



Planning Inspectorate  
c/o QUADIENT  
69 Buckingham Avenue  
Slough  
SL1 4PN

Customer: 0303 444 5000  
Services:  
e-mail: [norwichtotilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:norwichtotilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

The applicant

Our Ref: EN020027

Date: 6 March 2026

---

Dear Mr Pepper

## **The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 17**

### **Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for an order granting development consent for the Norwich to Tilbury project**

#### **Response to applicant's response to rule 17 letter**

Thank you for your response to our rule 17 letter of 3 March 2026.

The Examining Authority (ExA) welcomes the commitment to reorder and reformat the response to relevant representations document [[REP1-132](#)] under points 1, 2, 5, and 6 of annex A of our letter and to resubmit by deadline 2 of the examination timetable (**Thursday 12 March 2026**).

We note your comments under point 3 of the letter relating to Parish and Town Councils and MPs. However, the ExA considers it reasonable to expect that all statutory consultees receive the same treatment as each other in terms of the breadth and detail of response that they receive to their relevant representation (RR). We reiterate that we would wish to see these changes made by deadline 2 (**Thursday 12 March 2026**).

Point 4 of the letter made reference to the thematic response to other interested parties. The ExA appreciates that it is an onerous task to respond to the number of RRs in full detail. It is also accepted that not every RR can be responded to individually on a project of this scale, and a thematic response is therefore appropriate. Nevertheless, our concerns remain over the level of detail provided, which if not elaborated on is likely to result in additional written questions and/ or hearing time and consequential delays further into the examination timetable.

It is not realistic for the ExA to provide a full list of examples where more detail would be appropriate as requested. However those responses which include specific locational detail (for example to a particular natural environment designation, landscape feature, heritage asset, affected business and so on) were presumably highlighted in your original

coding exercise. It is these concerns which should be more specifically responded to. Repetition can be avoided by a cross-reference to the first instance in which you have responded to that particular concern.

As an example of further detail which could be provided we suggest you consider the relevant representations report for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway project [[REP1-048](#)].

Yours sincerely

*Susan Hunt*

**Lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our ['Privacy Notice'](#) before sending information to The Planning Inspectorate.