

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0327

# Norwich to Tilbury

**Volume 8: Examination Documents**

**Document: 8.5.5 Applicant's Response to the Oral Submissions Made  
at the Open Floor Hearings**

**Final Issue A**

**March 2026**

**Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027**

**nationalgrid**

# Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>About this Document</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Scope of this Document	1
1.3	Structure of this Report	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Organisations</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Organisations	3
<b>3.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Individuals</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1	Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Individuals	50
<b>4.</b>	<b>Further Submissions That Were Not Given Orally</b>	<b>177</b>
4.1	Applicant’s Response to Further Submissions That Were Not Given Orally	177

---

Table 2.1	Applicant’s response to issues raised by organisations during the hearings	3
Table 3.1	Applicant’s response to issues raised by individuals during the hearings	50
Table 4.1	Applicant’s Response to Issues Raised by Organisations in their Deadline 1 Submission (Identified as Oral Summaries)	177

---

# 1. About this Document

## 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document provides the Applicant’s written response to the written summary of the oral submissions made by Interested Parties at the Open Floor Hearings (OFHs) during week commencing 9 February 2026 in relation to the Norwich to Tilbury Project (‘the Project’).

1.1.2 This included three OFHs split across four sessions and three days, as follows:

- OFH1 Session 1: Tuesday 10 February 2026 at Ipswich Football Ground: Start 4:00pm, closed 5:56pm
- OFH1 Session 2: Wednesday 11 February 2026 at Ipswich Football Ground: Start 10:00am, closed 12:19pm
- OFH2 Session 1: Thursday 12 February 2026 at Orsett Hall, Essex: Start 10:00am, closed 12:06pm
- OFH3 Session 1: Thursday 12 February 2026 at the Space, Norwich: Start 11:00am, closed 12:23pm.

## 1.2 Scope of this Document

1.2.1 The three OFHs were held during week commencing 9 February 2026. In the OFH agendas [EV2-001, EV2-003 and EV2-004] the Examining Authority noted that although the Applicant would not be asked to address questions raised by Interested Parties at the OFHs, it should respond as written submissions at the next relevant deadline.

1.2.2 The Applicant responded to generic themes raised at the OFH in **8.5.4 Applicant’s Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]** submitted at Deadline 1. In that document, the Applicant noted that it would review the written submissions provided by third parties at Deadline 1 and would consider specific points raised and respond at Deadline 2. This document sets out the Applicant’s response to those specific points. Where an Interested Party has not submitted a summary of its oral case, a summary has been included based on the transcript of the IPs case from the relevant OFH. In some cases, the IP has provided more within the written summary to the OFH than was spoken orally at the hearing. These items are identified in bold as being additional points to those made orally and the points have been responded to within this document.

1.2.3 In some cases, the document cross references to either **8.4.1 Applicant’s Comments on Relevant Representations (Revision B)**, **8.8.2 Applicant’s Comments on Local Impact Reports (Revision A)** or the **8.8.1 Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)** as these documents respond to the point raised from the Interested Party (IP) and to avoid duplication. However, there are some cases where a Written Representation has not been made and therefore a full response is provided within this document.

- 1.2.4 The OFH summaries were published by the Planning Inspectorate on Tuesday 3 March, alongside other Deadline 1 submissions and without an accompanying updated examination library. The Applicant has identified that since this publication, minor changes have been made to several of the uploaded documents without explicit notification from the Planning Inspectorate, such that submissions were re-uploaded or in some cases re-categorised. The Applicant has sought to identify such changes whilst preparing its response to the Deadline 1 documents by cross-referring with the published Examination Library. However, given the compressed timescales it is possible that in some instances a change has not been identified and subsequently a OFH summary may be accounted for in another Deadline 1 document such as **8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)** or vice-versa.

## 1.3 Structure of this Report

- 1.3.1 Chapter 2 of this report presents the Applicant's response to oral submissions made by organisations. Chapter 3 of this report presents the Applicant's response to oral submissions made by individuals. The tables are structured into the specific open floor hearings and in the order that the third parties gave evidence. Chapter 4 includes two submissions, which are labelled as oral summaries but were not given orally at the OFH. These have been included for completeness.

## 2. Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Organisations

### 2.1 Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Organisations

2.1.1 Table 2.1 sets out the Applicant’s response to the issues raised in the oral submissions made by organisations during the OFH.

Table 2.1 Applicant’s response to issues raised by organisations during the hearings

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant’s Response
<b>Open Floor Hearing 1 (Session 1)</b>			
Essex Police/ Suffolk Police	<b>[REP1-232]</b>	Impacts on community safety need to be assessed and adequately mitigated, such as through a Section 106 agreement.	The Applicant has engaged with the Police, Fire and Ambulance services, the local highway authorities and National Highways and has assessed the impact of the Project on community safety from both a health and wellbeing point of view and a traffic and transport point of view. The Applicant and Main Works Contractor(s) will continue to engage on the topic of community safety with relevant stakeholders as part of the detailed design and during construction.  The Health and Wellbeing assessment (refer to <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b> ) found that while several locations have been identified where potential community safety (traffic) impacts may occur, the magnitude of effect is likely to be low. Considering proposed mitigation, a negligible (not significant) health effect is anticipated during construction for the general population and vulnerable groups.  <b>6.16 Environmental Statement, Chapter 16 – Traffic and Transport [APP-271]</b> concludes that the overall residual effects on

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>road user safety from the construction phase would be temporary, short-term, and the level of effect slight adverse and therefore not significant, considering embedded and additional mitigation.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out proposed mitigation in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E - Community Engagement and Public Information [APP-305]</b> – this includes a dedicated community relations team and a public liaison officer who will coordinate with the Main Works Contractor(s); and a free helpline, email address and freepost option for public queries or complaints. </li> <li> <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> sets out control and mitigation measures including the development of an Incident Management Plan in agreement with the blue light services; the identification of contingency routes in case of incidents on the road network; safety briefings and the development of a driver information pack to be issued to each construction vehicle driver; letters/emails notifying local residents and businesses/organisations of upcoming works; and additional site-specific mitigation measures including warning signs and temporary speed limits. </li> </ul> <p>The Applicant considers that no case has been made that a material residual safety or health impact is likely or justifies any request for a Section 106 agreement that meets the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.</p>
		<p>Impacts on their operations when providing police escorts for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). A sustained demand would require a bespoke solution such as a dedicated AIL team, which would be subject to appropriate lead-in time and</p>	<p>The Applicant is working closely with Essex Police and Suffolk Constabulary to confirm the number of AILs on the public highway that may require escort during the Project's construction, as well as any associated additional policing needs and lead-in times.</p> <p>To date the Applicant has shared with the Police forces proposed AIL routes, indicative volumes of AIL movements and indicative programme dates. The Applicant has held regular meetings with</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>developer funding.</p> <p>Concerned by the potential impact of the construction and operation of the project on traffic during the construction phase and on incident response.</p> <p>There also remain concerns with the assessment and acceptability of likely impacts, and the need for adequate mitigation in respect of both community and roads policing. These include the range of impacts on the workforce and local communities and the role of the emergency services in addressing these impacts.</p>	<p>the Police forces and will continue to engage to agree on the most appropriate and effective way to address the anticipated demand for ALL escorts, see <b>8.3.3. Statement of Common Ground Essex Police [REP1-074]</b> for further details.</p> <p><b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b> considers the potential impacts on, and access to, healthcare facilities, including emergency services, ambulances, hospitals and other NHS services associated with construction of the Project, drawing on information from <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport [APP-271]</b>.</p> <p>Where road diversions are required, traffic management and mitigation measures would be in place to reduce impacts. These include traffic management, contingency routes, signage and routing measures to ensure access or partial access can be maintained where feasible.</p> <p>The Police, Fire and Ambulance services would be given written notice of planned temporary lane or road closures and ALL deliveries. Further detail on these and other proposed mitigation measures are presented in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed driver/public transport passenger delay, pedestrian, cyclist and horse-rider delay, severance, amenity and fear and intimidation in <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Traffic and Transport [APP-271]</b>. The assessment of the traffic and transport construction effects has been summarised for all road links forming the Primary Access Routes (PARs) during the estimated peak year of construction daily (07:00-19:00) activity for the Project along with the significance of these effects. This assessment includes those committed developments likely to overlap with the Project peak year of construction and that could generate additional traffic along the PARs. Details of this</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>assessment are presented within <b>6.16.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 16.4 - Traffic and Transport Construction Effects [APP-275]</b>. A summary of the significance of effects is presented within Table A16.4.8 Summary of impact assessment. The findings of the assessment of effects is that overall, these would be temporary and are considered not significant when taking into consideration mitigation and controls detailed within <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> and <b>7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-329]</b>. For driver/public transport passenger delay a number of PARs were found to have adverse effects, where both the increase to future baseline traffic and receptor sensitivity is high. Within Essex this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAR 35 - A1341 Via Urbis Romanae</li> <li>• PAR 36 - A134 Northern Approach Road/A134 Wildeve Avenue/A134 Nayland</li> <li>• Road/A134 The Causeway</li> <li>• PAR 37 - A1124 Halsted Rd</li> <li>• PAR 49 - A414 Three Mile Hill/A1114 London Road</li> <li>• PAR 50 - A1016 Waterhouse Lane/A1016 Rainsford Lane</li> <li>• PAR 51 - A1060 Rainsford Road/A1060 Roxwell Road</li> <li>• PAR 59 - A129 Sun Street/A129 London Road/A129 Rayleigh Road</li> </ul> <p>In general, the worst case peak construction period would be for a short duration of one week. For PAR 59 - A129 Sun Street/A129 London Road/A129 Rayleigh Road, this would be over a seven week period.</p> <p>Junction modelling was undertaken to assess the likely impact that the increase in traffic due to the Project would have in combination with committed developments at key junctions on or connecting to the PARs during the AM and Peak hours. Where required, suitable</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			mitigation measures have been proposed or are under discussion with Essex County Council and National Highways, to reduce the Project's likely impact on traffic as presented within <b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333]</b> .
Suffolk County Council	<b>[REP1-177]</b>	General comments on engagement and consideration of alternatives.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Working hours are a significant concern. There is a critical need to protect the well-being of our communities by providing respite from impacts of construction and construction traffic on Saturday afternoons, Sundays and bank holidays.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		Tree loss across the scheme will be extensive, and effective and robust planting programme is central to mitigating these impacts and in relation to protecting and enhancing the Dedham Vale National Landscape.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		As technical delivery issues prevented undergrounding in the Waveney Valley, the council considers that an alternative scheme of offsetting compensation measures is now essential.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		The quality and robustness of the outline management plan is critical to allow this council and others to	The Applicant considers that the Examination process allows for the councils to request changes to the Outline Management Plans to support later discharge.

