Outlook

Oral Submission-Written Transcript - Trevor Seddon - [redacted] - Interested Party Reference number: [redacted]

From Trevor Seddon [redacted] >
Date Tue 2026-02-24 11:40
To Norwich to Tilbury <NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

1 attachment (17 KB)
Oral Submission-Written Transcript - Trevor Seddon - [redacted];

[redacted]

Interested Party Reference number: [redacted]

Please find attached my Written Transcript of my Oral Submission made on the morning of the 11th February 2026 at the Ipswich Town Bobby Robson Suite.

In summary, the questions that I would like detailed answers to are as follows;

Q1) In respect of the picturesque hamlet of Offton, National Grid's own documentation – Landscape and Visual Character Types ; Chapter 13 - identifies the Landscape Character Types surrounding Offton as an area that will experience a significant negative impact of the proposed Norwich to Tilbury infrastructure. Only two locations have been identified at this level of severity.

The other is Dedham Vale!

However, the mitigation approach differs materially between the two areas.

In Dedham Vale, undergrounding is proposed to reduce the acknowledged harm to landscape, heritage, and community value. In Offton, where the level of impact is described as comparable, the proposal remains overhead pylons.
This creates a clear issue of consistency and fairness.

If both locations are assessed as experiencing significant harm, can the Applicant explain, with evidence, why one community receives underground mitigation while the other does not?

Q2) Does continuing to deploy large-scale overhead pylons represent the best available solution. National Grid are addressing a 21st-century energy challenge using transmission technology developed in the last century. Steel lattice pylons are familiar, but they are not innovative or future-proofed when viable alternatives exist.

The Offton Parish Council has consistently requested that modern options, including offshore coordination, improved cabling techniques and HVDC undergrounding are independently evaluated alongside the antiquated technology preferred by National Grid
Can we please see an Independently validated report evaluating all costs associated with competing transmission solutions.

Q3) The baffling NT project plan for Offton is to demolish the existing 132kV line on the west of the hamlet and to re-route these UNDERGROUND to the east of the hamlet. The monster 50m high pylons will then run in the line vacated by the 132kV line. Difficult to understand for a layman and evidently impossible for National Grid to provide an explanation of Why!
Can we please have a rational detailed explanation of why this choice of development has been proposed, why not bury the 400kV line to the east of the hamlet and leave the existing pylons in place?

Invitation for PID's to visit the Hamlet of Offton.

We note that, despite the significant development proposals for Offton, PID's have not been invited by NT to visit the area, this is something that we would like to remedy and would be happy to escort PID's on a tour of the hamlet to describe the massive disruption to life and desecration habitat that is envisaged by NT.

Trevor Seddon

Good Morning, my remarks today will focus on the impact of this project on the picturesque hamlet of Offton where I live.

National Grid's own documentation – ***Landscape and Visual Character Types ; Chapter 13*** - identifies the Landscape Character Types surrounding Offton as an area that will experience a **significant negative impact** of the proposed Norwich to Tilbury infrastructure. Only two locations have been identified at this level of severity.

The other is Dedham Vale!

However, the mitigation approach differs materially between the two areas.

In Dedham Vale, undergrounding is proposed to reduce the acknowledged harm to landscape, heritage, and community value. In Offton, where the level of impact is described as comparable, the proposal remains overhead pylons.

This creates a clear issue of consistency and fairness.

If both locations are assessed as experiencing significant harm, can the Applicant explain, with evidence, why one community receives underground mitigation while the other does not?

Offton is not opposing the national requirement to move renewable energy from offshore generation into the grid.

What we question is whether continuing to deploy large-scale overhead pylons represents the best available solution. National Grid are addressing a 21st-century energy challenge using transmission technology developed in the last century. Steel lattice pylons are familiar, but they are not innovative or future-proofed when viable alternatives exist.

The Offton Parish Council has consistently requested that modern options, including offshore coordination, improved cabling techniques and HVDC undergrounding are independently evaluated alongside the antiquated technology preferred by National Grid

The baffling NT project plan for Offton is to demolish the existing 132kV line on the west of the hamlet and to re-route these UNDERGROUND to the east of the hamlet The monster 50m high pylons will then run in the line vacated by the 132kV line. Difficult to understand for a layman and evidently impossible for National Grid to provide an explanation of Why!

We have seen in other nationally significant cases, such as the Post Office Horizon IT scandal, how continuing with a contested solution despite credible concerns can cause lasting harm and loss of trust. Offton's concern is that avoidable impacts may be accepted without full evaluation of less damaging alternatives.

If Dedham Vale warrants undergrounding because of the significance of its impact, then Offton, identified as experiencing comparable harm, should be afforded the same consideration; indeed, we note that PID's have not visited the area, something that should be corrected.

We respectfully request that the impact on Offton is reassessed, that alternatives are transparently evaluated, and that mitigation consistent with other equally affected areas is applied.

Thank you.