitable (Plot 58a and 58b) will stay within the CPO until the alternative land has been confirmed as suitable, the Natural England licences have been varied, planning conditions discharged and the land acquired. The objector agreed to a walkover survey to determine the suitability of the land.</p> <p>NGET's intention is to continue to seek voluntary agreement over the land and rights required as soon as possible through proactive engagement with the landowner.</p> <p>In respect of business interruption, Fisher German confirmed indicative timescales. The main contractor will be appointed shortly and will be</p> |
|  | 52  | Construction Access Rights                           |  |  |   |
|  | 53  | Construction and Ecological Mitigation Access Rights |  |  |   |
|  | 54  | Construction and Ecological Mitigation Access Rights |  |  |   |
|  | 55  | Working Area and Ecological Mitigation Access Rights |  |  |   |
|  | 56  | Working Area Rights                                  |  |  |   |
|  | 57  | Construction and Ecological Mitigation Access Rights |  |  |   |
|  | 58a | <b>Freehold</b>                                      |  |  |   |

|  |                          |                           |  |  |   |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
|  | 58b                      | <b>Freehold</b>           |  | <p>committed to provide compensatory habitat on plots 58a/b to mitigate the impacts on protected species so as to ensure that their conservation status is maintained. The creation of compensatory habitat on plots 58a/b is therefore a legal requirement, pursuant to the Natural England licence, with which NGET must comply in order to deliver the Project.</p> <p>NGET requires the freehold of plots 58a and 58b because it is necessary for the compensatory habitat to be secured in the long term, and not reversed by subsequent development of, or incompatible uses of, the land, that are not in keeping with maintaining the favourable conservation status of the species covered by Natural England and the protected species licences.</p> <p>NGET acknowledge that in correspondence with RHL, NGET had suggested that it may wish to use plots 58a and 58b to relocate soil removed from the GSP land/plot 35 during</p> | <p>able to further discuss mitigation measures.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be unlikely that the objection would be withdrawn before the scheduled commencement of the hearings, but that the parties would be happy to state that they are co-operating over solutions and appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>On 20 October the landowner’s agent submitted a proposed price for Freehold sale of the alternative mitigation land. A revised price was submitted on 2 November and responded to by return. , and discussed on a call on 9 November. Negotiations continue. Negotiations continue.</p> |
|  | 59                       | Working Area Rights       |  |  |   |
|  | 23<br>(Table 2 interest) | Overhead Line Rights      |  |  |   |
|  | 25<br>(Table 2 interest) | Working Area Rights       |  |  |   |
|  | 29<br>(Table 2 interest) | Working Area Rights       |  |  |   |
|  | 40<br>(Table 2 interest) | Working Area Rights       |  |  |   |
|  | 42<br>(Table 2 interest) | Overhead Line Rights      |  |  |   |
|  | 44<br>(Table 2 interest) | Working Area Rights       |  |  |   |
|  | 45<br>(Table 2 interest) | Overhead Line Rights      |  |  |   |
|  | 3<br>(Table 2 interest)  | Arcing Horn Access Rights |  |  |   |

|  |                         |                            |   |  |  |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|
|  | 4<br>(Table 2 interest) | Arcing Horn Rights         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on farm and businesses (primarily impact of waste soil, creating a major constructions site immediately adjacent to field used for outdoor events and holiday 'yurts')</li> </ul> | <p>construction of the new substations. That is no longer the case. The land is required and intended for use only as ecological mitigation land, as set out above and in the Statement of Reasons.</p> <p>Reference is made at p.ii (on page 2) of the Objection to alleged severance of the holding by the compulsory acquisition of plots 58a and 58b, but with no explanation of how this severance is perceived to occur or of the claimed significant adverse impact. Plots 58a and 58b lie on the eastern side of the holding, and if the perceived severance claimed is to land owned to the north, access is still readily available over land owned to the west of plots 58a and 58b with existing gateways through to the land to the north. NGET would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further in order to better understand the nature of the concerns.</p> |  |
|  | 5<br>(Table 2 interest) | Arcing Horn Access Rights  |   |  |  |
|  | 6<br>(Table 2 interest) | Arcing Horn Rights         |   |  |  |
|  | 7<br>(Table 2 interest) | Working Area Rights        |   |  |  |