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		monitor and control the activities of the Applicant's contractors during construction of the project.	
Burstall Parish Council	The OFH summary is under Peterson [REP1-494]	All of the matters included within the OFH summary are included within the Written Representation [REP1-151].	Due to the matters covered in the Oral Statement being included within the IPs Written Representation [REP1-151], the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
Cotton Parish Council	[REP1-159] (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	<p>General comments on engagement, consideration of alternatives, landscape impacts and mitigation and compensation measures.</p> <p>Cotton, and some adjacent affected parishes, is situated on high plateau open clay-land, mostly given to agriculture. The ability to mitigate the visual impact of 15 x 50m high pylons through the parish is absolutely minimal. Mid-Suffolk District Council point to "under-recognition of landscape quality" and "significant adverse landscape and visual impacts" from the scheme, and cite "current mitigation and compensation measures" as inadequate.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential localised effects of the Project where it passes to the east of Cotton.</p> <p>Through the approach taken to routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce (as far as practicable) the potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 recognises that it is not possible to fully mitigate the landscape and visual effects of electricity transmission infrastructure.</p> <p>Effects on landscape and visual receptors are reported in the Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment (LVIA) in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>. Significant effects are identified up to a distance of approximately 1.5 km for landscape receptors, and up to a distance of approximately 2 km for visual receptors.</p> <p>Judgements on landscape value were made as part of the assessment, as set out in Annex A of <b>6.13.A2 Environmental</b></p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>Statement Appendix 13.2: Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228].</b></p> <p>These judgements were informed by the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations. This defines landscape value as <i>'the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities'</i> (page 3).</p> <p>The points relating to landscape mitigation and compensation are addressed in Chapter 3 of the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
		<p>Three family farms in Cotton have their viability threatened in the short and possibly long-term as 12 pylons are to be sited on their land, and built by putting high proportions of that land out of use for indeterminate periods. We believe that diversions of the route to minimise the harm to them have not been seriously considered.</p>	<p>The Applicant cannot comment on site specific mitigation in this case, as we have not been advised of the names of the three family farms in Cotton that are impacted.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges there will be some short term disruption to the agricultural land use during construction. The Applicant is committed to compensate for losses arising as a result of construction, including disturbance, severance, and losses arising from restrictions on land use or agricultural operations on the terms of the Compensation Code. Where ongoing future losses in land productivity can be evidenced and attributed to the Project, such matters fall to be assessed and, where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p>
		<p>Thousands of tonnes of stone and aggregate need to be imported to East Anglia from distant quarries to build the haul roads, and then be removal. The carbon footprint will be huge. Most local roads were not built for heavy lorry traffic and are disintegrating. Alternatives, such as temporary matting, trackway systems</p>	<p><b>6.4.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 - Greenhouse Gas Assessment</b> includes an assessment of the change in carbon during construction of the Project which includes the impact of haul roads on carbon emissions.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing a number of PAR to route construction HGVs from the strategic and major road network to the site access points. These have been assessed for their suitability of movements, and any proposed mitigation associated is detailed in</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		or specialised ground stabilisation should be considered.	<p><b>7.3 Appendix C Indicative Highway Mitigation plans [APP-312 to APP-316].</b></p> <p>In EN-1 requirements, the Applicant has developed a multi-modal transport strategy, detailed in <b>7.11 Transport Assessment Appendix G [APP-340]</b>. The conclusion in that Appendix states: "In the event that development consent is granted for the Project, National Grid, in collaboration with the appointed Main Works Contractor(s), will pursue the exploration and implementation (where feasible, commercially viable and operationally reasonable) of alternative transport modes to deliver materials and large and/or heavy items."</p> <p>The Applicant is undertaking Ground Investigation (GI) surveys to inform the detailed design stage, to refine the temporary haul road designs and identify opportunities to reduce material volumes required where site specific conditions are suitable and practicable to do so. The GI survey data was not available at the time of developing the draft Development Consent Order Designs, and as such, the Applicant has undertaken a worst-case assessment. This assessment presented a temporary haul road depth of 400mm thickness. To reduce the material required to construct the haul road, the width of the haul road has been reduced for overhead line construction from 8m width with two-way traffic flows throughout, to typically 6 m wide, with passing places (widening to 8m) provided at typical intervals of 200m. The frequency of passing places is to be determined by site-specific conditions and the forward visibility along the haul roads at the detailed design stage.</p>
Dedham Vale National Landscape Partnership	No OFH summary has been made to the Planning Inspectorate	Noted that the transmission line is undergrounded in the Dedham Vale National Landscape but there will be significant impacts during construction and operation.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Enhanced duty on relevant authorities to further the purpose of the National Landscape. On that matter, the National Landscape Partnership is in discussion with the Applicant about how the Applicant can meet its responsibilities under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act duty.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>. The Applicant has submitted 8.3.1 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Dedham Vale National Landscape and Suffolk &amp; Essex Coast &amp; Heaths National Landscape at Deadline 2</p>
		<p>Which Dedham Vale National Landscape plan applies in determining the application (2021 to '26 plan to the '26 to '31).</p>	<p>At the time of submission of the Application, the Dedham Vale National Landscape Plan 2021-2026 provided the framework to guide decision making within the National Landscape and Stour Valley Project Area. The determination of the application should consider the framework presented in this version.</p> <p><b>8.4.2 Policy Compliance Tracker [REP1-133]</b> includes a review of the updated Dedham Vale National Landscape Plan 2026-2031. The assessment of effects on the special qualities of Dedham Vale National Landscape, set out in <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>, was reviewed against the 2026-31 Management Plan. There is no change to the identified special qualities of Dedham Vale National Landscape, which are set out in the Alison Farmer Associates report: Dedham Vale AONB Natural Beauty and Special Qualities and Perceived and Anticipated Risks (July 2016). The findings of the National Landscape Assessment Study therefore remain valid.</p>
		<p>How will natural beauty characteristics be impacted i.e. landscape quality, scenic quality, relative tranquillity, natural heritage features and cultural heritage.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
<b>Open Floor Hearing 1 (Session 2)</b>			
Sir Bernard Jenkin MP	<b>[REP1-469]</b> (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	The project will cause significant and irreversible harm to the Dedham Vale and to my wider constituency, including Ardleigh, north Colchester and the Colne Valley. The current alignment would have profound landscape, environmental and community impacts.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		The routing through this area is a direct consequence of the decision to locate the East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) at Ardleigh, a siting decision for which no reasonable alternatives were meaningfully considered by the Applicant. The existence of reasonably available alternatives precludes a route via or impacting upon the Dedham Vale due to its status as a protected National Landscape.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		The proposal fails to satisfy the requirements set out in NPS EN-5, as well as the statutory obligations introduced under the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
Babergh District Council	<b>[REP1-146]</b>	General comments on engagement, consideration of alternatives including HVDC could be considered and requests for cost comparisons. Also	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>concerns about impacts on Dedham Vale National Landscape.</p>	
		<p>The council considers that the arguments used to justify the overhead AC solution seem to contradict what has been said about the proposed solution for the Eastern Green Links. The Applicant has decided on an undersea HVDC solution for these, arguing that it is better technology, is more controllable, carries a much lower delivery risk, with comparable capital costs and much lower lifetime costs than AC. All these should also apply equally to an underground HVDC link for Norwich to Tilbury.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
		<p>The Applicant has failed to meet the requirements of NPS EN-1 in its consideration of non-designated heritage assets, undermining the value of their overall heritage assessment and risking significant harm to the historic environment.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
		<p>The Council is very concerned about the potential impact on the Grade I listed Little Wenham Castle, a scheduled monument, and the Grade I listed All Saints Church and medieval barns nearby.</p>	<p>The cluster of designated assets at Little Wenham has been assessed in <b>6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-209]</b>. Amongst the designated assets of this cluster, only the setting of Wenham Castle scheduled monument (1003759) and Little Wenham Castle listed building (1003759) have been considered to extend to the Order Limits. According to the methodology explained within <b>6.11</b></p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment [AS-068]</b>, assets where settings do not extend to the Order Limits, are not included in the assessment in this chapter, as there would be no potential for effects resulting from the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on these designated assets, including changes to their setting.</p>
		<p>The Applicant states that the project will have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, which are not considered to be adequately mitigated or compensated.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
		<p>The Council has significant concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of the scheme, its geographic and temporal relationship with other projects being delivered in the eastern region and the impact of a failure of appropriate coordination and mitigation on residents, businesses and the environment.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
<p>Mid Suffolk District Council</p>	<p><b>[REP1-172]</b></p>	<p>General comments on engagement, consideration of alternatives including that the existing network is likely to be sufficient until 2035 when HVDC could be considered.</p> <p>The Council has concerns regarding the volume, nature and cumulative impacts of development at and around</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		the Bramford substation and consider a strategic design and mitigation approach is essential to minimise impacts.	
		The Applicant has failed to meet the requirements of NPS EN-1 in their consideration of non-designated heritage assets, undermining the value of their overall heritage assessment and risking significant harm to the unique, historic environment of the district.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		The Applicant's reliance on post-decision surveys and mitigation across such a large project area risks the lawful and effective protection of ecology.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		The Applicant states the project will have a significant adverse landscape and visual impacts.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		The project would have significant far-reaching impacts on local and residential amenity and the health and well-being of our communities.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		We feel there has been inadequate consideration of impacts on the existing tourism businesses, jobs and visitors.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
Tharston and Hapton Parish Council	No OFH summary has been made to the Planning Inspectorate	<p>General comments on consultation, alternatives (including a request for underground cables), effects on ecology and cumulative effects from different developments on farmland and soils.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>The main footpaths in the locality are BR1, FP2 and FP33. These are routes the pylons would take and they would totally decimate these vital footpaths that everyone uses.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the comments regarding the PRoW listed (Tharston BR1, FP2 and FP33). The Applicant would note that Tharston Footpath 2 (FP2) is not affected by the Project and lies wholly outside the Order Limits. The continuation of this route, Ashwellthorpe Footpath 5, will however be affected. As set out in <b>7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-329]</b>, Ashwellthorpe Footpath 5 will require a temporary diversion of approximately 15 weeks due to a pylon working area, with users diverted around the perimeter of the working area for this period. For the remainder of the period during which Ashwellthorpe Footpath 5 is affected by The Project, the PRoW will remain open on its existing alignment, with access managed through the use of appropriate safety measures, in accordance with the <b>7.6 Outline PRoW Management Plan [APP-329]</b>. Following completion of the works, this PRoW will be reinstated along its original alignment.</p> <p>Regarding Tharston Bridleway 1 (BR1) and Tharston Footpath 33 (FP33), both PRoWs will remain open on their existing alignments throughout construction, with access managed as necessary through the use of appropriate safety measures, in accordance with the <b>7.6 Outline PRoW Management Plan [APP329]</b>. Following completion of the works, this PRoW will be reinstated along its original alignment.</p>
		<p>The construction of pylons would not only bring unwanted extra traffic to our very small rural roads, but also the extra emissions from the large lorries</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise emissions from construction related traffic. Commitment GG19 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> is a commitment to meet</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>would bring concerns to meet our green agenda.</p> <p>Tharston and Hapton Parish Council are still suffering from large lorries using the areas around, causing local parishioners, walkers, horse riders, along with local drivers, many issues with having to move over to accommodate the large vehicles on what is a C road, with many difficult bends that are dangerous in themselves, and these even larger lorries that will be used for the pylons would use this route damaging the road even further. Tharston and Hapton Parish Council are looking at all options around special orders to stop our C497 road being used.</p>	<p>certain emissions standards for construction related plant and vehicles (excluding construction worker private vehicles).</p> <p>The PAR, as defined under <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, proposed in this area is shown in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan – Appendix C – Indicative Highway Mitigation Plans – Section A [APP-313]</b> Sheets 2 to 4. From this, it can be seen that the section proposed to be utilised by construction traffic amounts to approximately 0.5km between the junction of the C497 and the B1113, and the proposed Site Access Points RG-B012 and RG-B013. This includes proposed mitigation location A6 at the junction with the B1113.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed this section of the Public Highway for use by the proposed construction traffic, and considers it suitable for the proposed usage. This has included preliminary design for the proposed Site Access Points RG-B012 and RG-B013, which have been subject to Road Safety Audits in line with the approach set out in <b>7.11 Transport Assessment – Appendix A – Norwich to Tilbury RSA Strategy [APP-334]</b>, overseen by Norfolk County Council as the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>In line with the access strategy set out in the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, and further committed to under Commitment Reference T03 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>, construction traffic will not make use of sections of the local road network (LRN) that are not part of the specified PARs, and therefore will not be permitted to travel on the C497 between the proposed Construction Points and the A140. Where the PAR is located on the short section of the C497, mitigation and control measures to ensure the safety of all road users are proposed as detailed within are proposed <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, e.g. Driver information pack.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> also includes measures with respect to condition surveys and remediation works on the Public Highway, which the Applicant considers suitable and appropriate for the proposed usage.
Pylons East Anglia	<b>[REP1-266]</b>	General comments on consultation, alternatives, impacts on local residents and effects on landscape and ecology.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Acid sulphate soils are present in the Waveney Valley and could be present in the Stour Valley in Suffolk and also in the Colne Valley. The Applicant has not carried out the recognised tests for these potential soils.	These points are addressed in <b>Document: 8.4.6 Applicant's comments on submissions received at Procedural Deadline A [REP1-136]</b> .
Villages against Pylons	<b>[REP1-282]</b>	General comments on alternatives and consultation.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		<p>The proposals will cause significant harm to the landscapes of the Fordham and Colne Valleys which are held to be of equivalent natural beauty landscape value to the Dedham Vale itself. This area ought to have been treated equivalently to the Dedham Vale itself, just as the Stour Valley Project Area has been.</p> <p>That the Dedham Vale and its setting will be greatly damaged is not, a matter of dispute, although over time National Grid were seeking to 'downplay' the impacts.</p>	<p>The area around Fordham and the Colne Valley is not within a nationally designated landscape and therefore does not meet the criteria for undergrounding within nationally designated landscapes as set out in EN-1 and EN-5.</p> <p>Judgements on landscape value were made as part of the landscape assessment, as set out in Annex A of <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2: Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>.</p> <p>These judgements were informed by the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations. This defines landscape value as '<i>the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities</i>' (page 3).</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Document 6.13.f9 at pages 6,7,8 demonstrate that infrastructure will be greatly visible throughout the Dedham Vale, although our own analysis submitted to you previously demonstrates that the impact is significantly understated in the Applicant's Document 6.13.f19 demonstrates that between 11 and 23 pylons will be visible across more than half of the Vale. In some places in the West of the Vale up to 35 pylons will be visible due to the extremely poor choice of location for the Western cable sealing end (CSE) Compound (Great Horkesley - Tilbury Side). In short, if these proposals proceed as submitted then the Vale will be encircled in a "Ring Of Steel". Its setting will be devastated.</p>	<p>Landscape Character Area (LCA) A4 Colne River Valley Floor and LCA A5 Colne River Valley Slopes are assessed as being of medium-high value.</p> <p>The assessment of effects of the Project on Dedham Vale National Landscape is set out in <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>. Whilst there will be significant effects during construction due to the installation of underground cables, these will gradually reduce as vegetation cover re-establishes and will become 'not significant' in the longer term.</p> <p>There will however be some significant visual effects on views looking outwards from the edge of the Dedham Vale National Landscape, where some of the proposed pylons would be visible.</p> <p><b>6.13.F9 Environmental Statement Figure 13.9 - ZTV of Proposed 400kV Overhead Line by Project Section proportions of structures visible version [APP-245]</b> illustrates theoretical visibility of the proposed pylons (proportions of structures visible). <b>6.13.F19 Environmental Statement Figure 13.19 - ZTV within Dedham Vale National Landscape [APP-255]</b> illustrates theoretical visibility of the proposed pylons from the National Landscape and shows the number of pylons theoretically visible. The methodology for the production of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping is set out in <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology [APP-227]</b>.</p> <p>The generation of a ZTV is a starting point for understanding the theoretical extents of visibility of the Project. In practice views will diminish with distance, as they become a smaller part of the view, as a result of perspective. While the Digital Terrain Model has been amended to include some buildings and woodland blocks, their maximum heights have been estimated. Other intervening screening vegetation, for example hedgerows, are not included and</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Although the wording of NPS-EN5 between September 2022 and today has been evolved, the focus was always on harm to the National Landscape, including its setting, and there was never a statement that only infrastructure within a National Landscape could cause it harm. Nor was there ever a statement that harm was considered to be eliminated by undergrounding.</p> <p>NPS EN-5 says in paragraphs:</p> <p>2.9.12: <i>'even residual damage is likely to be unacceptable in planning terms'</i></p> <p>2.9.19 that the Applicant must <i>"seek to avoid altogether internationally and nationally designated areas of the highest amenity, cultural or scientific value by the overall planning of the system connections"</i>.</p> <p>2.9.21 the first consideration should be to re-route in order to avoid impact, stating that the route can only impact a National Landscape when the <i>"...natural beauty of these areas</i></p>	<p>these may substantially filter views experienced by people walking along a path or roadside pavement, even if it is near to the Project. It is therefore necessary to treat ZTVs as a tool, and to use them with caution. The ZTV is used as one of the tools available to a landscape practitioner, and tested through field work and modelling of photomontages, so that true visibility, in practice, can be better understood.</p> <p>Good design of electricity transmission infrastructure is achieved by application of the Holford and Horlock Rules, alongside an iterative design approach informed by stakeholder engagement, relevant sections of national policy (EN-1 and EN-5) and the embedded environmental design mitigation as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. Such good design principles are then intertwined with the technical design requirements alongside the regulatory and other constraints such as operational, safety and security requirements for new electricity transmission infrastructure. NPS EN-5 makes it clear that the government considers overhead lines should be the <i>'strong starting presumption for electricity networks developments in general'</i>, although <i>'this presumption is reversed when developments will cross part of a nationally designated landscape'</i> (para 2.9.20). It is also noted that EN-5 identifies that there may also be instances outside the nationally designated landscapes, where <i>'a high potential for widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts'</i> (para 2.9.24) may result in the use of underground cables in certain sections. Paragraph 2.9.12 of NPS EN-5 states (in full) that <i>'However, in nationally designated landscapes (for instance, National Parks, The Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) even residual impacts may well make an overhead line proposal unacceptable in planning terms.'</i></p> <p>Underground cables are proposed in four locations, including through the Dedham Vale National Landscape. The Dedham Vale</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><i>cannot feasibly be avoided by rerouting overhead lines...</i>" and makes it clear that it is the impact to the beauty of these areas which matters, not the location of the infrastructure: <i>"In these areas, AND where harm to the landscape, visual amenity and natural beauty OF these areas cannot feasibly be avoided by re-routing overhead lines, the strong starting presumption will be that the applicant should underground the relevant section of the line"</i>. There is no statement that the infrastructure in question needs to be within the National Landscape, only that it causes harm to it.</p> <p>2.9.22 details the exemptions to the presumption to undergrounding which applies in NPS-EN5 2.9.20 and 2.9.21. There are only two exemptions: (i) <i>"where it is infeasible in engineering terms"</i>; and (ii) <i>"where the harm that it causes is not outweighed by its corresponding landscape, visual amenity, and natural beauty benefits"</i>.</p>	<p>National Landscape is a nationally important and designated landscape. With the proposed underground cable, the effects on views and setting would be reduced. This would also reduce effects on the setting of heritage assets located within the National Landscape.</p> <p>EN-5 paragraph 2.9.24 recognises that there may be cases where, though no part of the proposed overhead line crosses a designated landscape, a high potential for widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts along certain sections of its route may result in recommendations to use undergrounding for relevant segments of the overhead line. In these cases, paragraph 2.9.25 of EN-5 indicates that the SoS must weigh the feasibility, cost, and any harm of the undergrounding against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adverse implications of the overhead line proposal; and</li> <li>• the cost and feasibility of re-routing overhead lines or mitigation proposals for the relevant line section.</li> </ul> <p>In response to the relevant EN-5 paragraphs 2.9.14 and 2.9.23 to 2.9.25, the strong starting presumption in favour of overhead lines is not displaced, and it is not even displaced 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.</p> <p>In accordance with EN-1 and EN-5 policy, the Applicant has applied the strong presumption of overhead lines in the correct places, and reversed that presumption in the circumstances of a designated National Landscape. The Project has included undergrounding in particular locations outside the National Landscape, at Great Horkesley having applied the EN-5 policies. Details are set out in <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122] 5.6 Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> and <b>8.5.3 Applicant's</b></p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>Written Summary of Oral Submission and Response to Action Points for Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP-139].</b></p> <p>The reference to Paragraph 2.9.19 relates to the Horlock Rules. the Horlock Rules, devised by National Grid in 2006, provide guidelines for the siting and design of new substations, or substation extensions. They also concern the siting of CSE compounds and line entries.</p> <p>The guidance provided by the Horlock Rules has been applied throughout development of the Project. <b>7.18 2022 – Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [AP-356]</b> published in 2022, and the Design Development Reports published as part of the 2023 non-statutory consultation (<b>7.20 2023 Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b>), 2024 statutory consultation (<b>7.21 2024 – Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b>) and with the application for development consent (<b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>).</p>
		<p>There is the requirement imposed by the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023, requiring that developers must '<i>seek to further the aims</i>' of the National Landscape.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>.</p>
		<p>Against this background, the key question is whether there exist any alternatives to the proposed route. The Group questions whether the route across the Dedham Vale is necessary and point back to the assumption that the EACN would be in Ardleigh and were other locations considered.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>If the EACN needs to be in Tendring then it would be necessary for this Inspectorate to consider the cumulative impact from the different developments. Unfortunately, there has been no examination of the cumulative impact by the Applicant.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.4.6 Applicant's comments on submissions received at Procedural Deadline A [REP1-136]</b>.</p>
Dedham Vale Society	No OFH summary has been made to the Planning Inspectorate	<p>General comments on alternatives including that some alternatives would avoid the need for a large swathe through Dedham Vale National Landscape.</p>	<p>These points are addressed <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>The working area in the National Landscape is up to 1km wide. The area of concern relates to the significant amounts of infrastructure within close proximity to the National Landscape along the southern boundary, with significant visual impact within it and impact on its setting. This will cause such harm to the National Landscape in the long term that, if not mitigated now and will undoubtedly result in legal challenges at a later stage.</p> <p>There are significant discrepancies in the outcome of the Applicant's analysis on the southern boundary compared to the north, which appear to have a significant analysis bias against the south.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 2.9.21 to 2.9.23 of NPS EN-5 require consideration of the effects (using the term 'harm') on a National Landscape. These are both the direct effects (i.e. physical effects on the designated area) and the indirect effects arising from infrastructure proposed outside the designated area.</p> <p>'Harm' is not reported on in a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the purpose of which is to identify effects in accordance with GLVIA3, as part of the EIA process, but it is considered in the planning balance, given use of the term in the policy above.</p> <p>The purpose of a National Landscape is to 'conserve and enhance natural beauty', as set out in the CRoW Act 2000. The Special Qualities of Dedham Vale National Landscape explain the aspects of natural beauty which are important for this nationally protected landscape.</p> <p>When considering effects on Special Qualities, the long term effects, during operation, on the National Landscape will not be significant, and therefore will not constitute 'harm' to these Special Qualities.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant states that it has met the duty to protect and enhance, relating to section 85 of the CROW Act, by following the visual mitigating hierarchy. However, there are far greater minimised options that could be implemented to the south to reduce the impact, specifically undergrounding from EACN along the southern boundary to a distance of at least 2km in the north. However, the Applicant has jumped straight to the offset option with an offer which does not, in our opinion, come close to offsetting the impact, and then simply stated that they have met the requirement, with no data or information to back this up.</p>	<p>There will however be some significant visual effects on views looking outwards from the Dedham Vale National Landscape.</p> <p>The fact that the Project will be visible from within the Dedham Vale National Landscape is not disputed, but the Applicant's position is that the long-term adverse effects on the Special Qualities of the National Landscape will not be significant (and so will not constitute 'harm'). Note that, in terms of indirect effects, the potential for effects on the Special Qualities of the Dedham Vale National Landscape was considered when siting the CSE compounds to the north of Raydon airfield and at Great Horkesley.</p> <p>In addition, there will be short to medium-term significant effects on the Special Qualities of Dedham Vale National Landscape during construction and after reinstatement, as a result of the work required to install underground cabling through this area, and the time taken for vegetation to become established, once the reinstatement work has been completed. This is because of the time it takes grassland to establish across disturbed areas, and for hedgerows and trees to grow.</p> <p><b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b> presents the assessment of effects of the Project on Dedham Vale National Landscape. The assessment was undertaken taking into consideration the Special Qualities, which describe which aspects of natural beauty are important in the Dedham Vale National Landscape.</p> <p>The assessment was also informed by a Position Statement from the Dedham Vale National Landscape Partnership.</p> <p>The Position Statement clarifies that: <i>'The National Landscape Partnership...considers the setting to the AONB to be the area within which development and land management proposals, by virtue of their nature, design, scale, siting, materials and colour have the potential to result in substantial impacts, positive or</i></p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant has provided an overlay of the ZTV so that you could clearly see that the visual impact is much, much bigger to the south than it is to the north, and it stretches out much further. However, in contrast, the infrastructure is closer to the National Landscape on the south than it is in the north.</p> <p>It compares the ZTV with what the Applicant has derived as the visual setting. This visual setting includes all of what I've labelled zone 3 – visible from 10% to 15% of the National Landscape – and half of zone 4 – 10 to 15%. They also expanded this out to include two sensitive areas, although, they have lower visual impact – Brett Vale and Upper Layham. Note here that the closest infrastructure is double the distance</p>	<p><i>negative, on the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB.</i> [emphasis added]. It is considered (as informed by Paragraph 5.10.34 of NPS EN-1 (2024)) that the reference to 'substantial' impacts here is taken as meaning the 'likely significant effects' identified through the EIA for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant has a statutory duty, in accordance with Section 85 of the CRoW Act 2000, to seek to 'further the purposes' of the National Landscape. The Applicant confirms that this duty has been fulfilled as set out in <b>5.10 National Landscapes – Duty to Seek to Further the Purposes Report (s85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) [APP-120]</b>.</p>
			<p>The IPs' document refers to the reverse ZTV in Figure A13.5.3 in <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>. The reverse ZTV illustrates the areas outside the National Landscape where the top half of 50 m high structures would potentially be visible from within the National Landscape; it does not represent theoretical visibility of the Project and associated infrastructure as stated in the comments. Further detail about the reverse ZTV is provided in paragraphs A.5.42 to A.5.49 of <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>.</p> <p>The setting study for the National Landscape is set out in Annex A of <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>. The study considered areas where vertical infrastructure would be visible in views to and from the National Landscape and also areas with similar landscape characteristics which contribute to the character, qualities and sense of place of the National Landscape. The setting was not defined by the reverse ZTV alone. Site visits were undertaken to inform the study.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>from the National Landscape boundary compared to their derived visual setting at 2km on the zone 4 and 5 boundary. Their documentation states one of the reasons it was moved further away after previous consultation was to reduce the visual impact on the National Landscape. You can also see that there are relatively low ZTV from the CSE and pylons from within the National Landscape.</p> <p>Page 3 shows the diagrams for the south. However, here there is a complete contrast. Their defined visual setting doesn't even cover the whole of visual zone 3 or any of zone 4. It doesn't include the similar area to Brett Vale, i.e. Fordham Valley. It's not only excluded from the visual setting, but has the pylons sited directly along it. Colne Valley, just to the west, is also excluded from the visual setting and is impacted also. One CSE and approximately four kilometres of pylons reside in zone 3, as close as 1.2 kilometres. [Inaudible] CSE and another four kilometres of pylons reside in zone 4, as close as 1.2 kilometres.</p> <p>Two of the CSEs have actually been located in the Applicant's own derived visual setting, almost 1km closer to</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees that the above ground elements of the Project are closer to the south than to the north (1.3 km and 2 km, respectively). The siting of CSE compounds was informed by a number of environmental and technical factors and not just landscape and visual considerations.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project around Ardleigh. There would be visibility of pylons around Ardleigh from the National Landscape as shown in Figures A13.5.8 and A13.5.9 in <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>. Project ZTVs were based on the individual pylon heights as set out in the Table of Parameters in <b>2.3 Works Plans - Sections A to H [APP-017 to APP-024]</b>. Further detail about the Project ZTVs is provided in paragraphs 13.6.3 to 13.6.7 of <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology</b>.</p> <p>The generation of a ZTV is a starting point for understanding the theoretical extents of visibility of the Project. In practice views will diminish with distance, as they become a smaller part of the view, as a result of perspective. While the Digital Terrain Model has been amended to include some buildings and woodland blocks, their maximum heights have been estimated. Other intervening screening vegetation, for example hedgerows and hedgerow trees, are not included and these may substantially filter views experienced by people walking along a PRoW or local lanes, even if it is near to the Project. It is therefore necessary to treat ZTVs as a tool, and to use them with caution. The ZTV is used as one of the tools available to a landscape practitioner, and tested through field work and modelling of photomontages, so that true visibility, in practice, can be better understood.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>the National Landscape than the one to the north. On the pylon visibility maps, you can see that they have a much wider visual impact on the National Landscape than those to the north. The pylons circling Ardleigh will have a much higher visual impact, as 10 of these are the bulkier angle pylons, and the curvature around Ardleigh will result in them appearing closer together from the National Landscape. Additionally, two are 10m taller, which is not covered in the ZTV, as far as I'm aware. All of this resides within zone 4, whereas, nothing resides within zone 4 to the north.</p> <p>On page 4, you'll see the consolidated impact of all of this, with many areas having 23 to 37 pylons visible, and with three areas within the National Landscape in its visual setting having 37 to 52 visible.</p> <p>This should be sufficient to ensure a full undergrounding of this section to conform to Section 85.</p>	
<b>Open Floor Hearing 2</b>			
Chelmsford City Council	<b>[REP1-155]</b>	General comments on alternatives and that the project would lead to impacts to ecology, heritage and archaeology, best and most versatile	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		(BMV) agricultural land, and on the local economy and highway network.	
		This project would introduce 40-50m high pylons and overhead lines of an industrial character within the rural landscape. They would lead to harmful visual intrusion that cannot be mitigated due to their height and scale. The effects would be permanent.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		As inappropriate development, the project would lead to loss of openness and would be harmful to the green belt.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		The proposed lower-height pylons would have a wider stance and heavier frame compared to full height pylons and would have a greater visual presence in the context of the southern part of Great Waltham conservation area. Further consideration is needed of the alternative proposal to replace three of the low-height pylons with two full-height pylons to ensure this is appropriate to the area.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		We are particularly concerned regarding impacts on residential amenity. In some places, the route would pass less than 200m from	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		residential properties, leading to a harmful change in outlook.	
		The proposed construction working hours of 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. Mondays to Fridays and 7.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. at weekends and bank holidays are unacceptable and offer no respite from noise for residents.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
		We consider the DCO should not be granted without a substantially funded landscape and visual compensation scheme, as well as reasonable compensation and benefits in the form of a skills and employment fund, funding heritage and community benefits.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		The proposed 28-days time period to discharge requirements is too short to enable thorough consideration of the requirement and allow proper consultation with consultees. We suggest at least 56 days to deal with each requirement.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
Tendring District Council	<b>[REP1-184]</b>	Local businesses and residents rely on a functioning, open and reliable road network. The rural lanes are already narrow, flood-prone and under pressure. Construction traffic on the scale proposed will strain these routes to beyond breaking point if mitigation is not lasting, robust, enforceable and	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> . <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> details that construction HGVs not adhering to the PARs and use of the haul roads is a matter of non-compliance. Section 6.3 of <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> details the enforcement procedure of investigation by National Grid

