

To the Planning Inspectorate,

Further to my formal objection to the National Grid Norwich to Tilbury Pylons Development Consent Order in November 2025, I would like to add to my earlier submissions and reflect on recent hearings.

My property is a terraced house within a wider condominium known as The Vale, located not far from the Norwich Substation. It is situated in a rural area and is classified as NDHA (the Henstead House), originally built as a workhouse in 1836. South Norfolk Council's response in July 2024 to the Statutory Consultation undertaken by NG highlighted the harmful effect that the proposed wires and pylons would have on its historic setting.

Though each resident has private land, the condominium includes communal grounds with gardens, a driveway and parking areas.

1. The communication throughout the consultation process has been inconsistent, poorly coordinated, and lacking transparency.

a) Two proposed pylons with overhead cables are to be erected just outside the perimeter of The Vale. Given this proximity, I had reasonably assumed that all residents would receive key correspondence regarding the project timelines and landowner consultations. However, not all residents received the October/November 2025 letter informing them of the 27/11/2025 deadline, nor the June 2025 correspondence regarding landowner consultations (I didn't). Only after a meeting was called with Fisher German representatives was this group of residents informed that the contractors intended to access The Vale to reroute the back lower voltage power line to move the higher voltage line closer. This would have required digging up our only driveway. A driveway that all residents use and have all recently paid to resurface.

b) Very poor organisation and coordination transpire also in updating data and responses sent to NG. I rent the property next door to mine as office space. I have forwarded questionnaires to my landlady to which she has replied both online and by post. Despite this I have kept receiving the same questionnaires and letters asking for replies. I am also aware that the provision of maps and project information about the rerouting of the electricity line mentioned above has been unclear and contradictory, with inaccurate or inconsistent data. In some instances, map keys did not correspond to the maps themselves, and when residents requested clarifications, the representatives were unable to provide satisfactory explanations. As a result, residents still lack access to consistent and comprehensible maps clearly marking the affected areas.

c) All information on the project is lacking transparency: the Community Letters are (expensive) marketing material with no accurate information on the project: National Grid's cost comparison with alternative projects vaguely states that alternatives could be 4.5 or 11 times more expensive than the proposed overhead line project, but fails to clarify what costs have been accounted for or how these figures were derived. Also email responses to specific questions on distances of pylons and cables have been ambiguous. Moreover, the language used and the procedural information in written and sometimes verbal communication is very often obscure to those who are not familiar with technical, bureaucratic and legal jargon. This is very concerning as it prevents many interested parties from giving meaningful responses.

2. There has been no proper consultation

Neither I nor my neighbours felt that proposals were still formative when we were made aware of the NG AC cables and lattice pylon project, and that alternative options were realistically being evaluated and presented. Multiple studies and responses during the Statutory Consultation have highlighted the availability of alternative solutions, yet the project under consideration has remained solely focused on overhead pylons and AC cables.

3. Not enough time has been given to allow for appropriate analysis of alternative options. While I support the transition to green energy and the need to upgrade the electricity network to meet future demands the 2031 deadline has been questioned by the independent review commissioned by Norfolk Suffolk and Essex County Councils. The current proposal treats the East of England merely as an "energy corridor." This approach results in energy produced offshore being routed through our region, causing devastating impacts on local communities and environments while providing little local benefit. Additionally, the escalating costs of other ongoing UK energy projects raise serious concerns about financial management and efficiency. I understand that these projects have not been nationally coordinated, leading to unnecessary duplication and avoidable land take. The forthcoming Strategic Spatial Energy Plan promises to deliver a coherent, cost-effective and publicly acceptable national grid strategy. Current network capacity has been deemed sufficient for connections until 2035 by the above-mentioned Independent Review. This presents an opportunity to take a step back, pause the examination, and fully evaluate alternatives that minimise harm and duplication.

4. Climate change is causing more frequent storms, which are putting higher stress on overhead networks compared to underground options. Recent storm events in early 2026 have caused significant damage and outages in the UK and Europe, underscoring the vulnerability of overhead lines. This adds to my concerns that the proposal's reliance on high onshore pylons and overhead cables is an anachronistic choice.

For all the above reasons I respectfully ask the Planning Inspectorate to pause this examination and require National Grid to fully explore alternatives to overhead pylons that protect communities, heritage, environment, and public welfare. The long-term wellbeing of residents and the environment must take precedence over short-term convenience or presumed cost savings.

Yours sincerely,

Flora Leone