

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)

Norwich to Tilbury Project

Procedural Note

This request for additional submissions was received on 19 February 2026 with a deadline of 23:59 on 26 February 2026. Due to the short timescale, the school half-term period, and full-time responsibilities within our household, we have not been able to obtain professional planning or legal assistance in preparing this submission.

We respectfully reserve the right to refine or supplement these submissions should further evidence become available during the Examination.

Continued Opposition to the Proposed Development

We reiterate our continued opposition to the proposed overhead line alignment and associated works affecting our property and surrounding area, as set out in our Relevant Representation submitted on 27 November 2025.

This submission focuses specifically on the proposed temporary construction compound, Plot G-4/53, located along the A129 adjacent to our home at [REDACTED], and the surrounding road layout.

Objection to Proposed Construction Compound Location

We object to the siting of the proposed compound at its currently identified location at Plot G-4/53 on the following grounds:

- Highway safety risks
- Unsuitable and constrained road layout
- Proximity to residential properties
- Proximity to sensitive receptors and households with protected characteristics
- Significant level differences and topographical constraints
- Lack of clarity regarding the compound's exact use
- Absence of evidence demonstrating that this location is necessary
- Potential for unacceptable hours of operation (including 24-hour working)

1. Road Layout and Highway Safety

The proposed compound is located along the A129 immediately alongside our home, garden, and garden room (which sits along the side/rear boundary of our property).

Our property sits within a looped road configuration:

- The A129 runs along our side and rear boundaries.
- A narrow rural lane runs along the front of our property.

This lane was not designed to accommodate sustained or diverted through-traffic. It is:

- Narrow and constrained
- Insufficient in width for safe two-way flow
- Bordered by blind bends at both ends
- On an incline due to level changes
- Without adequate forward visibility

When congestion or disruption occurs on the A129, vehicles divert down this lane. Even where temporary traffic management is introduced, drivers frequently:

- Ignore signal controls
- Travel at excessive speed
- Attempt unsafe passing manoeuvres

This creates hazardous entry and exit conditions at both ends of the lane and at our property access.

We hold photographic and video evidence demonstrating the unsafe conditions that arise during even short-term disruption of the A129. A recent partial carriageway closure during a relatively quiet half-term week resulted in significant congestion, unsafe manoeuvres and disturbance to such an extent that we temporarily vacated the property until the road was reopened.

The introduction of sustained construction traffic, including HGV movements associated with a compound at this location, would materially intensify these existing safety concerns.

These highway constraints cannot be fully appreciated from drawings alone and require on-site observation.

2. Topography and Level Differences

There is an approximate 1.5–2 metres (5–6 feet) level difference between sections of the road and adjacent residential land, retained in part by a raised garden planter boundary.

This level change:

- Amplifies noise propagation
- Alters light spill effects
- Increases visual dominance
- Intensifies the perceived scale of activity

The compound's proximity to the retained raised boundary planter (not clearly identifiable on the submitted plans) may have implications for subsoil stability and ground loading. Given the dwelling's close proximity to this boundary, any change in ground conditions, vibration, or sustained loading could introduce additional risk which has not been assessed within the submitted documentation.

The compound would not sit neutrally within the landscape but would occupy elevated and visually prominent ground in immediate proximity to dwellings.

3. Proximity to Sensitive Receptors

The compound would operate in immediate proximity to residential properties, including our own household.

Members of our household have protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. The Examining Authority is under a Public Sector Equality Duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity.

Our household includes individuals who are particularly sensitive to noise, vibration, flashing lights, and sustained environmental disturbance. There are no periods during the day when the property is regularly unoccupied. In planning terms, our home constitutes a sensitive receptor.

The intensity of compound activity, including but not limited to, HGV arrivals, engine idling, reversing alarms, lighting towers, plant operation and potential 24-hour working, would have a disproportionate and harmful effect on our household circumstances.

A site inspection would enable the Examining Authority to properly appreciate the spatial relationship between the proposed compound and these sensitive receptors, and to understand the potential for disproportionate impact.

4. Lack of Clarity Regarding Compound Use and Hours

We have not been provided with sufficient clarity regarding:

- The precise function of this compound
- The operational scale
- Storage activities
- Lighting specifications
- Noise-generating plant
- Confirmed hours of operation

We understand that works may be authorised on a 7-day, 24-hour basis. Such operational flexibility would be wholly inappropriate in this constrained residential setting.

Without detailed clarity, it is not possible to assess whether impacts can be mitigated.

In the absence of defined parameters, affected parties cannot meaningfully assess or respond to the likely impacts.

5. Alternative Site Assessment

We have not seen evidence demonstrating:

- That alternative compound locations were robustly assessed;
- That less harmful options were discounted for sound planning reasons;
- That this precise location is necessary.

We respectfully request clear evidence of:

- The site selection methodology used;
- Alternative sites considered;
- Criteria applied in site comparison;
- Justification for selecting this specific location adjacent to residential properties.

There appear to be other sections of the A129 corridor and surrounding land parcels that may offer safer and less harmful siting opportunities away from sensitive receptors.

Request for Site Inspection

We formally request that the Examining Authority undertake a site inspection (accompanied or unaccompanied as appropriate) to assess:

- The compound access point along the A129
- The narrow lane to the front of our property
- The blind bends and visibility constraints
- The incline and level differences
- The spatial relationship between the compound and surrounding homes

A site visit would enable proper understanding of:

- The hazardous road geometry
- Existing traffic conflict points
- The constrained width of the lane
- The topographical relationships
- The proximity to sensitive residential receptors
- The likely disproportionate impact on our household's protected circumstances

These matters cannot be adequately understood through plans alone.

Request to Participate in Hearing

We request the opportunity to speak at a future Open Floor Hearing in relation to the compound location and associated impacts.

Due to full-time responsibilities within our household, we would prefer to participate remotely. Where remote participation is not available, we reserve the option for a suitable professional representative to speak on our behalf.

Conclusion

We continue to oppose the overhead line alignment and associated works as previously stated.

In relation to the temporary compound, we consider that:

- The road network is unsuitable and unsafe for sustained construction traffic;
- The compound is positioned at a constrained and hazardous location;
- The proximity to sensitive residential receptors is inappropriate;
- The level differences intensify impacts;
- Potential 24-hour operational flexibility would be unacceptable;
- It has not been demonstrated that this specific location is necessary;
- A site inspection is required to properly assess these matters.

We respectfully request that the Examining Authority give full and careful consideration to whether the compound should be relocated to a safer and less harmful position.