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		delivered before construction commences.	and the Main Works Contractor(s), and informing the Local Highway Authority, where appropriate. The <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> is secured through Requirement 4(1) of Schedule 3 of <b>3.1 draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b> .
		Tendring communities want to see firm and comprehensive social value policy, not voluntary commitments, but legally enforceable requirements in the DCO.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		We are proud promoters of the Sunshine Coast, but if genuine and high-quality visitor accommodation is taken up, our hotels and guest houses risk losing their core customers. We need the Applicant to work with us to ensure accommodation strategies do not hollow out our visitor economy.	A visitor bedspace assessment has been undertaken in <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-265]</b> . This has been informed by previous experience on similar National Grid projects. It has been assumed that labour travelling from the broader geographical area would be distributed across various types of accommodation as follows: 50% would use camping and caravan sites; 20% would stay in short-term lets; 20% would use hotels or bed and breakfasts; and the remaining 10% would commute from home to the area. Therefore, it is likely that the majority of the non-local construction workers would take up other forms of accommodation. The number of jobs supported by the Project is relatively low, a maximum number of 1,548 non-local workers would require temporary accommodation at any one time across the Project and no significant effect is anticipated. From previous project experience, it is highly unlikely that workers would take up single occupancy accommodation and it is more likely that workers would share accommodation. In addition, the short-term lets used are likely to be in locations spread across the district or county (given that construction activity moves along a linear route)

