I object strongly to this proposal as there are better methods to transmit electricity from the offshore wind farms to London where all this electricity is going. Offshore connections would be much more efficient

I object to the Norwich to Tilbury pylons project which will bring severe harm to the environment, communities, landscapes & heritage of East Anglia. Viable and deliverable alternatives such as an offshore grid and undergrounding of cables. Have not been presented for this consultation and therefore this consultation is inadequate, as it has failed to give alternatives to this extremely damaging route.

I am not against the upgrade of the grid to cope with the coming change to renewable energy, in fact I support all the efforts to decarbonise the nation's electricity generation. But there are much better & less damaging alternatives to a 180km route of pylons through East Anglia. Most of the power that is being delivered by the pylons is coming from offshore wind power, it makes little sense to bring this power to shore at several different locations to transport the power to Tilbury on land. When all these wind farms could be connected out at sea & the power brought to land at Tilbury where it is needed. In your own documentation you state that 92% of this electricity is required in London, so why should East Anglia suffer the environmental & social disruption for London?

National Grid have stated that an offshore option isn't viable & can't be delivered for 2030, or at a reasonable cost compared to pylons. However, in the National Grid document **Eastern Green Link 3 and 4 Strategic Options Report February 2024,** it is stated in Paras 5.0.2 & 5.0.3 that the overhead pylon option is inferior to an offshore cable for reasons of reliability, capacity & being able to deliver in a reasonable timescale. Yet here on the Norwich to Tilbury line, the opposite is stated & completely disregard an offshore option. This to me seems completely crazy, an offshore option should be considered.

'*5.0.2 Power flows on AC transmission system circuits cannot be controlled to the same extent as can be achieved using HVDC connections. This lower level of controllability can result in higher power flows particularly during transmission system fault conditions. Taking account of the potential for higher power flows that could be expected, therefore to provide the potential equivalent capacity, the AC option would need to consist of a high capacity (6,930MW) double circuit route to meet any high loading during fault conditions.*

5.0.3 The required capacity HVDC links over the proposed distance have comparable capital costs, but much lower lifetime costs than the alternative onshore AC option in this case. It is also recognised that delivery of an onshore solution with a long route length, carries much higher delivery risk than the HVDC reinforcement proposals (EGL3 and EGL4) that are currently being progressed. The use of overhead lines is not considered to be feasible because they cannot be delivered by the required 2030 timescale. Consequently, an option using overhead line technology is not considered to meet the National Grid | Eastern Green Link 3 and 4 | Strategic Options Report 36 identified need for additional transmission system capacity and therefore, was discounted.'

I have recently read a paper written by the London School of Economics (LSE) which looks at the effects of property prices when pylons are constructed near to existing dwellings. The paper is entitled:-

Are friends electric? Valuing the social costs of power lines using house prices
By Cheng Keat Tang Stephen Gibbons, August 2023.

This paper comes to the following conclusions:-

'Properties within 0 to 300m experience a 9.6% reduction in their market value after pylons are installed. These effects remain stable at around 3.8% for properties between 300 and 600m, around 6.4% for those between 600 and 900m and around 4.8% for those between 900 and 1200m. Beyond 1200m, the estimated effects are quite imprecisely estimated at 2.0%'.

Why has this not been taken into consideration in your consultation document? This is surely an extremely important factor & should be costed into the overall cost of the project, as an economic harm to a large swathe of East Anglia. In our small village of Aldham, where most properties will be within 300m of a pylon, that would result in an estimated economic loss of around £8.4m. If all houses up to 1200m away from a pylon were added to this calculation & then projected that along the whole of 180km, this would add up to Billions of pounds of economic loss and harm to the East Anglian community, way outstripping National Grid's so-called estimate for building these pylons. If the Treasury Green Book rules had been adhered to in this investment appraisal, then the cost of this project would massively outweigh any estimate for an offshore alternative. Surely a better option would be to build an offshore grid & avoid these economic harms to all these people.

