

From David Mathews to the Inspectorate

at

National Grid East Anglia Pylons.

I made initial comments on 11th November 2025, which are on your files.

I did not attend meetings but I have read National Grid's Summary.

I therefore hope the following will be taken in to consideration.

My comments on the NG summary -

1. Is there supporting evidence (March 2026) that HVDC circuit breakers are in short supply? When are there sufficient available?

2. Page 7 top. "Urgent need" - but not a system/plan that crushes everything it touches to the detriment to farming, livelihoods and the general environment.

Speed is to be subject to quality, long term maintenance costs and respect for inhabitants and the environment generally.

3. Page 8. "economical way" does not mean the cheapest. Must include reasonable assessment of the costs of long term maintenance, security of electricity supply,

protections against severe weather, solar storms, sabotage and enemy action.

(cf. Ukraine).

4. Page 9. Top. The Applicant "concludes", states its own "presumptions" and has not shown any independently audited costs.

- St. Remegious Church" – Alter the underground route !

No need for a change in technology if the same technology used throughout.

5. Page 10. Top. " Less economic" Therefore shows that National Grid is seeking cheap results without forward thinking.

E.g. "the strong starting presumption in favour of overhead lines is not displaced, even where there is a high potential for widespread and significant adverse effects. In those circumstances, the Secretary of State should only prefer underground or subsea where the benefits clearly outweigh any extra economic, social or environmental impacts."

My opinion – that underground or subsea clearly DO have very clear all round benefits.

6. Page 14. "Unforeseen events.....are very rare in the U.K." More likely now due to very hot summers, flooding (undermines structures) not just in the obvious areas, war, plus the 11 year solar cycle.

7. Page 15. Top. Planning Act 2008. 18 years and potentially 20 years out of date. So also for Electricity Act 1989.

In practice this legislation was for a different age.

8. Page 24. BNG percentage. Seems to be at a minimum. The BNG policy is what the National Grid says it is therefore is not in accordance with the Public's requirements.

9. There is no mention of POTENTIAL ARCHEAOLOGICAL SITES.

East Anglia has already uncovered a wealth of history and artefacts; much more to be discovered.

10. Page 34. Have the ARMY AIRCORPS, the R.A.F. and the U.S.A.F. given their assessments? 5Km seems too little.

11. THERE IS NO MENTION OF COSTS AUDIT OF UNDERSEA CABLING NOR OF COMPLETE UNDERGROUND ROUTING. All this should be independently verified.

Also -

a. Maritime cabling is being used for East Coast Scotland to North East Coast of England. No explanation is made of the reason why this is not used for East Anglia.

b. Similarly, LionLink could be connected much further south to the East Anglian maritime cable.

c. It is NOT an excuse that NG have already built onshore structures in Norfolk/Suffolk. That's NG's problem and no one else's.

Additionally -

The Inspectorate would of course be aware of any attempt by NG or other parties leaving out unfavourable facts and actual costings. In my opinion if this is proven then this is fraud at worst, or if not that, then devious.

~DM~