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>On flooding and drainage, the rural roads are not just narrow, they are vulnerable and, in some cases, already at breaking point. Surface-water flooding and inadequate drainage already cause damage and this results in closures and hazards. Construction traffic will make matters worse unless strong conditions are in place.</p> <p>Highways mitigation should not merely mitigate, it should improve and future proof. This will require investment in drainage, culverts, road strengthening and long-term resilience.</p>	<p>The construction access strategy is detailed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. The Applicant is proposing to use PARs to route construction traffic from the strategic and major road network to the site access points. Construction HGV drivers not adhering to these routes is a matter of non-compliance, detailed in Section 6.3 of the CTMP. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment for the suitability of the PARs defined, to identify areas where mitigation would be required for safe two-way HGV movements. Mitigation could include for works to improve failing drainage systems and to replace watercourse crossing structures where highway mitigation works and site access points are necessary to accommodate HGV movements. With these necessary mitigations in place, as concluded by the assessment presented in <b>6.12 Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Hydrology Land Drainage and Flood Risk [APP-221]</b>, there are anticipated to be no significant effects on land drainage/flood risk associated with use of the PARs.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing to undertake pre and post construction surveys on routes used by HGVs. In accordance with mitigation measure GG06 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> a record of condition will be carried out (photographic and descriptive) of working areas that may be affected by construction activities This record will be available for comparison following reinstatement after the works have been completed to enable the standard of reinstatement to meet the condition in the pre-condition survey.</p> <p>The mitigation proposed by the Applicant is designed to a permanent standard, following suitable guidance. The Applicant will continue to discuss the legacy street works measures from the Project with the Local Highway Authority.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The Government announced that communities which host nationally significant energy infrastructure should receive long-term support and compensation. That must come with clear commitments.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>.</p>
<p>Ardleigh Parish Council</p>	<p>The OFH summary and Written Representation are both in the same document <b>[REP1-145]</b></p>	<p>General comments on alternatives, consultation and cumulative effects, especially around EACN.</p> <p>In identifying the route and locations the Applicant's own published analysis has demonstrated that coordinated offshore transmission could reduce infrastructure by up to 50% and deliver savings of approximately £6 billion by 2050. Additionally, earlier analysis identified potential savings of between £2.4 and £5.6 billion compared to a purely radial solution.</p> <p>Assessment of impacts: part 5 of EN-1 requires generic impacts, including human health, safety and emergency response capacity, to be assessed and weighed in the planning balance. Even where national need is accepted, EN-1 makes it clear that the</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The document referenced is the "Holistic Approach to Offshore Transmission Planning in Great Britain" published by National Grid Electricity System Operator (ESO) 2020. The National Grid ESO now known as the National Energy System Operator (NESO), was a fully separate entity from the Applicant in 2020 and now is an independent public body. Both the NESO and its former entity ESO have a separate regulatory licence and business separation was in place.</p> <p>Therefore, this information was never published by the Applicant and has since been superseded by subsequent NESO publications. Including Clean Power 2030 published in 2024 and the Centralised Strategic Network Plan published in 2025.</p> <p>The Project is designed to comply with design safety standards including the National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standard (NETS SQSS) and the suite of National Grid policies and processes which contains details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing, and operating its projects. These design safety standards constitute an</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>presumption in favour of consent cannot be disengaged when residual impacts present unacceptable risks to human health or public safety. Clearly, in respect of the ALBA, adverse impacts outweigh the benefits, notwithstanding national need.</p>	<p>embedded mitigation measure as reported in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description [APP-130]</b>.</p> <p>Existing National Grid processes are designed to identify potential security and safety risks during construction and operation (and maintenance) (including risks from major accidents and disasters) and to design these out at each stage of project development. This informs a suite of National Grid policies and processes, which contain details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing, and operating assets such as proposed on the Project.</p> <p>As set out in <b>ES Chapter 10: Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b> and <b>Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> the Project will not result in significant adverse effects on human health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Matters of public safety and pollution control are also considered where appropriate throughout the ES, including <b>ES Chapter 10: Contaminated Land, Geology and Hydrogeology [APP-181]</b> and <b>ES Appendices 6.9.A1: Baseline Information and Preliminary Contaminated Land Risk Assessment [APP-182]</b>, <b>Groundwater Baseline and Qualitative Groundwater Risk Assessment [APP-184]</b>, <b>Traffic and Transport Construction Effects [APP-275]</b>, <b>Flood Risk Assessment [APP-331]</b>, <b>Outline CTMP [APP-309]</b> and <b>Electric and Magnetic Field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>.</p> <p>Management plans are submitted with the Application which secure the implementation of measures during construction and operation which would seek to avoid or reduce risks relating to pollution and emissions, including <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and accompanying management plans within the appendices.</p> <p>The <b>Statement of Statutory Nuisance [APP-084]</b> describes the matters that constitute 'statutory nuisances' within Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA 1990) and considers</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>whether the Project has the potential to cause nuisance, concluding that, with good practice measures in place (included in the above mentioned management plans), no breach of Section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 is expected as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes The Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 require the environmental assessment to identify, describe and assess, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the vulnerability of the proposed development to 'major accidents and disasters'. All potential effects were scoped out from further assessment as there are no likely significant effects, as described in <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-296]</b>. A standalone MAD chapter is therefore not included within <b>Volume 6 Environmental Statement [APP-123 to APP-298]</b>.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Project would not present an unacceptable risk to human health and public safety.</p>
Little Bromley Parish Council	The OFH summary and Written Representation are both in the same document <b>[REP1-145]</b>	<p>General comments on alternatives, consultation and cumulative effects, especially around EACN.</p> <p>Little Bromley's infrastructure and road network are limited. Construction traffic associated with this proposal would utilise narrow rural lanes not designed for sustained heavy goods vehicle movements. Further, the Applicant's proposal introduces a permanent access road from the centre of Little Bromley to service the EACN, with significant and permanent character changes being made to Bentley Road. The parish council's relevant representation identifies the significant safety, severance and</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The construction access strategy is detailed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. The Applicant proposes to route construction traffic from the Major Road Network (MRN) and Strategic Road Network (SRN), along PARs to the Site Access Points. There are two PARs in Little Bromley, Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road. The Applicant is proposing to use a permanent access route to avoid routing traffic through little Bromley village and connect the two routes. Construction HGV vehicles will not be permitted to use alternative routes, and this is a matter of non-compliance, detailed in Section 6 of the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, which is secured through <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>amenity impacts arising from the construction traffic and the permanent works to the LRN. Cumulatively, you should also note that traffic servicing all of the substations and converter station will be routed through Little Bromley.</p>	<p>The PARs have been assessed for suitability of two-way HGV movement, and any associated mitigation is detailed in <b>7.3 Appendix C Section C Indicative Highway Mitigation Plans [APP-312 to APP-320]</b>. Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road have been assessed to require widening to accommodate the design vehicle movements, and a separate temporary footway and cycleway is proposed to provide off road facilities to facilitate non-motorised user movements using the construction period, in line with LTN1/20 guidance.</p> <p>Schedule 13 of <b>3.1 draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>, details that there will be temporary speed limit restrictions on Bentley Road, Ardleigh Road and Little Bromley Road. The permanent access road is to facilitate operational robustness for ALL movements, where required. The permanent access route will be securely fenced, in accordance with GG29 in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is and will continue to engage with the North Falls and Five Estuaries Projects, to understand the access strategies of using Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road, and to coordinate traffic management where possible.</p> <p>The significance of effects on driver/public transport passenger delay, pedestrian, cyclists and horse-rider amenity, severance, delay and fear and intimidation is presented within <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport [APP-271]</b>. No significant effects on sensitive receptors were found as a result of the increase in traffic from the Project and committed developments in Little Bromley when mitigation and controls are in place to create a safe environment for all road users. This includes widening of the carriageway, shared pedestrian/cycle off road facilities along PAR 30 Bentley Road and PAR 31 – Bentley Road/Ardleigh Road, and a temporary reduction in the speed limit. Details of mitigation and controls are as set out within <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>In Little Bromley Parish Council's submission, the impacts it has identified arise because the project has not assessed lower-impact strategic alternatives. The Applicant's own published material demonstrates that coordinated offshore transmission could reduce infrastructure by up to 50% and deliver savings of approximately £6 billion by 2050.</p>	<p>The document referenced is the "Holistic Approach to Offshore Transmission Planning in Great Britain" published by National Grid Electricity System Operator (ESO) 2020. The National Grid ESO now known as the National Energy System Operator (NESO), was a fully separate entity from the Applicant in 2020, and now is an independent public body. Both the NESO and its former entity ESO have a separate regulatory licence and business separation was in place.</p> <p>Therefore, this information was never published by the Applicant and has since been superseded by subsequent NESO publications. Including Clean Power 2030 published in 2024 and the Centralised Strategic Network Plan published in 2025.</p>
		<p>Part 5 of EN-1 requires consideration of impacts on human health, safety and emergency response capacity to be assessed and weighed in the planning balance. Even where national need is accepted, EN-1 makes clear that the presumption in favour of consent is not absolute and may be disengaged where residual impacts present unacceptable risks to human health or public safety.</p>	<p>The Project is designed to comply with design safety standards including the NETS SQSS and the suite of National Grid policies and processes which contains details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing, and operating its projects. These design safety standards constitute an embedded mitigation measure as reported in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description [APP-130]</b>.</p> <p>Existing National Grid processes are designed to identify potential security and safety risks during construction and operation (and maintenance) (including risks from major accidents and disasters) and to design these out at each stage of project development. This informs a suite of National Grid policies and processes, which contain details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing, and operating assets such as proposed on the Project.</p> <p>As set out in <b>ES Chapter 10: Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b> and <b>Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> the Project will not result in significant adverse effects on human health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Matters of public safety and pollution control are also considered where appropriate throughout the ES, including <b>ES Chapter 10:</b></p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>Contaminated Land, Geology and Hydrogeology [APP-181] and ES Appendices 6.9.A1: Baseline Information and Preliminary Contaminated Land Risk Assessment [APP-182] Groundwater Baseline and Qualitative Groundwater Risk Assessment [APP-184], Traffic and Transport Construction Effects [APP-275], Flood Risk Assessment [APP-331], Outline CTMP [APP-309] and Electric and Magnetic Field Compliance Report [APP-330].</b></p> <p>Management plans are submitted with the Application which secure the implementation of measures during construction and operation which would seek to avoid or reduce risks relating to pollution and emissions, including <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and accompanying management plans within the appendices.</p> <p>The <b>Statement of Statutory Nuisance [APP-084]</b> describes the matters that constitute 'statutory nuisances' within Section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 and considers whether the Project has the potential to cause nuisance, concluding that, with good practice measures in place (included in the abovementioned management plans), no breach of Section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 is expected as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes The Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 require the environmental assessment to identify, describe and assess, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the vulnerability of the proposed development to 'major accidents and disasters'. All potential effects were scoped out from further assessment as there are no likely significant effects, as described in <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-296]</b>. A standalone major accidents and disasters chapter is therefore not included within <b>Volume 6 Environmental Statement [APP-123 to APP-298]</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
North-West and South-West of Chelmsford Parishes Group	[REP1-259]	<p>The Applicant's CPRSS report of 2022 had corridors L and Q to the east and south of Chelmsford. Using our local knowledge, we identified strategic options and mapped detailed routes with potential variations. Finally, we submitted our proposals to an independent landscape consultancy, which concluded that our principal combination of route sections significantly outperforms the preferred route.</p>	<p>In light of the above, the Project would not present an unacceptable risk to human health and public safety.</p>
		<p>We accepted that our proposals would need discussion and refinement, as any proposals inevitably do. Our emails to arrange further meetings were initially welcomed, but ultimately no dates were offered and eventually our emails went unanswered, so, sadly, we cannot submit an SOCG as we had hoped, although that is not through want of our trying.</p>	<p>The suggested alternatives propose different arrangements for seeking to lead to a relocation of the proposed connection from passing the north and west of Chelmsford and to instead pass to the east of Chelmsford. From here there are alternatives to south-west and south-east to connect to Tilbury. The main rationale for the proposed move to the east of Chelmsford is to seek to route the new connection in the proximity of existing overhead line structures (both 400kV and 132kV lattice pylon lines are present).</p> <p>The Applicant has considered this feedback each time it has been raised but continues to arrive at the same conclusion. That is that there is no readily identifiable overhead line route to achieve the connection in full. Much is made by the respondent of individual extracts from Options Appraisal Summary Tables, however, there remain some fundamental constraints such that the Applicants position remains unchanged.</p>
		<p>The group remains baffled primarily by the Applicant's decision to prefer a route through untouched countryside to the obvious alternative east and</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware the group of parishes has looked to arrange a meeting. The Applicant was unable to meet at the time due to the preparation of the targeted consultations held in early 2025. The proposals submitted by the group were considered at each stage of consultation and included within the Consultation report.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>south of Chelmsford, where there are opportunities to close parallel and rationalise with existing power lines. Self-evidently, the general duty imposed by schedule 9 of the 1989 Act to preserve natural beauty would be better met if effects can be limited to existing overhead line or trunk road corridors.</p>	<p><b>Summary of Oral Submission and Response to Action Points for Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-139].</b> Reasons why the route to the east of Chelmsford was discounted are set out in Chapter 7 of <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b> and also Section 9.2 of <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122].</b></p>
Tritton Farming Partnership	<b>[REP1-281]</b> OFH is included in the same document as the Written Representation	All of the points raised in the OFH summary are included and expanded on within the Written Representation.	Due to the matters covered in the Oral Statement being included within the IPs Written Representation <b>[REP1-281]</b> , the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
Brett Aggregates Limited	<b>[REP1-210]</b>	<p>The objections we have made concern a mineral extraction prospect site at Lowleys Farm near Great Leighs, to the north of Chelmsford.</p> <p>During the pre-app engagement into the DCO, the Applicant was made aware of the mineral scheme, its importance and value. During these engagements, alternative routes were offered by the landowner, Tritton Farming Partnership, in good faith across other areas in their ownership. Despite this, the route chosen passes right over the middle of the mineral scheme, right over its deepest point. The NSIP scheme, without</p>	<p><b>6.9.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 9.2 - Qualitative Minerals Resource and Infrastructure assessment [APP-183]</b> provides an assessment of existing minerals infrastructure, candidate sites and minerals safeguarded areas. The assessment recognises this candidate site A59 Lowleys Farm which was put forward in 2023 as part of the Review of Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014. The review has not currently concluded which of the candidate sites will be included in the final plan and the guidance provided by Essex County Council describes that allocation in the final plan does not mean that planning permission for mineral extraction will be granted. Therefore, candidate sites have a lower sensitivity than existing sites.</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with the promoter of the site and the Order Limits within this area have been widened to allow flexibility for an alternative alignment should the site be allocated. Widened Order Limits have been included to allow for response to the potential allocation within the minerals plan. An amended route</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		amendment, will have a significant impact on this important resource.	alignment within those Order Limits has been proposed which places pylons to the edge of' and potentially outwith, the area of potential minerals abstraction thus substantially reducing the level of interaction. Engagement is ongoing to finalise the details.
Aldham Parish Council	No separate OFH submission.	The document <b>[REP1-144]</b> on the Planning Inspectorate website states that ' <i>This written representation expands and builds on the Oral Statement made at the First Open Hearing on Thursday 12th February.</i> '	Due to the matters covered in the Oral Statement being included within the IPs Written Representation, the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
Whirledge and Nott Chartered Surveyors (representing 80 affected parties)	<b>[REP1-286]</b>	<p>General comments on alternatives and consultation.</p> <p>Consultation has taken substantial time and cost, and yet many responses are either absent or uncertain as to be unusable. There is a particular serious issue around the associated third-party works. Landowners are being left to deal directly with third-parties, in relation to diversions or reinforcements that directly arise from this project. There has been no consultation by those parties, no clear accountability and responsibilities repeatedly deflected by the Applicant. There remains significant uncertainty around construction methods and programme, making sensible planning impossible.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant recognises that consultation and engagement has required significant time and resource for affected landowners, it does not accept that responses have been absent or deliberately unclear. The Applicant has undertaken multiple rounds of statutory and non-statutory consultation and ongoing landowner engagement and continues to refine its proposals in response to feedback received. Where matters remain subject to design development or third-party confirmation, this reflects the scale and complexity of the Project rather than a lack of engagement or accountability.</p> <p>In relation to third-party works, including utility diversions and reinforcements, these arise as a necessary consequence of the Project but are often delivered by statutory undertakers or asset owners operating under their own regulatory and technical frameworks. While direct landowner contact with third-party undertakers may occur as part of those parties' statutory processes, this does not represent a deflection of responsibility by the Applicant, which remains committed to facilitating engagement,</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Agreed licence terms have not been adhered to, including failures to provide survey data required for a proper review and informed engagement, and there is also continued pressure to agree standardised heads of terms (HoT), despite these not being presented to clients in good time.</p>	<p>explaining roles and responsibilities, and addressing landowner concerns through its appointed land agents and project team.</p> <p>Heads of Terms (HoTs) have been issued to affected parties and their appointed agents in good time. Multiple meetings have been held with Whirledge and Nott, as well as other agents, to discuss the terms outlined in the HoTs and to gather feedback from all stakeholders.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's approach to have consistency within the HoTs rather than a standardised approach, to ensure equality across all affected parties. The IP has been made aware that the reissuing of HoTs is part of National Grid's broader strategy. This process takes into account feedback from affected parties wherever reasonably practicable. Revised versions of the HoTs have already been provided to the IP for their reference, enabling them to advise their clients appropriately. The Applicant has adopted an approach that prioritises consistency within the HoT, rather than enforcing a rigid standardised format. This method is intended to ensure fairness and equality for all affected parties.</p>
Essex Scouts and Guides	<b>[REP1-234]</b>	<p>The Essex International Scout and Guide Jamboree has been held at Roxwell since 2012. The proposed pylon route cuts through the site and two towers sit in the heart of the camping and activity areas. The Applicant informed us that the 2028 Jamboree cannot take place during the construction period. If the scheme proceeds, undergrounding the section is the only realistic mitigation that would materially reduce harm. Failing that, the Applicant must identify and fully fund a suitable alternative site.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that it has had extensive engagement with Essex Scouts and Guides. The Applicant is currently working with the Essex International Scout and Guide Jamboree to support the identification of an alternative site for the 2028 event, and to assist with longer term planning for future events.</p> <p>Engagement is and will continue constructively with the aim of resolving outstanding issues and progressing a legal agreement between the parties.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
<b>Open Floor Hearing 3</b>			
Norfolk County Council	[REP1-174]	General comments on alternatives and cumulative effects.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		The Waveney Valley is the most sensitive landscape in the project route through Norfolk. With Suffolk County Council, we jointly commissioned a valued landscape assessment which shows the sensitivity of the landscape.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> . The Applicant refers to the Valued Landscape Assessment in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b> .
		We were disappointed to find out that the Waveney Valley alternative is no longer part of the proposal.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b> .
Roydon Parish Council	[REP1-175] (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	General comments on alternatives, the Holford Rules and environmental impacts.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Holford Rule 1 states that pylons should 'avoid, if possible, the major areas of highest amenity value'. Supplementary notes state that 'routes should minimise the effect on other special landscapes, including those of county district or local value'. Ignoring this, the Applicant has routed pylons through the Waveney Valley, considered a valued landscape by Suffolk and Norfolk County Councils, both county wildlife trusts, and local residents. What makes the valley so special is its contrasting habitats of	Detailed siting and routeing is informed by the guidance available in the Holford and Horlock Rules, the results of technical and environmental studies and fieldwork and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. The Applicant notes that balanced decision-making is required to consider the different combinations of effects and consequences. Decision making on route alignment in the Waveney Valley is set out in section 4.6 of <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> . Routeing needed to balance the potential effects on heritage assets, the WaLOR project, landscape and views, and the experience of users of the Angles Way.