Other than the visual and environmental impacts of the Norwich to Tilbury proposed pylons, there are many concerns about effects on health, wellbeing and safety. Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) emitted from high voltage cables have been linked to various health conditions such as childhood leukemia (Wertheimer and Leeper, 1979; Feychting and Alhbom, 1993), various forms of adult cancers (Feychting and Ahlbom, 1994; Elliott et al., 2013), suicide and depression (Baris and Armstrong, 1990), heart disease (Sorahan and Nichols, 2004) and neurodegenerative disorders (Sobel et al., 1995; Savitz et al., 1998). Surely in this day and age we should be avoiding such harms, National Grid may possibly argue that there isn't enough evidence, but to me that is like the tobacco industry denying smoking caused cancer. Surely to be safe wouldn't it be better to avoid the possibility of these harms and have an offshore option instead. If National Grid goes ahead with this project knowing that there are these heath harms, then they are surely being negligent in their duty of care to the public.

Strong winds and natural disasters can topple power lines, causing fire risk. One of the deadliest wildfire that completely burnt down the town of Paradise in California in 2018 was due to power transmission lines.(For more information, refer to https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/15/business/ pge-fire.html). Surely an offshore grid would be much safer and better for everyone.

Environmentally this project is a disaster for East Anglia. Vast swathes of countryside will be ripped up, concreted over & dug up. Huge acreages of prime

farmland will be put out of action for many years and may not ever recover. Countless numbers of trees will be felled in the name of 'Green' energy. Many species of flora and fauna will be affected & may never recover. We have bee orchids that grow in our garden & some of these are within the project boundaries, we have Red Kites, Buzzards & bats that use our garden as home. What is the consequence for these species? No one has visited us for an ecological survey, so how do you know what impact this project will have on the flora & fauna? I thought we were trying to save the planet by converting to green energy, not wreck it as this project will. Surely an offshore grid would be much better than the environmental harm that this project will inflict on East Anglia.

Our house is Grade II listed, if the farmer next to us was to propose building a modern structure as close to our house as you propose building a pylon, planning law would prohibit such a building as it would be detrimental to the setting of a listed building. Yet National Grid appears to be able to ignore such planning regulations & in fact seems to be going out of its way to build as close as possible to our listed house. The original proposal was to have a straight line going to the west of our village, a much more direct route & one that would have impacted on less than half the listed buildings the current proposed route does. WHY? It doesn't make sense, but none of this makes sense, when the best option is an offshore grid.

The Gunning Principles dictate how consultations should be carried out, these guidelines are legally binding & National Grid has failed in several areas & therefore this consultation should be declared illegal.

I proposed a slight change to the pylon route (if it is to go ahead) through our village, which I believe would benefit the majority of the village and reduce the harm. But your response was not adequate

4.13.66 Suggest alternative route between pylons TB054 to TB060, so that the Project is routed away from Aldham village on a better trajectory that would be shielded by existing trees and follow a lower altitude and therefore reducing the impact on our village (plan provided by respondent).

National Grid response;-

These suggested alternative alignments pass to the east of Aldhamhall Wood and to the south of Aldham Hall. Whilst noting that they do reduce effects on residential amenity to residents on the eastern edge of Aldham (albeit such effects are not considered in isolation to be inconsistent with policy), the proposed alternatives increase effects on the substantially unscreened Grade II listed building at Chippetts Farmhouse. They are less direct and require more angle pylons and additional pylons compared with the 2023 preferred draft alignment so are considered less consistent with Holford Rules. Overall, the alternatives are less preferred for these reasons. National Grid has made some adjustments in response to feedback and other studies that have moved pylons TB054, TB055 and TB056 further from the residential properties at the edge of Aldham. We will continue to make changes to the 2024 preferred draft alignment where practicable as we receive further feedback and as the Project develops.

However the pylons would be no where as near to Chippets farm as Brick Cottages, which is also Grade II listed & you would take the pylons much further away from a Grade II* listed property of Aldham Hall & have a lesser impact on may properties in the main village of Aldham. So as far as I can see there are many more positives to this proposal than negatives. National Grid has a preconceived proposal, which is against the Gunning principles & are unwilling to listen to alternatives.

Power lines also generate noise pollution. Corona noise (crackle or hum) is emitted when air around electric cables is ionized, particularly on wet days. (For more technical details, see [redacted] Aeolian noise is generated from vibrations when strong winds blow against the cables and pylons. The bigger the transmission lines, the greater the noise from both sources. Our garden is within 50m of these cables, in fact the project boundary is within our garden, the noise generated will be intolerable & probably make it impossible to sleep at night, what mitigation measures are National Grid willing to make to counter all this extra noise?

This consultation appears to be Diktat, no alternatives given to consider & ignoring the public responses.

Please listen & propose an offshore grid, it will be much better for everyone & the planet.