

Georgie Hannigan

From: fordhampylons@mail.com
Sent: 06 March 2026 10:36
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Deadline 2 submission

Categories: Deadline Submission

NORWICH TO TILBURY PROPOSAL

INTERESTED PARTY REFERENCE NUMBER: [REDACTED] (VILLAGES AGAINST PYLONS)

Dear Sir,

Many thanks once more for the opportunity to speak at the recent hearing held at Ipswich.

We note that National Grid have now published their response: "Document 8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings"

This document merely groups statements by those presenting on a broad thematic basis and refers back to their previous submissions to you.

Neither their previous submissions nor their response in this new document address the rather specific points of policy we have raised in respect of National Grids proposals in and around the Dedham Vale. Indeed they do not even attempt to address the points made, namely that:

- the route through the Dedham Vale has always been conditioned on their preemptive decision about the location of the EACN, in respect of which only one area was ever considered
- that per EN5 they were required to avoid the Dedham Vale and its setting altogether, adopting an alternative route even if that led to a longer overall run of Pylons
- that on their own evidence alternatives which are both feasible and comply with this requirement exist such as EAS1, or those detailed by NESO in their East Anglia Review
- that this precludes the selection of Ardleigh as a location for the EACN or the route through or near to the Dedham Vale
- that there are no terms of policy which in the circumstance override this requirement

- that, even in the event that this route had been the only plausible route - which it is not - then EN5 would have required dramatically greater use of undergrounding to the South of the Dedham Vale and the removal of the first pylons much further from it given the planning policy statement that even "residual" damage to the protected National Landscape is unacceptable

- that Cost is not a relevant consideration per policy when the outcome is to reduce harm to the Dedham Vale, indeed policy explicitly recognises that avoiding harm to a National Landscape may increase cable runs and costs significantly

These are important matters of policy set out and supported by Government and which have only ever been strengthened in subsequent drafts of EN5. They which speak directly to the merits (specifically the lack thereof) and to the conduct of National Grid with respect to the public throughout this process. They deserve to be addressed.

It seems that National Grid now intend to pay similar disrespect to the Planning Inspectorate presumably hoping that you too will simply brush over their failure to engage with specific questions or actual detail of policies.

We remain confident that you will not and would be grateful if you could direct National Grid to address these matters explicitly and in detail.

Should they fail to do so then this can only imply that they recognise that their proposals are not in fact compliant.

Kind Regards

David Burns
Villages Against Pylons