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>peatland fen, deciduous woodland and heath, specifically Wortham Ling, an SSSI, and Roydon Fen local nature reserve. To compound the impact, the pylons will run through the narrow gap between these two sites, seriously detracting from their setting.</p>	<p>The Applicant has routed and sited the alignment in accordance with the Holford Rules, as well as taking cognisance of the results of survey information and consultation feedback</p> <p>There are no current local landscape designations such as Special Landscape Areas within the Study Area. Judgements on landscape value were made as part of the assessment in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2: Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>. Landscape value judgements are detailed in Annex A: Landscape Value Assessment, which is presented in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2: Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>. These value judgements were informed by the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations. This defines landscape value as 'the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities' (page 3). The value judgements were informed by a range of sources including the Waveney Valley Valued Landscape Assessment.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>This area is within a DEFRA funded Landscape Recovery Project (Waveney and Little Ouse Recovery Scheme – WaLOR)) which seeks to enhance its biodiversity, landscape, heritage assets and their surroundings, and enable positive cultural and social benefits. These objectives will be adversely affected by the proposed route of the the Applicant's development.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on the Waveney and Little Ouse Landscape Recovery (WaLOR) project as far as practicable and are actively engaging with the WaLOR project team on a regular basis. With the overhead line solution through the Waveney Valley and other carefully designed construction elements, impacts on the WaLOR project will be minimised and the WaLOR objectives will not be adversely affected by the Project. Full details on the engagement to date on the WaLOR are presented within <b>5.9.18 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Suffolk Wildlife Trust [REP1-044]</b>. The Applicant is committed to ongoing collaboration with the WaLOR project team to ensure successful delivery of both projects. The Main Works Contractor(s) would seek to engage with the WaLOR project team during detailed design development, to reduce any potential for conflicts</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Holford Rule 2 states that pylons should 'avoid smaller areas of high amenity value'. The proposed pylon route has significant impacts on the setting of listed buildings in Roydon. One pylon for example will be just 200m from the Grade II listed, 17th century Lime Tree Farm on Snow Street. Other pylons will be upwards of 200m from other listed buildings in this area, and further south, the Grade I listed St Remigius Church will be overshadowed by four pylons.</p> <p>Some of the route lies close to the long-distance Angles Way footpath and the archaeological noted site of Bush Hall, a non-designated heritage asset within the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>between the two projects both in terms of construction working areas and programme.</p> <p>Limetree Farmhouse (1373273) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, and significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 – APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Holford Rule 3 states that, 'All other things being equal, choose the most direct line with no sharp changes of direction'.</p> <p>There is no greater example of the entire Norwich to Tilbury route where a village is so impacted by disregard for this rule. The towers and cables will be the single most dominant feature of the landscape on three sides of the village, with two sharp changes of direction.</p> <p>Routes with significantly less impact on people and the environment would either swing more gently through</p>	<p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p> <p>Regarding the Church of St Remigius and Bush Hall please see the Applicant's comments on the Historic England Written Representation in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b>.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>sparsely populated areas to the west of Bressingham and west of Worthingam Ling, or more directly to the east of Diss, following the approximate route of the A140 road.</p>	
		<p>Holford Rule 4 states that the route should choose tree and hill backgrounds, in preference to sky backgrounds.</p> <p>Roydon is known for big skies. Several are protected under Policy 16 of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan made in October 2023. These views were chosen by the public before they ever knew of the Norwich to Tilbury project. These key views, north of the village from Darrow Lane and south across the Waveney Valley, will be devastated by the presence of pylons.</p>	<p>Detailed siting and routeing was informed by the guidance available in the Holford and Horlock Rules, the results of technical and environmental studies and fieldwork and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. The Applicant notes that balanced decision-making is required to consider the different combinations of effects and consequences.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that there will be significant effects on landscape and visual receptors at locations along the length of the Project. The effects are set out in the assessment presented in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>As set out in Table A13.1.9 of <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology [APP-227]</b>, recognition of the value of views was determined with reference to a number of factors, including whether it was recorded as being of importance in a Neighbourhood Plan. This was carried through to the judgement of sensitivity in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment [APP-229 to APP-232]</b>. In addition to this, the viewpoint assessment in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment [APP-229 to APP-232]</b> identifies where an LVIA viewpoint is within the vicinity of a key view identified in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Tacolneston Parish Council	<b>[REP1-181]</b> (incorrectly labelled as	General comments on alternatives including undergrounding, consultation, ecological and landscape effects and effects on	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	Written Representation)	residents, including property devaluation, severance of land and disruption of amenities.	
		<p>Tacolneston has the Great Field, with evidence of Saxon strip farming, and archaeological finds. This is the site of proposed pylons 33, 34, and 35. Between these sites, the pylons, accompanying construction, haul roads, etc, the archaeology is vulnerable to destruction.</p>	<p>Through routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce as far as practicable potential impacts on archaeology. A comprehensive desk-based assessment and walkover have been undertaken, which includes the archaeological assets in this area (<b>6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-209]</b>), along with archaeological evaluation (<b>6.11.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.4: Geophysical Survey Results Report [APP-212]</b>, <b>6.11.A5: Environmental Statement Appendix 11.5 – Trial Trenching Results Report [APP-213]</b>, <b>6.11.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.6 - Geoarchaeological Monitoring of Ground Investigation Works Report [APP-214]</b>). This has identified archaeological sites along the proposed route. Where sites of archaeological significance were identified, the Applicant has sought to avoid direct impact. Where complete avoidance has not been feasible, the Applicant will ensure that any residual impacts are minimised and that appropriate mitigation measures are in place.</p> <p>The Applicant fully recognises the importance of safeguarding archaeological remains, and our approach is aligned with this principle. The approach set out in <b>7.5 Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-328]</b> and secured through Requirement 5 within <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b> already includes provision for a range of mitigation strategies, including preservation in situ should highly significant remains be identified.</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Parish Council recently made a tree preservation order on an ancient oak tree (Stickfer Oak) with a girth of over 5m situated next to pylon 33. I know that the TPO will be superseded if the project is allowed to go ahead.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that under Article 51 (2) of Schedule 14 within <b>3.3 Draft DCO - Validation Report for DCO [APP-058]</b> the Applicant may undertake works to TPO trees.</p>
		<p>Tacolneston is situated within a predominantly agricultural and ecologically sensitive area. The introduction of 50m-high steel lattice pylons will irrevocably industrialise this beautiful landscape. The sheer scale of the pylons will constitute an unacceptable dominating and permanent scar on the horizon, destroying the character of the countryside which is valued by both residents and visitors. The parish council maintains that this visual intrusion is disproportionate to the perceived national benefit and represents a failure to respect the local environment.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project where it crosses to the east of Tacolneston.</p> <p>Whilst the rural landscape will remain in place beneath and around the proposed overhead line, it is nevertheless recognised by the Applicant that significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity will occur. These effects are reported in the LVIA in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>The area around Talconeston is located within Landscape Character Area (LCA) E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland. As set out in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>, significant adverse effects are identified within approximately 1.5 km of the Project, during construction and operation.</p> <p>The area around Tacolneston is located within Visual Receptor Areas (VRA) A5 Tacolneston, and A7 Forncett St Peter. Significant adverse effects are identified within approximately 1.5 km of the Project, during construction and operation, as set out in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>.</p>
		<p>The construction and presence of this vast infrastructure will result in</p>	<p>Through routeing, siting and the iterative design process, the Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential</p>

