FREEPOST N TO T

T: 0800 915 2497
email: contact@n-t.nationalgrid.com
www.nationalgrid.com/n-t

nationalgrid

Susan Hunt
Lead Member of the Examining Authority
The Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
60 Buckingham Drive
Slough
SL1 4PM

6 March 2026
By email

Your Reference EN020027

Dear Ms Hunt

National Grid Electricity Transmission plc
The proposed Norwich to Tilbury Development Consent Order
Applicant's Response to Rule 17 Letter

We write following receipt of the Rule 17 letter on the afternoon of 3 March 2026.

The letter contains Annex A that sets out six points and suggested amendments. It also requests that the Applicant's response to Relevant Representations document be updated to address these points for Deadline 2 on 12 March 2026.

Whilst we can do most of these tasks, it is important to note that we are also responding to Written Representations and Local Impact Reports for the same deadline, which is itself an unusually short deadline.

After careful consideration of the contents of the letter, we respectfully propose the following approach in order to provide the ExA with a comprehensive and useful response and assist you in managing the examination workload:

Parts 1, 2, and 5

We understand these requests to relate primarily to the formatting and presentation of the document; therefore, we believe we can submit a revised version of the Relevant Representations (RR's) document for Deadline 2 that implements these changes.

Part 6

We understand from discussion with the Case Team that this would be resolved by addressing points 1 and 2, which, as set out above, we can do.

Part 3

We can provide a thorough response to all statutory consultees including Parish Councils and Relevant Representations from MPs as requested. Whilst we can provide assurance that all these responses have been considered in response to the themes provided in the Relevant Representation document, to break this down and provide individual detailed responses to each is a detailed task and will take some time beyond Deadline 2. In addition, some of these parties will have submitted Written Representations (WRs), which we are responding to at Deadline 2 and which may reflect a progression of their comments at RR stage. In light of the above considerations we therefore request that we be permitted to deliver the requested information at Deadline 3 and the regulation 17 letter is amended and reissued to that effect, in order that we have the time to provide a high quality and thorough response to your regulation 17 request, and such that it can also

take account of our WR response (i.e. we may not respond to a statutory consultee RR in full if we have responded to an WR that is duplicate or supersedes earlier comments – if there are any such instances). The Applicants response to WR's will be provided at Deadline 2.

Part 4

The wider request as per the Rule 17 letter is 'Where appropriate more detail should be provided in table 2.1'. We have reviewed this request and whilst we are keen to aid the ExA, we believe that in order to practically deliver this request we would require more specific and targeted instruction. To provide context to this, Table 2.1 was arrived at through a coding and analysis process of the nearly 4000 RRs and taking into account that many of the points raised were addressed in the Consultation Report submitted with the application, a document that is itself 5400 pages long. That coding exercise commenced immediately upon publication of the RRs and took over a month to complete even with substantial resource. Therefore, in order to deliver this request, we would need to conduct an exercise to review again all c4000 RRs in order to identify potential points of further detail. We do not think this is feasible for Deadline 2 given the volume of LIRs and WRs requiring detailed response and additionally, we believe our detailed responses to WRs and LIRs are likely to provide the clarification you are seeking on many points.

Therefore, whilst we have fulfilled the specific example in the Rule 17 request regarding vibration matters, in order to fulfil the wider request, we ask that this aspect of the Rule 17 letter is clarified to identify specific areas of more detail that the ExA would like to understand, and that the timescale for its fulfilment is amended accordingly, with the benefit of understanding the scale of the exercise. Alternatively, the clarification could be made through the ExA's first Written Questions, having had sight of the Deadline 2 documentation by that time. We would be happy to discuss this matter further and provide more detail on the practical limitations of the request and how we can collectively overcome them.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Pepper
Project Director