|  | 8<br>(Table 2 interest) | Construction Access Rights |   |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>P10 of the Objection refers to the case of <i>R (Hall) v First Secretary of State</i> and in particular to three circumstances in which compulsory purchase could not be justified in the public interest, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Land proposed to be acquired may be excessive because development proposals can be constructed without needing that land to be acquired</li> <li>ii. Acquisition of a right over the land, rather than its acquisition, might suffice</li> <li>iii. Land may be necessary for the development, but [the] landowner may be willing to agree to sell.</li> </ul> <p>The Objection states that “With reference to point ‘ii’, in so far as any off-site habitat creation is required to re-create the compensatory habitat (including of woodland for enhancement to satisfy the dormouse</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives to compulsory acquisition have not been considered</li> </ul> | <p>mitigation recommendations), compulsory purchase powers are not required because they could be achieved by the use of lesser powers than compulsory purchase (temporary possession and acquisition of rights of maintenance)".</p> <p>Firstly it should be noted that while the Housing and Planning Act 2016 includes temporary possession powers, these are not yet in force so are not available to NGET. As to the acquisition of new rights, as explained at paragraph 8.12 of the Statement of Reasons, "NGET is taking a proportionate approach to acquisition and only seeks to acquire the freehold title to the Order Land for the purposes of above ground permanent infrastructure, namely the NGET GSP substation and the SEPN substation (CPO Plot 35), and to mitigate the impacts of the new substations on the habitat of protected species (CPO Plots 58a and 58b). In all other instances rights in land will be acquired."</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>NGET requires the freehold of plots 58a and 58b because it is necessary for the compensatory habitat to be secured in the long term, and not reversed by subsequent development of, or incompatible uses of, the land, that are not in keeping with maintaining the favourable conservation status of the species covered by Natural England and the protected species licences.</p> <p>Protected species licences can only be issued if they meet three "licensing tests". One of the questions that must be addressed in order to secure a licence is whether the action authorised will be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range ('the FCS test'). Therefore, the land required to compensate for the loss of the protected species habitats and maintain the species favourable conservation status should constitute the following:</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>a) be located in a place that would not risk wildlife mortality; this would be achieved by locating the compensatory habitat on land that avoids crossing highways, such as avoiding land south of the A22;</p> <p>b) be ecologically connected to the GSP land and the wider landscape, and as close to the GSP land as reasonably practicable to benefit protected species affected by the Project;</p> <p>c) be of low ecological value to minimise impacts to any protected species that might already be using the land during any habitat improvement or creation works; and</p> <p>d) be of an appropriate size/quality.</p> <p>In line with the above requirements, two fields (totalling c.13.7 ha) were identified by NEGT’s ecology advisors</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>as potentially suitable for compensatory habitat as they were within 500m (the typical natural range for GCN) of the proposed substations (located around Pylon 4VM068) and of low ecological value. Both of these fields are owned by Ridgewood Holdings Limited. NGET approached Ridgewood Holdings Limited (represented by James Ashcroft) who explained that Ridgewood Holdings Limited were not willing to allow NGET to use these fields but were, in principle, amenable to NGET using an alternative area (included in the Order as plot 58a and 58b) for the creation of compensatory habitat.</p> <p>In addition to the options on land owned by Ridgewood Holdings Limited, four other nearby land parcels (belonging to different landowners) were identified as being potentially suitable for compensatory habitat, on the basis that they were likely to be of low ecological value and were connected to the proposed</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative locations to plots 58a and 58b have not been properly considered</li> </ul> | <p>development site through the wider natural landscape. Of these options, only three could be directly accessed from a road, which would be necessary to facilitate access for the intended long-term management of the land. However, only the Ridgewood Holdings land avoided crossing any highway and was located within the natural range of GCN (500m). The Ridgewood Holdings land was therefore identified as the most suitable option to compensate for impacts arising from the development.</p> <p>Ecological surveys of the Ridgewood Holdings land (Plots 58a and 58b) were carried out to acquire baseline habitat information. In addition, a pond located immediately south of plots 58a/b was confirmed to have a low population of GCN and as such enhancing this land would provide benefits to the metapopulation of GCN in the area thus, ensuring the species remained at a favourable conservation status. The information demonstrated that plots 51a/b met all the requirements</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>outlined at a)-d) above ('Ecological mitigation/compensation land requirements'), making these plots appropriate for compensatory habitat.