Organisation	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>significant and unavoidable ecological damage. Furthermore, the permanent pylon highways and the maintenance requirements will require the clearance of natural vegetation, disrupting established ecosystems and local wildlife corridors.</p>	<p>impacts on key ecological features such as designated sites, irreplaceable habitats, protected species, ecological connectivity/wildlife corridors and habitats/species of principal importance. The design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors. As part of the EIA process for the Project, a suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken over the 2022-2025 period. The findings of which informed the design and approach to mitigation.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts on valuable habitats and species.</p>

# 3. Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Individuals

## 3.1 Applicant’s Response to Oral Submissions Made by Individuals

3.1.1 Table 3.1 sets out the Applicant’s response to the issues raised in the oral submissions made by individuals during the OFH.

Table 3.1 Applicant’s response to issues raised by individuals during the hearings

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant’s Response
<b>Open Floor Hearing 1 (Session 1)</b>			
Finnie	[REP1-441]	Challenging the UK green agenda and DCO process.	This comment relates to the merits of policy set out in a national policy statement and it is not for the Applicant to respond to in relation to the specific project.
Langton	No OFH summary has been submitted	General comments on consultation, Gunning Principles and alternatives.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant’s Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		The project will require thousands of tons of new materials driven by the fuel of thousands of lorry movements and reliant on steel imported from across the globe. This will have a large carbon footprint.	These points are addressed in the <b>Applicant’s Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
		Owner of a farm in Wenham, where there will have seven pylons and undergrounding on BMV land and c 200 acres or a third of their productive land, either permanently or during the construction phase. It will cut the farm in half and make any operations convoluted or	Discussions have been ongoing between the Applicant and the IP’s land agent. The farm will be affected during the construction phase, however crossing points will be agreed to enable farm operations to continue. The design has been mitigated to reduce post construction impact for the farm i.e. pylons located to field perimeters where feasible.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		completely impossible, impacting viability of the business.	
Blacker	[REP1-304]	<p>General comments on HVDC as an alternative and the need to consider the environment in the cost comparison of options, also undergrounding in the Waverley valley.</p> <p>Pylons and bird strikes go together Redgrave and Lopham Fen is the largest valley fen in England and one of the most important wetlands in Europe. Collision with power lines and electrocution from power line infrastructure kill of over 100 species of wild birds in the UK. Birds en route to the Fen via a Waveney Valley with pylons are unsuspecting victims. The pylons route also includes part of the proposed UNESCO World Heritage East Coast Flyway. Future generations would forgive neither the permanent destruction of habitats critical to migration, nor the risk of mortality to migrating birds along the Flyway.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises the importance of Redgrave and Lopham Fen and the wider Waveney Valley for migratory and wintering birds. As the Project crosses the River Waveney downstream of Redgrave and Lopham Fen, vantage point surveys have been carried out at this location to assess collision risk. Vantage-point survey methodology is set out within <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>, and impacts assessed within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>The surveys examined whether proposed overhead lines could fragment flight corridors or increase mortality along routes between coastal and inland habitats. The assessment did not identify locations which pose notable collision concern. Despite this conclusion, on a precautionary basis, orange spacers and bird diverters on the earth wire are proposed at the River Waveney, as detailed in <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>The proposed UNESCO World Heritage East Coast Flyway is largely defined by designated sites of International Importance including Special Protection Areas (SPA) for avian interest, Ramsar Convention Wetlands and Special Areas of Conservation. The effects on such 'European Sites', including an assessment on collision risk, is presented within the <b>5.3 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report [APP-082]</b>. The</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>Project is outside the Impact Risk Zone for most coastal European Sites, with the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA/Ramsar and Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar considered at Stage 1 screening within the <b>5.3 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report [APP-082]</b>. Surveys did not identify areas of notable concern, and no adverse effects on the integrity of a European Site was concluded. This conclusion was agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence indicates the Project does not pose a significant collision risk nor does it compromise established movement corridors for migrating and commuting birds.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Acid sulphate soils and their risk of oxidisation The soilscapes presented by the Applicant do not align with the mapping of the Soil Survey of England and Wales. The Applicant has not carried out the recognised tests for potential acid sulphate soils.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>Document: 8.4.6 Applicant's comments on submissions received at Procedural Deadline A [REP1-136]</b>.</p>
Wills	<b>[REP1-456]</b>	<p>Concerns about the cumulative construction impacts on Lark Hall on Sandpits Lane. The IP want a tweak to the Order Limits at the fence line to reduce impacts on their property and also to look at mitigation measures that will be needed.</p>	<p>The Order Limits have been narrowed at this location due to the presence of homes and are constrained by woodland and other properties. The Applicant considered alternative installation methods such as horizontal directional drilling, but this was constrained due to available space and on balance the effects of carefully completed open cut installation are reduced compared with other methods. The apparent overlap of the Order Limits is thought to arise due to slight mismatch between data sets. The Applicant is investigating the mapping point but can confirm that construction works would not need to extend beyond the fence line into the IPs garden.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Concerns about impacts on Grade II listed home (which was rated as a moderate adverse impact in the Environmental Statement) but this didn't address the full cumulative impact. There is also no information on how impacts could be mitigated other than reference to best practice measures and no response to requests for a discussion on this.</p> <p>Provided a redacted image with the oral summary.</p>	<p>All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 – APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>, which considers impacts that could arise as a result of direct and indirect factors and that could cause physical impact or impact through change to setting. As the grade II listed Lark Hall (1036983) is located outside the Order Limits the impact assessed is due to change within its setting that affects its value. The assessment concluded that the moderate adverse effects would occur during construction, with neutral effects during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). As it is the temporary construction works that would cause impact the standard construction mitigation measures are appropriate as any measures designed to lessen the visual impact of the Project would be of a scale that would visually adversely alter the setting of the asset.</p> <p>With regard to construction noise and vibration, this is assessed in <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration [APP-256]</b>. Construction noise and vibration will be managed via the commitments in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b>. These measures ensure that best practicable means (BPM) will be employed by the contractor(s) to reduce the effects of noise and vibration during construction as far as practicable. Further detailed construction noise and vibration assessments will be undertaken by the contractor based on their specific methodologies. Specific mitigation measures will be identified during these assessments and incorporated in the final NVMP.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>With regard to potential building damage due to vibration, this has been assessed as part of the construction vibration assessment to identify locations with potential risk. Suitable control measures are in place in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b> to ensure that this is reassessed by the contractor(s), and suitable mitigation measures and monitoring are put in place should a risk of potential damage be identified.</p> <p>With regards to this specific property, it has been identified as potential experiencing potential adverse effects from noise, but these would not significant. With regards to vibration, there is potential for vibration to be perceptible at this property if vibratory compaction techniques are used, but would not be of a level to cause potential building damage. As outlined above, this will be subject to further review and assessment by the contractor(s).</p>
Vermont	<b>[REP1-315]</b>	<p>General comments on Equator Principles, alternatives such as HVDC and whole life costs of options.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>Lives at a listed farmhouse with a celebrated garden, sited c 100m from the EACN, which will largely destroy the community amenity of the garden. the Applicant has refused to include the property in its heritage survey.</p>	<p>An assessment of effects on residential visual amenity for properties within 200m of the proposed overhead line has been provided in <b>6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-233 and APP-234]</b>. This study area has been based on Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (LI TGN) 2/19 'Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)', which explains that breaches of the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold are unlikely to occur for a project of this nature beyond a distance of 200m. Our plans show that residential buildings at Hungerdown which we believe the IP is referring to</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>are located over 350m away from the proposed overhead line, so, whilst it is recognised that impacts to residential visual amenity may occur at this property, they are not expected to breach the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold.</p> <p>Where a person's land is not acquired and no land rights are taken, but they consider that their property may be adversely affected by the construction or operation of the Project, they may fall within what is commonly referred to as a Category 3 claim interest.</p> <p>A relevant claim may arise where physical factors attributable to the Project such as noise, vibration, lighting or other measurable effects can be demonstrated to have caused a compensatable loss. Claims based solely on generalised blight, perceived loss of value, or concern about proximity to the Project are not compensable under the statutory framework.</p> <p>The Applicant cannot confirm in advance whether a person will be entitled to make a Category 3 claim, nor whether any claim would result in compensation. All claims are assessed on a case by case basis, having regard to the specific circumstances and the statutory tests that apply.</p>
		<p>The Applicant initially recognised that the IP had a case for non-statutory financial compensation for the documented £400,000 loss in the resale value of the property but now has no interest in a discussion at all.</p>	<p>The Applicant held a meeting with the IP in July 2025 and the IP has appointed a land agent. The Applicant acknowledges that the IP raised the point of financial compensation but the Applicant confirms it did not recognise the unsubstantiated loss of £400,000. The Applicant's position has not changed.</p> <p>In January 2026, at the Great Bromley consultation event, members of the Project team met with the IP to discuss the change application and the IP's concerns. Following the discussion in Great Bromley the IP forwarded previous correspondence to the Applicant highlighting areas where they</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			felt questions had not been addressed, which the Applicant is reviewing and will respond to.
Elliott	[REP1-389]	<p>General comments on consultation, alternatives and impacts on landscape, listed buildings and wildlife including bird strike.</p> <p>We have been through three consultations, submitted copious feedback, met with the Applicant's agents and expressed our concerns, not one of our questions has been answered.</p> <p>Increased water levels would cause the stream to ford over the driveway to the IP's home more frequently and deeply preventing access. Runoff from fields onto the highway races down a steep hill, already causing erosion in heavy rain. An increase will cause damage and dangerous road conditions.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The only interaction with the project on the IP's land is with the UK Power Networks (UKPN) works. This third party will be escalated to engage with this IP at the earliest opportunity. The Applicant has engaged with the IP directly and attended an on-site meeting with the IP and their land agent on 24 July 2025, to directly answer questions regarding the routing of the overhead line, hear concerns relating to the impact on viewpoints and vistas, and to explain the process of route design and the constraints in this area. Feedback on design related matters and engagement has been reported in the Design Development Reports published as part of the 2023 non-statutory consultation (<b>7.20 2023 Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b>), 2024 statutory consultation (<b>7.21 2024 – Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b>) and with the application for development consent (<b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>).</p> <p>As detailed in <b>8.2 Drainage Strategy DCO [REP1-072]</b> the Project will embed a range of measures and controls to manage runoff from the construction swathe so as to avoid contributing to any existing local flooding and drainage issues. The controls detailed in the Strategy are secured through commitments that are included within the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The buzzing and wind noise for the homes SO close to the power line, given the unique topography of the valley and our experience of noise channelling through it.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to using a low noise 'triple araucaria' conductor type. Due to its geometrical configuration, the triple Araucaria design is the least electrically stressed conductor system that National Grid uses. It is the best design for reducing the effects of line crackle (corona discharge) and would reduce the generation of noise from the proposed overhead lines during operation.</p> <p>By using this conductor system, adverse effects from operational noise are not expected, even directly underneath line. This includes during wet conditions when corona discharge, and therefore noise generation, would typically occur. On this basis, operational noise from overhead lines was scoped out of the Environmental Statement. Despite this, information regarding noise from overhead lines, including an assessment justifying scoping out, is provided in <b>6.14.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 14.5 – Operational Noise from Overhead Lines Informative [APP-261]</b>.</p>
		<p>The impact on the huge variety of bird and wildlife on our land, on the bat and owl nesting sites, badger sets, the flight path of the wildfowl on the pond, all right next to the pylon line. Ecologists have visited and told us it is a rich habitat and that further assessments will be needed, but there have been no subsequent surveys.</p>	<p>This area of land has been subject to a full range of ecological surveys over 2022-2025. These surveys have included habitats, bats, badgers and birds and the results and assessment of impacts on ecological receptors are presented within <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> and the associated ecological appendices. Impacts to ecological features within this area of land are associated with third party works and are therefore minor and short-term. Impacts on trees and hedgerows, amongst other ecological features, will be refined further at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> sets out a comprehensive mitigation strategy for habitat loss (temporary and permanent) and any impacts, including fragmentation and disturbance, on protected</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			species as agreed with Natural England and Local Planning Authorities. In addition, the Applicant has committed to deliver 10 % Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) with environmental and societal benefits.
		Unclear why the project proposes to fell trees on the IPs land to bury an existing line when there is open farmland a few metres away.	Assuming the comment refers to Sheet 4 of <b>2.16 Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed and or Managed Plans - Section D [APP-051]</b> this is likely due to the standard buffering of the centrelines and in all likelihood trees would be avoided for cabling of UKPN assets, unless they are close to the existing poles whereby there could be some impact.  Note, this is only marked as potentially affected for the tree group and a portion removed for the hedgerow at the pole itself. Details as per commitments in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> , UKPN will seek to minimise vegetation impact.
		<b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b>  The Applicant understated the impact of the project in the consultation. Our property is a grade II listed building. The documents described the farmhouse and its setting.  The farmhouse has farm buildings to the rear (uphill side) and views to the east and south. The paragraph notes that a small woodland blocks the view to the east but does note that “due to the proximity (of the pylons) there is a probability that the top of the pylons would be visible from the asset”. The person making this comment has clearly not stood on the property site. The pylons will be placed just behind the described woodland, the slope	Highfield Farmhouse (1225094) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a minor adverse, and not significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) ( <b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b> ). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) ( <b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b> ). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b> , <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic</b>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>rises, the trees are approximately 20m tall. There is no “probability” that the pylons will be seen. It is certain and due to the topography of the land they will tower for at least 30m, possibly more, over the top of the trees, the description of being able to see the “top” of the pylons is misleading and understates the impact. The pylons and overhead wires will give the impression of towering over the property and all the pylons and the CSE compound at the end of Crabtree Lane (TB35/TB36) to TB40 (possibly more) will clearly be visible from this elevation. This was also evident from your simulation seen at one of the consultations.</p> <p>The Applicant’s document stated that the CSE compound is located in a dip, however height differential of that and the surrounding land is minimal and the extremely industrialised infrastructure can clearly be seen and has an impact upon a number of listed buildings around it, including Highfield Farmhouse. TB40 which is placed opposite the end of the driveway, is a larger pylon due to the angle change of the line. The woodland is deciduous and therefore in the winter months will provide no screening at all, the pylons will be visible from top to bottom.</p>	<p><b>Environment [APP-208].</b> The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p>	<p>Through routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce as far as practicable potential impacts on the settings of listed buildings. The Applicant acknowledges that the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>There are multiple listed properties across the Fordham valley, all quite different in character. When we adapted our property to accommodate my husband's disabilities it involved many lengthy discussions with the local conservation office, numerous site visits and three iterations of plans. There was a requirement to not change in any way the elevation when viewed from the south and from across the valley. Any new roof elevations to the rear of the house had to be lower than the main farmhouse roof and not visible from across the valley so as not to alter the view from other areas of the valley. All building materials had to be approved and be "conservation" or reclaimed. This materially increased the cost of the project but was accepted as part of the responsibility of owning a listed property set in beautiful countryside and we understood the importance of not changing the views for our neighbours or the image of the heritage building. The material adverse change to the setting of the listed properties across the Fordham Valley will diminish their value and appeal, but most importantly there will not be investment into these listed buildings, they are by their construction nature and the requirements of the listings very expensive to maintain, they will be of very limited appeal and fall into disrepair and the region will lose its heritage assets.</p>	<p>settings of some designated assets fall partially within the Order Limits and this is assessed within <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment [AS-068]</b>. Where this occurs, the Applicant has assessed the significance of effect on the value of these assets within <b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>. The Project has also assessed the level of harm in <b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b> on designated assets where land that forms part of the setting of designated assets falls within the Order Limits. The assessment has not concluded any substantial harm to heritage assets, although less than substantial harm has been identified as is common for many types of developments and should be considered in the context of the planning balance of the benefits of the Project. As the Project is classified as critical national priority as set out in section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 (2024) the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that CNP infrastructure will meet the test for public benefit that outweighs harm, even if substantial harm were identified, as set out in paragraph 4.2.15-17 of NPS EN-1 (2024).</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Impact on wildlife and the Fordham valley landscape: The area is ecologically a very rich and diverse habitat. The proposed industrial construction along its perimeter will disturb the wildlife. It is a rare, undisturbed, high quality water meadow habitat. This area is alongside a stream which runs into the River Colne, part of it forms a large pond.</p>	<p>changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p> <p>The siting and design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts on valuable habitats and species.</p> <p>Along the River Colne is the Fordham Bridge Meadow LWS, which is located 70 m away from the Order Limits. Impact pathways to this designated site are limited to potential hydrological links. The hydrological protection measures set out within <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> would mitigate impacts to Forham Bridge Meadow LWS and the associated surrounding wetland habitats. No significant residual ecological effects have been identified in the Fordham Valley landscape.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>When we purchased the property 21 years ago, the area was designated a Conservation Area by Colchester City Council, this was for good reason, the very diverse habitat and gently undulating landscape is particularly attractive and peaceful, the Colne valley and its tributaries are of significant landscape value and equal in quality to the Dedham Vale, this landscape should be preserved for future generations.</p>	<p>The value of the landscape has been considered and the approach to making judgements on the value of landscape receptors is set out on pages 12 to 18 of <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology [APP-227]</b>. Judgements on landscape value are reported in Annex A Landscape Value Assessment of <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area (LCA) A4 Colne River Valley Floor and LCA A5 Colne River Valley Slopes are assessed as being of medium-high value.</p> <p>These judgements were informed by the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations. This defines landscape value as <i>'the relative value or importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities'</i> (page 3).</p>
Davis	No OFH summary has been submitted	The proposed overhead line passes c 20m from the summer house and garden seating area. The IP has concerns regarding the effects of Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) from the overhead line on his heart device and overall health.	The UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for managing EMFs, which are incorporated into the decision-making process for applications for Development Consent in NPS EN-5. These policies, which include exposure limits, have been set by an independent authoritative scientific body, UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) who carefully review all science around magnetic fields and health. After decades of research into EMF and health there are no established health effects below the exposure limits. All the infrastructure proposed as part of this project complies with the requirements of EN-5 and evidence of compliance is available in the <b>7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b> . In addition to compliance with the Government's exposure limits, the overhead line design, as detailed in Section 6.2 of <b>7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b> ensures

