

From: [karen Fisher](#)
To: [Norwich to Tilbury](#)
Subject: Copy of oral submission made at Open Hearing - Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 February 2026 14:13:48
Attachments: [Planning Hearing.docx](#)

Dear Sirs

Please find attached a copy of the oral submission that I made at the Open Hearing in Norfolk on 13th February.

Please note that for some reason the recording that has been put on the project website does not include the first line of my submission namely "I live in a conservation area in a listed, 17th century thatched cottage in Forncett St Peter"

I would request a site visit by the inspectors to fully understand the narrow lanes of our villages and how difficult it will be for construction traffic and residents to use these lanes simultaneously as well as the huge risk to ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders when footpaths are closed and there are road closures/diversions and extra traffic will need to use these lanes.

For ease of reference my full oral submission is set out below:

Good morning. I live in a conservation area in a listed, 17th century thatched cottage in Forncett St Peter, a small village in South Norfolk mentioned in the Domesday book with a thousand year old church. There is a chapel where John Wesley preached, it has been written about by Wordsworth and Larkin and the Forncett Hoard of roman coins now housed in the British Museum were discovered there. There is a 13 acre triple SI site Forncett Meadow and the village sits in the Tas valley through which runs one of only 200 vitally important chalk rivers in the world. These would be at huge risk of irreparable damage from run off from construction work should this proposal go ahead.

It is also home to a wonderful community whose lives have been thrown into disarray for the last 4 years with many finding their mental health severely affected by the worry of these proposals which would leave Forncett sandwiched between the existing and the proposed pylon lines creating a dense industrial wirescape in clear breach of the Holford Rules. 45 existing pylons can be seen from the fields behind my house and National Grid states that there could be visibility of up to 70 pylons from the more elevated parts of the village and that for the vast majority of the route there will be a significant impact on landscape character. Our village would be encircled by metal towers looming over us on either side of the valley.

The computer generated visualisations of the proposed route through Forncett provided at the consultations did not include the existing pylon line to show the true cumulative effect and is just one example of the many deficiencies in the consultation process, some of which have been referenced by other speakers.

We are told that costings for this project are about 5 million pounds per kilometre yet costings for Bramford to Twinstead appear to be about 24 million pounds per kilometre. How can Norwich to Tilbury be 5 times cheaper? What have National Grid NOT included in its costings of this project?

Why has a route through unspoiled countryside been chosen when it could have run alongside major A roads with easy access which would have caused only short term disruption whereas the inaccessible routes through our villages will cause permanent destruction of areas of natural beauty and critically important ecosystems and adversely affect communities, homes,

livelihoods and the mental health and wellbeing of so many people. Why have cheaper, better and faster alternatives not been properly considered? Is it that pylons give easy opportunities for the industrialisation of East Anglia with a proliferation of solar and BESS site applications, including a solar proposal that would engulf our village? These will generate huge profits for corporations at the expense of local communities and the real human cost must not be underestimated.

This is the wrong proposal in the wrong place and I would ask that further hearings be held to consider the alternatives in greater detail. A responsible and evidence based decision must reject the current overhead pylon route and require that National Grid pursue an environmentally and socially sustainable alternative to protect heritage, ecology, nature and wellbeing of all communities along the route.

Yours faithfully

Karen Fisher

Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

Good morning. I live in a conservation area in a listed, 17th century thatched cottage in Forncett St Peter, a small village in South Norfolk mentioned in the Domesday book with a thousand year old church. There is a chapel where John Wesley preached, it has been written about by Wordsworth and Larkin and the Forncett Hoard of roman coins now housed in the British Museum were discovered there. There is a 13 acre triple SI site Forncett Meadow and the village sits in the Tas valley through which runs one of only 200 vitally important chalk rivers in the world. These would be at huge risk of irreparable damage from run off from construction work should this proposal go ahead.

It is also home to a wonderful community whose lives have been thrown into disarray for the last 4 years with many finding their mental health severely affected by the worry of these proposals which would leave Forncett sandwiched between the existing and the proposed pylon lines creating a dense industrial wirescape in clear breach of the Holford Rules. 45 existing pylons can be seen from the fields behind my house and National Grid states that there could be visibility of up to 70 pylons from the more elevated parts of the village and that for the vast majority of the route there will be a significant impact on landscape character. Our village would be encircled by metal towers looming over us on either side of the valley.

The computer generated visualisations of the proposed route through Forncett provided at the consultations did not include the existing pylon line to show the true cumulative effect and is just one example of the many deficiencies in the consultation process, some of which have been referenced by other speakers.

We are told that costings for this project are about 5 million pounds per kilometre yet costings for Bramford to Twinstead appear to be about 24 million pounds per kilometre. How can Norwich to Tilbury be 5 times cheaper? What have National Grid NOT included in its costings of this project?

Why has a route through unspoiled countryside been chosen when it could have run alongside major A roads with easy access which would have caused only short term disruption whereas the inaccessible routes through our villages will cause permanent destruction of areas of natural beauty and critically important ecosystems and adversely affect communities, homes, livelihoods and the mental health and wellbeing of so many people. Why have cheaper, better and faster alternatives not been properly considered? Is it that pylons give easy opportunities for the industrialisation of East Anglia with a proliferation of solar and BESS site applications, including a solar proposal that would engulf our village? These will generate huge profits for corporations at the expense of local communities and the real human cost must not be underestimated.

This is the wrong proposal in the wrong place and I would ask that further hearings be held to consider the alternatives in greater detail. A responsible and evidence based decision must reject the current overhead pylon route and require that National Grid pursue an environmentally and socially sustainable alternative to protect heritage, ecology, nature and wellbeing of all communities along the route.