</p> <p>This land is ecologically connected to the GSP land via outgrown hedges and a watercourse. It is approximately 440m from the GSP land, with no barriers in-between to impede species movements (such as roads or major watercourses). It also falls within the normal foraging ranges for many of the protected species associated with the GSP land. Its close proximity and connectivity to the GSP land is such that populations of protected or otherwise notable species that will be affected by the Project will directly benefit from the measures proposed here. Other land options are less favourable/suitable, due to their separation by public highways, which limit their connectivity to the land affected by development.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>Furthermore, the land is currently of low ecological value and would provide the gains for protected species and wider biodiversity, following the implementation of the compensation measures proposed. As noted above, it is also directly accessible from Sand Hill Lane. As well as avoiding adverse impacts associated with creating site access to alternative plots, this will enable ongoing access to complete the necessary monitoring surveys and long-term (at least c.25-30 years) management of the newly created and improved habitats. In addition, this option would avoid any severance of the remaining RHL (Plate 1).</p> <p>As indicated above, NGET did consider several alternative locations for ecological compensation/mitigation. However, plots 58a and 58b are the most ecologically suitable and their use for this purposes was, in fact, suggested by Ridgewood Holdings Limited. Moreover, Ridgewood Holdings Limited confirmed, in the context of</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | <p>NGET's applications for protected species licences, that this land could be used as compensatory habitat.</p> <p>The Objection confirms that Ridgewood Holdings Limited do not object to the principle of the Project which is welcomed by NGET. It acknowledges that the GSP land was acquired by NGET from Ridgewood Holdings Limited by voluntary agreement, and that there has been a long history of engagement/negotiation between NGET and Ridgewood Holdings Limited on the Project proposals.</p> <p>Ridgewood Holdings Limited were consulted on and fully aware of the need for compensatory habitat and indeed suggested that the land included in the Order as plots 58a and 58b be used for that purpose in preference to other Ridgewood Holdings land identified by NGET.</p> <p>Following an initial offer to acquire land for compensatory habitat in March</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |    |                              |   |  |  |
|--|----|------------------------------|---|--|--|
|  |    |                              |   | 2021, discussions have continued and NGET's intention is to continue those discussions in an amicable and constructive manner in order to secure the land and rights needed for the Project without the use of CPO powers.                                     |  |
| <b>Southern Power Networks OBJ 5</b>       |    |                              |   |  | Objection withdrawn.                         |
| <b>Hamilton Palace Limited OBJ 6</b>       | 38 | Ecological Mitigation Rights | 'Holding objections' pending conclusion of negotiations with NGET.<br><br>Acknowledge that discussions are progressing well with NGET, matters are agreed in principle, and that once agreement is reached on the detailed scope of works the objections will be withdrawn. | NGET welcome confirmation that discussions are progressing in a positive manner; that the majority of matters have been agreed in principle; and that upon formal documentation of the matters agreed in principle, the objections will be formally withdrawn. | Objections formally withdrawn on 8 November. |
| <b>Represented by Robert Gates and Co.</b> | 40 | Working Area Rights          |   |  |  |
|  | 42 | Overhead Line Rights         |   |  |  |
| <b>Agnes Gnomou OBJ 7</b>                  | 32 | Overhead Line Rights         |   | NGET remain committed to reaching voluntary agreement and as such, NGET's agents, Fisher German, will continue to be in regular contact to ensure that outstanding matters can be resolved as soon as possible.  |  |
| <b>Represented by Robert Gates and Co.</b> |    |                              |   |  |  |

|  |    |                              |  |  |  |
|--|----|------------------------------|--|--|--|
|  |    |                              |  | Objection withdrawn 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2022. |  |
|  | 34 | Working Area Rights          |  |  |  |
|  | 36 | Ecological Mitigation Rights |  |  |  |
|  | 39 | Overhead Line Rights         |  |  |  |
| <b>Ahmed Ben-Zarti OBJ 8</b>               | 44 | Working Area Rights          |  |  |  |
| <b>Represented by Robert Gates and Co.</b> |    |                              |  |  |  |