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>that the EMF reduces quickly with distances from overhead line.</p> <p>EN-5 provides guidance on EMF and heart devices stating: <i>'2.9.58 The Department of Health and Social Care's Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency does not consider that transmission line EMFs constitute a significant hazard to the operation of pacemakers.'</i></p> <p>National Grid are unaware of any reported instances of an overhead line interfering with a correctly fitted modern electronic implantable device such as a pacemaker or ICD. Further details of EMF and medical devices is provided <b>Section 2.10 in 7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>.</p> <p>National Grid take these issues very seriously and will continue to engage with anyone who has concerns, to provide reassurance that there will be no EMF impact to medical devices from National Grid equipment.</p>
Drewry	<b>[REP1-318]</b>	<p>Owens a small piece of land, surrounded by ancient hedgerows and mature trees, orchard, a nuttery and keeps bees.</p> <p>Concerns about EMF on human health and also ability of honeybees to function properly, and whether it would affect his hives and wider biodiversity in the local area.</p>	<p>In the UK, the body of research regarding EMF, human health and impacts to ecosystems is reviewed by authoritative groups, such as the UKHSA, who advise Government on the measures that should be put in place to protect against EMF exposure based on that body of evidence. Government have acted on that advice and set EMF policies and guidelines which are detailed in EN-5. This sets out clear guidance on the EMF requirements Industry need to meet when developing new infrastructure and is detailed in <b>7.8 Electric and Magnetic Fields Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>. Within this guidance, both human health and impacts to ecosystems are considered. It is important that decisions on EMF exposures are made independently of industry. EN-5 states: p'2.9.59 <i>There is little evidence that exposure of crops, farm animals or natural ecosystems to transmission line EMFs has any</i></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<i>agriculturally significant consequences.'</i> Additionally, National Grid has previously worked with the British Beekeeping Association to establish hives around our sites, including high voltage substations, which have thrived. Where hives are particularly close to high voltage power lines, it may be necessary to check the earthing of the various parts of the hive, something that is easily done and on which National Grid can advise if helpful.
		The IP has repeatedly asked why the Norwich to Tilbury route goes diagonally across his land, when immediately to the west is a vast expanse of monoculture and would provide easy access for large machinery but has no response.	The Applicant is unclear which location this refers to and would be happy to respond if further details relating to the specific location can be provided.
Homewood	No OFH summary just the Written Representation [REP1-305]	General comments on consultation, alternatives and impacts on landscape and historic buildings.  The route through our historic villages maximises harm. 50m steel lattice pylons along ridge lines directly behind homes, breaks skylines and encircles us with industrial infrastructure. This is not a minor visual impact, it permanently transforms a high-amenity rural landscape, contrary to the NPPF requirement to protect and enhance valued landscapes.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  The Applicant has complied with EN-1 and EN-5 policies including 2.9.23-2.9.25 and has applied the mitigation hierarchy.  The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project where it crosses to the east and south of both Fordham and Aldham.  The villages of Fordham and Aldham fall within Visual Receptor Areas (VRA) D5 Fordham, and D7 Fordstreet and Aldham, respectively. The Applicant recognises that there will be significant adverse effects within approximately 1.5 km within this area as a result of the Project, as set out in the

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>It causes serious heritage harm. Fordham's Grade I listed church, Aldham's Grade II* church and the Ford Street Conservation Area – with around twenty listed buildings – rely on open countryside setting. Pylons on elevated ground will dominate views and undermine centuries of historic character. Even more concerning is pylon TB047, situated on Roman archaeological remains. This is not the precautionary approach required in national policy.</p>	<p>assessments for these VRAs within <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>.</p> <p>Representative viewpoints in this area include Viewpoints 4.11: PRoW south of Aldham, 4.14: Fordham Road, north-east of Fordham, 4.24: Essex Way near Fordstreet, 4.30: Mill Road, North of Fordham, and 4.37: Hines Close, Aldham. The assessments for each of these viewpoints is set out in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 3 of 4 [APP-231]</b>. Major and significant adverse effects at construction and operation are recorded for each of these representative viewpoints, except for Viewpoint 4.37: Hines Close, where moderate-major and significant adverse effects are reported.</p> <p>Regarding the Grade I listed All Saints' Parish Church, Fordham (1239789) please see the Historic England response in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b>.</p> <p>Church Of St Margaret And St Catherine (1170063) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, and significant, significance of effect during construction and a moderate adverse, significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>).</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>Fordstreet Conservation Area (CA9) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a moderate adverse, significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) <b>(6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070])</b>. The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and operation (and maintenance) <b>(6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215])</b>.</p> <p>All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on these designated assets, including changes to their settings.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Colne Valley is a place of regional conservation significance closely linked to the nearby Dedham Vale National Landscape. Ecology and public amenity will suffer. Woodland Trust land at the Fordham Hall Estate has regional conservation value and will be fragmented by construction corridors and tree loss.</p>	<p>changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p> <p>Regarding the archaeological remains referred to by the respondent, please see the Statutory Organisations response in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b>.</p> <p>The siting and design process has taken account of existing biodiversity and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors. Impacts to the immature woodland at Fordham Hall Estate has been minimised as far as practicable, with the route of the overhead line avoiding the estates large blocks of woodland planting.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to further avoid or reduce impacts on woodland habitat. There will be no significant residual long-term fragmentation impacts on the Fordham Hall Estate woodland, with replacement planting to be undertaken by the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Essex Way long-distance path runs through this landscape; walkers, riders and cyclists come here because of its openness and tranquillity. Overhead lines introduce collision risks for birds along the River Colne and disrupt long established wildlife corridors</p>	<p>Applicant on completion of works, as set out within the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>Fordham and the Fordham Hall Estate are located within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) D5, Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 Colne River Valley Slopes and LCA B5 Rochford's Farmland Plateau and are represented by Viewpoint 4.08 and Viewpoint 4.30. Significant effects have been identified within approximately 1.5 km of the Project in these areas, as set out in paragraphs 13.7.52 to 13.7.63 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b> for visual receptors and paragraphs 13.3.513 to 13.3.558 in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b> for landscape receptors.</p> <p>As the Project crosses the River Colne, which was assessed as a potential bird flight corridor during desk study analysis, vantage point bird surveys have been carried out at this location to assess collision risk. Vantage point survey methodology and results are set out within <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>, and impacts assessed within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>The surveys examined whether proposed overhead lines could fragment flight corridors or increase mortality along routes between coastal and inland habitats. The assessment did not identify the River Colne as a location which poses a notable collision concern. Precautionary mitigation is set out in the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			The sequential visual effects on the Essex Way are set out on pages 327-333 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b> . Effects on visual receptors on the Essex Way will range from major and significant (adverse) to minor and not significant (adverse).
Wass	<b>[REP1-330]</b> OFH is included in the same document as the Written Representation	General comments on compliance with policy and alternatives and whole life costings.  Objects to overhead lines between pylons TB-047 and TB-052 due to the adverse effects on designated assets, including Fordham's Grade I-listed church, Aldham's Grade II* listed church and Fordstreet conservation area.  Woodland Trust land within the Fordham Hall Estate, described as having regional conservation significance, would be fragmented by access corridors and vegetation removal. Pylon lines will introduce collision risks for swans, geese and herons which can be spotted along the River Colne, which in this area sits in a floodplain. The site for Pylon TB050 has frequently been underwater since early January.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  Due to the matters covered in the Oral Statement being included within the IPs Written Representation <b>[REP1-330]</b> , the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.  The siting and design process has taken account of existing biodiversity and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors. Impacts to the immature woodland at Fordham Hall Estate has been minimised as far as practicable, with the route of the overhead line avoiding the estates large blocks of woodland planting. <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to further avoid or reduce impacts on woodland habitat. There will be no significant residual long-term fragmentation impacts on the Fordham Hall Estate woodland, with replacement planting to be undertaken by the Applicant on completion of works, as set out within the <b>7.4</b>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C).</b></p> <p>As the Project crosses the River Colne, which was assessed as a potential bird flight corridor during desk study analysis, vantage point bird surveys have been carried out at this location to assess collision risk. Vantage point survey methodology and results are set out within <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>, and impacts assessed within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>The wintering bird vantage point surveys at this location were carried out between September 2022 and March 2023 (inclusive), with the viewing arch covering the river and its floodplain. Therefore, the survey location has been covered during the main passage and wintering period, covering a variety of conditions, including wet periods.</p> <p>The surveys considered movements of the mentioned birds (swans, geese and herons) along the River Colne and did not identify any locations presenting notable collision concern. Precautionary mitigation is set out in the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>Interactions with floodplains would be managed in accordance with the controls and mitigation measures described in <b>7.9 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-331]</b> and secured through commitments within <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>, specifically measures W07, W09 and W11, which will provide for the resilience of the Project to flooding and prevent increased flood risk to third party land.</p>
		Construction logistics not feasible on our local, rural roads, particularly around the A1124 bridge and Mill Road, where	The Applicant has checked with Essex County Council whether there are any weight restrictions with the bridge on Mill Road / Fiddlers Hill. It has been confirmed by Essex

