

From: [Gareth Morgan](#)
To: [Norwich to Tilbury](#)
Subject: Written representation in place of speaking at the Open Floor Hearings for N2T
Date: 22 January 2026 09:58:40

Dear Sir or Madam,

1. Introduction and status of this submission

This letter is submitted as a written representation in relation to the examination of the proposed electricity connection between Norwich and Tilbury.

I do not feel able to participate effectively in the Open Floor Hearings. I understand, however, that written submissions are afforded equal weight within the examination process, and I therefore submit the following points in writing for the Inspectors' consideration.

2. Purpose of this representation

This submission requests that the Inspectors seek clarification from the applicant on matters that appear central to compliance with the National Policy Statements for Energy, in particular the requirement to demonstrate that reasonable alternatives have been properly considered and assessed.

3. Seabed survey and offshore route assessment

(Relevant to NPS EN-1, paragraphs 4.2.7–4.2.8: assessment of reasonable alternatives; and EN-5 where applicable)

I respectfully ask the Inspectors to seek clarification on the following:

3.1 Whether a full seabed survey has been carried out for the proposed Norwich–Tilbury offshore route.

3.2 If so, when the survey was undertaken, its scope, and the level of detail involved.

3.3 Whether this work included in-depth route planning and feasibility analysis sufficient to allow meaningful comparison with the overland alternative.

3.4 Whether the findings of this work—including any offshore route options identified, assessed, or discounted—can be published for the purposes of the examination, together with the reasons for any options being ruled out.

These points appear directly relevant to whether the offshore option has been examined with a level of rigour comparable to that applied to the overland route.

4. Comparative time and cost expenditure

(Relevant to NPS EN-1 paragraphs 4.2.8 and 4.2.9: proportionality, justification, and decision-making transparency)

I ask that the Inspectors seek clear and comparable information on:

4.1 The amount of money and staff time spent to date on investigating and developing the offshore option.

4.2 The amount of money and staff time spent to date on the overland route.

4.3 How these figures compare, particularly in light of the apparent escalation of overland route costs associated with repeated correspondence, surveys, consultancy work, public exhibitions, venue hire for meetings, and related administrative activity.

This information appears relevant to understanding whether the overland route has been disproportionately progressed relative to alternatives.

5. Funding of route development costs

(Relevant to NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.2.1 and the principle of transparency in nationally significant infrastructure decision-making)

I respectfully request that the Inspectors clarify:

5.1 How costs associated with both the offshore and overland routes are being funded.

5.2 Whether these costs are borne directly by the applicant, recovered through electricity consumers, supported by government funding, or met through another mechanism.

This information may be relevant to considerations of proportionality, public interest, and value for money.

6. Comparative environmental assessment

(Relevant to NPS EN-1 Chapter 4; Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations; and the requirement to compare alternatives)

I ask that the Inspectors seek confirmation of:

6.1 Whether a comparative environmental assessment has been undertaken between the offshore and overland routes.

6.2 Whether this assessment considers both short-term construction impacts and long-term operational and environmental effects.

6.3 Which route was assessed as being less environmentally damaging, the criteria used to reach that conclusion, and—where possible—an indication of the relative scale of environmental harm associated with each option.

This appears fundamental to assessing whether environmental effects have been avoided or minimised where reasonably possible, as required by policy.

7. Closing remarks

Given the scale, cost, and long-term impacts of this project on communities and the environment, I believe it is important that these matters are clearly evidenced and scrutinised as part of the examination. I would therefore be grateful if the Inspectors would consider seeking formal, documented responses from the applicant on the points raised above.

Thank you for your consideration of this written representation.

Yours faithfully

Gareth Morgan