

P. Watson Responses

ExQ2: 20 June 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: Tuesday 11 July 2023

Ex Q1	Question to	Question
Q4.3.21	Carter Jonas LLP for Mr P Watson	<p><b>Mr P Watson interest in land at the Tadcaster CSECs/ location of western CSEC</b></p> <p>The Applicant responded to the points made in your Relevant Representation [RR-006] at Deadline 1 [REP1-015] and to your points made at the Issue specific Hearing 1 (ISH) [EV-003b] and [REP1-017], Table 2.3. It has set out its view on progress to reaching agreement in the Updated CA and TP Objections' Schedule [REP4-020], objection 3. On the ASI [EV-001b] and at CAH1, the Applicant also indicated a possible reorientation of the western CSEC and submitted an indicative plan in this regard [REP4-024], Table 2.3, item 5e. and [REP4-027], Appendix B.</p> <p>a) Would the concerns that you raised in your RR and at the OFH regarding the location of the western CSEC and its impact on farming activities be resolved by the proposed CSEC reorientation? Would you be you satisfied with this arrangement?</p> <p>b) If not, set out the matters which are still subject to resolution</p>
Response		<p>a) The impact on farming activities would still be greatly affected by the proposed CSEC reorientation. The CSEC would still protrude at least 37 metres into the field. I was not expecting the CSEC to come out as far as this. All farming activities would take a longer period of time in the field and the added compaction caused in the extra turning would have an adverse effect on yields. At the moment I can run straight along that boundary side but the extra work time year in year out and lost yield would be considerable. I am concerned that although the CSEC limits of deviation has changed and moved slightly, National Grid could still place the CSEC in it's original place. The area that they are asking for in the limits of deviation is still 3.5 times the size of the actual CSEC. Would National Grid be limited in acquiring only the land taken up by the CSEC (1,149 SQM)? Or would they be able to acquire the 4,541 SQM that is in the limits of deviation?</p> <p>I also have to ask whether it is necessary to have an access road off the A659 7 metres wide, 4 metres is the standard width and should be ample.</p> <p>b) I have tried to provide a plan (see attached) to demonstrate what could work. The CSEC West could easily be placed right up to the pylon. This is exactly the same as what is happening at CSEC East so it is possible from an engineering perspective. The CSEC would be placed over the boundary but more so on my side. The landowner to the North would have a quarter of the CSEC on his land but would have the burden of the pylon. This would be a more sensible use of land and share the burden of the proposed works on both landowners. This is not what is happening now. The hedgerow would need to be redirected to the north of the CSEC West so there would be a kink in the hedgerow but as hedgerows are cut once a year the disruption would be negligible. Perhaps National</p>

	Grid would be helpful in realigning the hedgerow to facilitate this? This has the added advantage of reducing the amount of access road required from the A659.	
Q4.3.22	Carter Jonas LLP for Mr P Watson	<p><b>Mr P Watson interest in land at the Tadcaster CSECs access to land</b></p> <p>As above, and additionally the Applicant has responded to questions at CAH1 regarding alternatives which would enable the access track currently shown for extinguishment of rights to be retained [REP4-027, Action Point 10.</p> <p>Do you have any further points to make in connection with the proposed extinguishment of rights and access to your land from the A659.</p>
Response	<p>In REP2-039, P149-170 National Grid set out the swept path analysis of various vehicles that could use the area of land between the CSEC and the A64 using just an earthworks bank. There is no mention of a retaining wall being present in that report. The earthworks bank solution clearly leaves a flat 6 metre strip for vehicles to travel on. Only the very longest road going vehicle could not get through (and that was only slightly on the edge of the limits) and all agricultural vehicles tested could. I am unlikely to want to take an articulated vehicle along the 6 metre wide strip. I suggested at our meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2023 that for the new diversion route around the CSEC they could include a right of way on the same terms but exclude articulated lorries. I am yet to hear back from them on that. Even if a slight camber remained on the strip of land, agricultural vehicles would easily be able to travel along it, it is after all what they do every day. Of course if they put in a retaining wall I could take any vehicle along the new right of way which is what I would want ideally and is certainly possible. If the cost of the retaining wall really was the issue they would have said so straight away. Sadly I am left with the impression that National Grid have been determined to extinguish the right of way from the start. I have to point out that in court Mr Ingham made it very clear that he did not want the Right of way running across his land.</p> <p>In the past I have planted two different crops in that field using the A659 access for one part of the field and the right of way for the other part. It is not possible to do this from one access point due to different drilling times and harvest times of the two crops. I will no longer be able to do this in the future if the Right of way is extinguished.</p> <p>In REP1-015 13.5 National Grid state that they would be willing to not proceed with the acquisition of the land to the south of the CSEC East. They would also be willing to provide access to this land for Mr Ingham over the 6 metre strip between the CSEC and the A64 to access this land. Clearly they have no issues with Mr Ingham using this strip for access but have come up with a series of unreasonable excuses for myself. I would also expect that National Grid will want to take vehicles along this strip in order to access the south west side of the CSEC East. Whether it is National Grid or Mr Ingham who end up owning that land, access will be needed along that 6 metre strip to take a tractor with a hedgecutter to maintain the hedge beyond, forestry equipment or even maintenance of the gas pipe. None of the</p>	

vehicles involved will be small. Could National Grid confirm whether they have agreed to buy the land to the South west of CSEC East from Mr Ingham?