Jessica Dunlop

From: karen Fisher [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2026 16:21
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Fw: Copy of oral submission made at Open Hearing - Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]
Attachments: Planning Hearing.docx
Categories: CO, Deadline Submission

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sirs

Further to my email below of 14th February I would like it noted that the transcript of what I said at the open hearing on 13th February has also been omitted from the public record. I am concerned that my submission available to the public does not contain the details of the village and property to which I am referring. I would ask that this error be corrected and the record amended accordingly.

In addition to my earlier submission it has come to my attention that there is an ongoing planning application in Forncett St Peter for an extremely large lake of 12,230 square metres which will be within 150m of pylon RG040. This application has raised concerns from Mr Hickling the Historic Environment Officer in particular in relation to roman and medieval artefacts that have been found in that area and lists the provisions that should be put in place should planning be granted for the lake. I would ask that should planning be granted for the Norwich to Tilbury project that National Grid are expected to meet the same provisions. The following is the letter sent by the Officer to the local planning department at South Norfolk Council.

"RE: 2025/3624: Gilderswood Farm Gilderswood Lane Forncett St Peter The proposed development consists of a lake of significant size which will have a very significant ground impact. Roman pottery as well as medieval and later metal objects have been recovered from the field immediately to the north, suggesting at least Roman activity in this area. Metal detecting in the field to the southeast has produced a large number of artefacts of Roman and later dates, including a number of Roman coins. Consequently, there is potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest (buried archaeological remains, especially of Roman date in this case) may be present at the site and that their significance will be affected by the proposed development. If planning permission is granted, we therefore ask that this be subject to a programme of archaeological mitigatory work in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2024) para. 218. We suggest that the following conditions are imposed:- A) No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and 1) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording, 2) The programme for post investigation assessment, 3) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording, 4) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation, 5) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation and 6) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the written scheme of investigation. and, B) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the written scheme of investigation approved under condition (A). and, C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological written scheme of investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured. In this instance the programme of archaeological mitigatory work will comprise one phase - the monitoring of groundworks for the development under archaeological supervision and control. A brief for the archaeological work can be obtained from Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Service. Please note that we now charge for our services. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact me. Yours sincerely, Steve Hickling, Historic Environment Officer Correspondence address: Norfolk Historic Environment Record Archive Centre"

Yours faithfully

Karen Fisher

Sent: Saturday, February 14, 2026 at 2:13 PM

From: "karen Fisher" [REDACTED]

To: NorwichToTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Subject: Copy of oral submission made at Open Hearing - Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

Dear Sirs

Please find attached a copy of the oral submission that I made at the Open Hearing in Norfolk on 13th February.

Please note that for some reason the recording that has been put on the project website does not include the first line of my submission namely "I live in a conservation area in a listed, 17th century thatched cottage in Forncett St Peter"

I would request a site visit by the inspectors to fully understand the narrow lanes of our villages and how difficult it will be for construction traffic and residents to use these lanes simultaneously as well as the huge risk to ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders when footpaths are closed and there are road closures/diversions and extra traffic will need to use these lanes.

For ease of reference my full oral submission is set out below:

Good morning. I live in a conservation area in a listed, 17th century thatched cottage in Forncett St Peter, a small village in South Norfolk mentioned in the Domesday book with a thousand year old church. There is a chapel where John Wesley preached, it has been written about by Wordsworth and Larkin and the Forncett Hoard of roman coins now housed in the British Museum were discovered there. There is a 13 acre triple SI site Forncett Meadow and the village sits in the Tas valley through which runs one of only 200 vitally important chalk rivers in the world. These would be at huge risk of irreparable damage from run off from construction work should this proposal go ahead.

It is also home to a wonderful community whose lives have been thrown into disarray for the last 4 years with many finding their mental health severely affected by the worry of these proposals which would leave Forncett sandwiched between the existing and the proposed pylon lines creating a dense industrial wirescape in clear breach of the Holford Rules. 45 existing pylons can be seen from the fields behind my house and National Grid states that there could be visibility of up to 70 pylons from the more elevated parts of the village and that for the vast majority of the route there will be a significant impact on landscape character. Our village would be encircled by metal towers looming over us on either side of the valley.

The computer generated visualisations of the proposed route through Forncett provided at the consultations did not include the existing pylon line to show the true cumulative effect and is just one example of the many deficiencies in the consultation process, some of which have been referenced by other speakers.

We are told that costings for this project are about 5 million pounds per kilometre yet costings for Bramford to Twinstead appear to be about 24 million pounds per kilometre. How can Norwich to Tilbury be 5 times cheaper? What have National Grid NOT included in its costings of this project?

Why has a route through unspoiled countryside been chosen when it could have run alongside major A roads with easy access which would have caused only short term disruption whereas the inaccessible routes through our villages will cause permanent destruction of areas of natural beauty and critically important ecosystems and adversely affect communities, homes, livelihoods and the mental health and wellbeing of so many people. Why have cheaper, better and faster alternatives not been properly considered? Is it that pylons give easy opportunities for the industrialisation of East Anglia with a proliferation of solar and BESS site applications, including a solar proposal that

would engulf our village? These will generate huge profits for corporations at the expense of local communities and the real human cost must not be underestimated.

This is the wrong proposal in the wrong place and I would ask that further hearings be held to consider the alternatives in greater detail. A responsible and evidence based decision must reject the current overhead pylon route and require that National Grid pursue an environmentally and socially sustainable alternative to protect heritage, ecology, nature and wellbeing of all communities along the route.

Yours faithfully

Karen Fisher