

I wish to register my strong and unequivocal objection to the proposed Norwich–Tilbury transmission line, particularly the sections that would cut through Fordham, Essex and the Colne Valley landscape. The current proposal is wholly unacceptable and represents a short sighted, environmentally damaging, and needlessly destructive approach to energy transmission.

Let me be absolutely clear: I fully support the transmission of renewable energy from offshore wind farms. It is essential for the UK's energy future. However, supporting renewable energy does not mean accepting an outdated, landscape destroying pylon corridor that inflicts permanent damage on rural communities and protected environments. The method being proposed is entirely the wrong one.

East Anglia is already blighted by a substantial lattice of power lines and enormous pylons. Driving a further chain of industrial scale pylons through the East Anglian countryside and around Fordham and the beautiful Colne Valley in particular, would cause irreversible harm. These landscapes are valued precisely because they remain unspoiled. Installing towering steel structures across them would destroy the very qualities that make them unique. It is astonishing that such a route is even being considered when less damaging alternatives exist.

The environmental consequences are not minor inconveniences — they are major, long-term losses. The Colne Valley is a vital ecological corridor, and the proposed pylons would fragment habitats, disrupt wildlife, and degrade an area that should be protected, not sacrificed. The construction footprint alone would cause significant damage, and the ongoing presence of pylons would permanently scar the landscape.

The impact on local communities is equally unacceptable. Residents in and around Fordham would be forced to live with intrusive infrastructure dominating their views, reducing the enjoyment of their homes and countryside. Property values would inevitably fall, and the noise and visual intrusion of high voltage lines would erode quality of life. These are not abstract concerns — they are real, predictable consequences that the current proposal simply ignores.

The economic damage should not be underestimated. Rural tourism in the Colne Valley and surrounding villages depends on the area's natural beauty. Once that is compromised, it cannot be restored. Local businesses, farms, and the wider community would bear the cost of a decision made without regard for the long-term wellbeing of the region.

It is unacceptable that National Grid's proposal fails to prioritise credible, modern alternatives. Both an offshore subsea route and undergrounding are viable, proven options — and when delivered using HVDC technology, they are far more efficient and environmentally responsible than traditional AC overhead lines.

- HVDC subsea cables are already widely used for long distance transmission. They avoid inland environmental destruction entirely and offer lower losses, greater resilience, and none of the visual blight of pylons.
- HVDC underground cables require narrower corridors, fewer above ground installations, and dramatically reduce landscape and habitat disruption. They eliminate the need for towering pylons and the permanent industrialisation of rural areas.

These alternatives are not speculative or experimental — they are established technologies used across the UK and internationally. National Grid's refusal to prioritise them in this project is indefensible.

For all these reasons, I urge the planning authority to reject the current Norwich–Tilbury proposal outright. The environmental, social, and economic costs of overhead pylons through East Anglia in general and Fordham and the Colne Valley in particular are far too high, especially when better, cleaner, and more responsible solutions are readily available. I expect this objection to be taken seriously, and I welcome further engagement in the consultation process.