The access off the A659 is going to be far from satisfactory. I have to point out that farming can be an intense job often involving a race against the weather. Weekends and bank holidays count for nothing in the world of farming. If I don't get the crops in before the rain comes the repercussions can be disastrous. At the very least the milling premium on a crop can be lost (worth £50 a tonne) or in extreme cases the whole crop can be lost. The field produces well in excess of 100 tonnes of wheat. Weather patterns are becoming more extreme as well. I have a need to access my fields at all times. To turn up at the field to have fly tipped waste blocking the entrance is more than a little inconvenient. Delays to fertiliser applications, fungicide sprays and delayed drilling before the rain comes also come with a heavy yield penalty.

The traffic on the A659 can become very heavy if not stationary if the A64 bypass is blocked or the A1 is blocked and traffic is rediverted along the A659. It won't surprise you that car drivers are extremely reluctant to let tractors out onto the road when this happens. If no trailers get to the field nothing gets harvested. I can simply use the current right of way when this happens.

Vehicles parked in the gateway cause added frustration. I hope that the planning inspectorate saw clear evidence of other vehicles parking in this area when they did the site inspection. The proposed new entrance will be large enough for much larger vehicles to park in. A lot of drivers are reluctant to move when asked especially when they are on a legally required rest break. There is a real safety issue here for me parking on a busy 60 mph road and waiting for other vehicles to leave.

I want control of my own entrance so that I can stop illegal activities taking place, and this usually means with the use of boulders and not polite signs. There is no need for National Grid to own this entrance. There are no issues with visibility onto the A659 and the hedgerow is already established. It is totally unnecessary for National Grid to want a 10 metre strip of land next to the A659 just to cut the already established hedge once a year. If National Grid needed the hedge leaving at a certain height I could agree to that.

I am unsure whether National Grid really need a 10 metre strip of land between my field and the SSOB field. They could simply plant a hedgerow and leave the management of it to either side stipulating that it should be kept at a certain height.

To sum up I need my own access point off the A659 that I can control. I also need the Right of way through brickyard farm retaining so that if problems do arise with the entrance at the A659 (like heavy traffic) I can keep going to the field. It not simply a matter of convenience it is a matter of necessity. The field currently has two access points for various reasons. I did not spend a considerable amount of time and money going to court getting a diversion around the pylon if I thought that the right of way wasn't absolutely necessary. The CSEC West could easily be moved to a much better place that isn't in the middle of a field. I think it would be helpful to know what deal has been done between Mr Ingham and National Grid.

There are clear issues with the positions of CSEC East and West and I am of the opinion that there are more suitable positions elsewhere.



### TADCASTER WEST INDICATIVE ALTERNATIVE CSEC POSITION



#### LEGEND

##### DCO SUBMISSION & INDICATIVE ALTERNATIVE

- ORDER LIMITS
- PROPOSED NEW LATTICE PYLON
- EXISTING LATTICE PYLON - TO BE DISMANTLED
- EXISTING OVERHEAD LINE - TO BE MODIFIED
- PROPOSED ACCESS SWATH
- PROPOSED ACCESS POINT
- PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION COMPOUND

##### DCO SUBMISSION ONLY

- PROPOSED NEW OVERHEAD LINE
- PROPOSED NEW UNDERGROUND CABLE
- PROPOSED ACCESS SWATH
- PROPOSED CABLE SEALING END COMPOUND

##### INDICATIVE ALTERNATIVE

- PROPOSED NEW OVERHEAD LINE
- PROPOSED NEW UNDERGROUND CABLE
- PROPOSED ACCESS SWATH
- PROPOSED CABLE SEALING END COMPOUND

**Notes**  
 This drawing is scaled at paper size A3, therefore any prints taken at smaller sizes will affect accuracy of the measurement units and should not be scaled against.

Coordinate System: British National Grid  
 Sheet 9: Central Grid Reference: 400000 Sheet 10: Central Grid Reference: 440000  
 0 12.5 25 50  
 Meters

FOR BACKGROUND MAPPING INFORMATION HAS BEEN USED

Rev	Date	Remarks	Drawn	Checked	Approved
A	02/10/2017	FIRST ISSUE	JOS	TT	SP

200

TADCASTER WEST INDICATIVE ALTERNATIVE CSEC POSITION

**nationalgrid**

Publication Number:			
Drawing Reference:			
XX			
Scale	Sheet Size	Sheet	Print
1:1,250	A3	SHEET 1 OF 1	A