

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2026 21:13
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Your ref EN020027 - Interested Party Reference [REDACTED]

Categories: Deadline Submission

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

Dear Sirs,

We have protested before about the legal deficiencies in National Grid's proposals and note that their representations are commonly misleading or simply untrue.

The Holford Rules clearly state that the overhead power lines should avoid areas with the highest amenity. It is clear that the intention was (and continues to be) to preserve the quality of the natural environment that has existed undamaged for so long.

Those areas provide an opportunity for so many people to enjoy the beauty of nature untainted by human development. This is hugely beneficial for so many people both physically and mentally. Close to where I live, in addition to many walks and other rural facilities, there is an ancient bluebell wood that provides recreation and relaxation to so many visitors throughout the year - it has a wide variety of flora, including protected species, and fauna, including many species of birds. The proposals by National Grid would have a hugely negative impact on everyone who currently enjoys this environment and it is the job of the planners to preserve it.

There are clearly viable alternatives to overhead power lines, in particular burying cables underground or constructing an offshore grid. In either case, it would be appropriate to use the most up-to-date technology which would give longer term benefits in respect of efficiency and, undoubtedly, cost. The current proposals do not use up-to-date technology as used in other parts of the world and in their proposals National Grid have not seen fit to provide the most basic comprehensive economic justification for the scheme; in the costings that they have provided there are clearly significant costs that have not been recognised and have thus been excluded.

The current proposals ignore the fact that untold damage would be done to large swathes of open countryside along the proposed route and, in particular, through the Dedham Vale and the valleys of the River Colne and the River Stour. Landscapes would be permanently destroyed for no good reason other than to line the pockets of wealthy investors.

As has been argued so many times since these proposals were first made public, the documentation merely states that this is the cheapest way and that there is no other option. They merely seek to bulldoze their way through the planning system and generally ignore the rules that have been created for good reason.

I live in a rural area in the Colne Valley that would be blighted by this project and suggest therefore, before proceeding, that the project be reappraised and properly costed in a professional manner recognising the options that so clearly exist. It is wrong that so many individuals could be so adversely affected for the benefit of so few.

I should be happy to receive a visit for members of the Inspectorate which will help to illustrate the devastation that would be caused and to help them understand the consequences that are so unnecessary.

Yours faithfully

Mark Passmore