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>increased heavy vehicle traffic should raise safety and environmental concerns.</p>	<p>County Council that this is not a location of concern for use as a PAR (Link PAR 38) by construction traffic.</p> <p>For the site access points proposed along Mill Road / Fiddler's Hill, the preliminary designs have been developed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards and relevant guidance, and subject to Stage 1 Road Safety Audits. The Applicant has engaged with the Local Highway Authority throughout the development of these proposals</p> <p><b>6.1 Environmental Statement [APP-123 to APP-298]</b> has been prepared, covering a wide range of topics including noise, vibration and construction-traffic related impacts.</p> <p><b>6.14.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 14.2 - Construction Traffic Noise Assessment [APP-258]</b> sets out the assessment of construction traffic noise and the public highway, which has been assessed for its change in noise dB (decibel) outcome magnitude and effect on the A1124 as 'negligible - not significant', and for Mill Road as 'small - not significant'.</p> <p><b>6.16.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 16.4 - Traffic and Transport Construction Effects [APP-275]</b> has assessed A1124 Halsted Road and Mill Road for the impact assessment, with the assessment concluding potential significance of effect as 'large' delays for driver and public transport, 'slight' for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-rider severance; 'moderate' effects to pedestrian, cyclist and horse-rider amenity; and 'slight' effect for fear and intimidation on the A1124 Halstead Road.</p> <p>Mill Road has been assessed as 'slight' delays for driver and public transport, 'neutral' for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-rider severance; 'slight' effect to pedestrian, cyclist and horse-rider amenity; and 'slight' effect for fear and intimidation.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
Tamsin Fairley of Savills, instructed on behalf of T. Fairley and Sons Ltd	<b>[REP1-275]</b>	The IP has not had proposals for a voluntary agreement or sufficient detail to fully understand the potential impact on the business and residential property. This change request also does not affect the drainage rights being requested nor the Ardleigh Road widening proposals.	<p><b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333]</b> has been produced to support the application for development consent, and sets out the assessment of effects on the transport network in relation to traffic and transport matters associated with the Project.</p>
		The landowner has received details indicating that it would be responsible for the ditch infrastructure carrying water away from all three sites (North Falls, Five Estuaries and Norwich to Tilbury) without any maintenance contribution. It considers this to be an unacceptable position, given the high water table and the localised flooding in recent years.	<p>The Applicant has actively engaged with the land interests regarding the impacts of the Project on the affected location. Several meetings have been held on site to discuss, notably, on 19 November 2024, the Project's Land Rights Manager, together with representatives from Fisher German, attended a meeting to address unresolved concerns. The agenda of this meeting included discussion of the change application as well as the interactions with the North Fall and Five Estuaries Projects.</p> <p>In support of these discussions, the Applicant has provided both Version 1 and Version 2 of the HoT template to the land agent, allowing them to review and consider the proposed terms. However, it should be noted that HoT tailored specifically to the unique circumstances of this land holding, intended to secure a voluntary agreement, have not yet been issued. This is due to the ongoing changes related to the EACN access road, which must be resolved before an agreement can be finalised.</p>
			The Applicant is currently engaging with the IP on the attenuation pond, the details of which form part of the ongoing negotiation of HoT for a voluntary agreement.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Concerns about the use of the permanent haul road and part of the proposed widened Ardleigh Road for construction traffic, until such time that Five Estuaries and/or North Falls construct their temporary haul road across adjacent farmland. The IP proposes that all construction traffic should use the same temporary haul road.</p>	<p>The construction access strategy is detailed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. The Applicant proposes to route construction traffic from the MRN and SRN, along PARs to the Site Access Points. There are two PARs in Little Bromley, Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road. The Applicant is proposing to use a permanent access route to avoid routing traffic through little Bromley village and connect the two routes. Construction HGV vehicles will not be permitted to use alternative routes, and this is a matter of non-compliance, detailed in Section 6 of the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, which is secured through <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>.</p> <p>The PARs have been assessed for suitability of two-way HGV movement, and any associated mitigation is detailed in <b>7.3 Appendix C Section C Indicative Highway Mitigation Plans [APP-312 to APP-320]</b>. Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road have been assessed to require widening to accommodate the design vehicle movements, and a separate temporary footway and cycleway is proposed to provide off road facilities to facilitate non-motorised user movements using the construction period, in line with LTN1/20 guidance.</p> <p>Schedule 13 of the <b>draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>, details that there will be temporary speed limit restrictions on Bentley Road, Ardleigh Road and Little Bromley Road. The permanent access road is to facilitate operational robustness for ALL movements, where required. The permanent access route will be securely fenced, in accordance with GG29 in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b></p> <p>The significance of effects on driver/public transport passenger delay, pedestrian, cyclists and horse-rider amenity, severance, delay and fear and intimidation is presented within <b>6.16</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Concerned about the impact of construction vehicles passing immediately to the front of the Farmhouse on the structure and fabric of</p>	<p><b>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport [APP-271]</b>. No significant effects on sensitive receptors were found as a result of the increase in traffic from the Project and committed developments in Little Bromley when mitigation and controls are in place to create a safe environment for all road users. This includes widening of the carriageway, shared pedestrian/cycle off road facilities along PAR 30 Bentley Road and PAR 31 – Bentley Road/Ardleigh Road, and a temporary reduction in the speed limit. Details of mitigation and controls are as set out within <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. An access strategy has been developed to manage the impact of construction vehicles on the public highway and sensitive receptors, using suitable LRN connections from the SRN called PAR. In addition, temporary haul roads for construction vehicles are proposed along the Project alignment, further reducing the impact of construction traffic on the LRN. Further details of the access strategy can be found within the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. The Applicant is in discussions with North Falls and Five Estuaries, which could see the Applicant using the North Falls and Five Estuaries construction haul road south of Little Bromley, to access the EACN during construction. This would reduce the number of construction trips entering the village. However, during operation HGVs and AILs (Abnormal Indivisible Loads) accessing the substation would need to use the permanent access route included within the DCO. This number of movements during operation is limited due to the nature of the substation.</p> <p>With regards to construction noise and vibration, this is assessed in <b>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.14) [APP-256]</b>. Construction noise and vibration</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>the building and also the safety of the access to the property, which will be altered as a result of Five Estuaries' screening proposals.</p>	<p>will be managed via the commitments in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and associated <b>Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b>. These measures ensure that BPM will be employed by the contractor(s) to reduce the effects of noise and vibration during construction as far as practicable. Further detailed construction noise and vibration assessments will be undertaken by the contractor based on their specific methodologies. Specific mitigation measures will be identified during these assessments and incorporated in the NVMP.</p> <p>With regards to potential building damage due to vibration, this has been assessed as part of the construction vibration assessment to identify locations with potential risk. Suitable control measures are in place in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b> to ensure that this is reassessed by the contractor(s), and suitable mitigation measures and monitoring are put in place should a risk of potential damage be identified.</p> <p>As stated in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> The Applicant and the Main Works Contractor will work with North Falls and Five Estuaries to ensure suitable traffic management is in place to provide safe access in line with design guidance.</p>
		<p>There has been no cumulative assessment from the combined impacts from North Falls, Five Estuaries and Norwich to Tilbury on the business or property. Or consideration of other projects such as Tarchon.</p>	<p>An assessment of Cumulative Effects undertaken in accordance with the <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> is presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281]</b>. This assessment includes and inter-project cumulative assessment with North Falls and Five Estuaries. Socio-economics and landscape and visual impacts are also considered.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Tarchon Interconnector project was not included within the cumulative assessment for the Project as this proposal is still in early stages and no traffic information is yet available. However, the project has been added to the post-April 2025 list as the construction of the proposed development and the Project may overlap. In addition, the Tarchon Interconnector project will be required to undertake its own cumulative assessment with other developments as part of its respective development consent application.</p>
Lucas	There are no documents on the project pages of the Planning Inspectorate website under this name	<p>General comments on consultation and alternatives.</p> <p>The EACN substation will result in operational noise which will affect health and wellbeing. The ES does not consider that electrical substations generate substantial amounts of noise in the colder winter months of the year, also when there's high electricity demand. The Applicant failed to consider the location of the EACN to the west of Little Bromley and the prevailing wind conditions, resulting in sound travelling towards the village, exacerbating noise pollution.</p> <p>The ES did not consider the cumulative impact of the approved battery storage facility next to the current substation or the Tarchon project. There is a very substantial amount of development proposed around the existing Little Bromley substation but no joined up overall plan.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>With regards to operational noise from the proposed substation, this is assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Appendix 14.3 - EACN Substation Operational Noise Assessment [APP-259]</b>. The assessment also includes consideration of the cumulative effects of the proposed North Falls and Five Estuaries substations. The assessment is based on worst-case assumptions for transformer loading and noise levels and indicates that significant adverse effects from operational noise are not expected.</p> <p>An assessment of Cumulative Effects undertaken in accordance with the <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> is presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>The Tarchon Interconnector project was not included within the cumulative assessment for the Project as this project is still in early stages and no traffic information is yet available. However, this has been added to the post-April 2025 list as the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>construction of the proposed development and the Project may overlap. In addition, the Tarchon Interconnector project will be required to undertake its own cumulative assessment with other developments as part of its respective development consent application. All cumulative developments assessed in the cumulative assessment are listed in <b>6.17.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 17.2 - Long List and Short List of Other Developments [APP-283]</b>. The Applicant is required to assess the potential environmental impacts of the Project only and set out proposed mitigation, in an Environmental Statement in accordance with the EIA Regulations.</p>
		<p>There will be significant visual effects to public rights of way users in Little Bromley, eroding the recreational and amenity value of these routes. Whilst screening is planned, it will take decades to become effective, if it survives beyond the first summer of planting in one of the driest parts of the UK.</p> <p>In addition, the public rights of way used to access St Mary's Church from the village will be disrupted, requiring crossing arrangements over the permanent access route to the proposed EACN substation.</p>	<p>Effects at Viewpoint 3.13: PRoW, Little Bromley (Little Bromley 16) are assessed on pages 119-121 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 2 of 4 [APP-230]</b>. The assessment concludes there will be a moderate and significant adverse effect on recreational receptors using the local PRoW network and community receptors living and moving around Little Bromley.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a 30-year aftercare period at Environmental Areas in line with the commitments made within <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299]</b>.</p>
		<p>The new permanent access road for the EACN could have significant impact on traffic flows in Little Bromley, if measures are not put in place to ensure that other road users cannot use it as a rat run or shortcut between other major routes.</p>	<p>The proposed permanent access road will be a private route secured by locked gates to prevent errant access or rat running.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
Lushington	[REP1-380]	General comments on consultation and alternatives, including costing the impacts of compensation on the local communities, businesses, farms and families.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
J. Stacey	[REP1-394]	<p>General comments on disruption during construction and impacts on health, also on consultation, alternatives and use if the green book for costings.</p> <p>There has been a lack of engagement. The IP signed intrusive and non-intrusive survey licences with a promise that it would receive the raw data within 14 days of National Grid being in receipt of this data. The Applicant has continuously refused to give out this data until an EIR was served. We could have used the data to support our case.</p> <p>We have the line crossing our horse paddock and the line is within 160m of our house. We have requested at every opportunity, that this should be moved to the adjoining field. The walkover survey commissioned by the Applicant recommended that the line be moved away from the horse paddock and this would have supported our case. The reply, not directly to us but found in their application documents, was that it cannot be moved as it would be contrary to the Holford Rules.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>There has been considerable engagement with the IP, who has attended multiple consultations events, both non-statutory and statutory, and engaged with the Applicant at each event. In addition to the consultation events interaction there have been site visits and face to face meetings with both the IP and their agent, including a further two meetings in 2026 (15 January 2026 and on 25 February 2026).</p> <p>In respect of the data request the Applicant confirms this was provided after an EIR request, which was dealt with promptly, the data being provided on 25 September 2025 well ahead of the Examination timetable being published.</p> <p>The Applicant remains of the view that the alignment is appropriate. We also note that there is some flexibility in design arrangements that can be exploited to reduce / mitigate the area affected and duration. This may include some offsetting of the construction area relative to the pylon which will reduce the likelihood that works will be able to avoid breaching the landowners hedge line. Any refinement to the working arrangements for installation or siting of individual pylons would be considered through detailed design and informed by site specific discussions between the Contractor and the relevant landowner. Records of engagement are maintained, and any aspirational commitments are</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant claims that this application was compliant with EN1 as there are no other suitable sites of poorer agricultural quality that can accommodate the Project. How can this be the case as at the very beginning they had scoped out soils as stated in their 2022 document Corridor and Preliminary "Routeing and Siting Study Report April 2022"?</p>	<p>documented for detailed design purposes, subject to technical, environmental and constructability considerations.</p> <p>The approach to alternatives is set out in <b>6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Alternatives [APP-127]</b>. At each stage in the options appraisal process, transparent methods were used to inform decision-making. This included technical inputs from engineers, planners and environmental consultants to inform the decisions and design.</p> <p>In relation to EN-1, <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b> states that soils are scoped out on the basis that, with the topics which have been included, this would not have a significant effect on the determination of the preferred route. For the overhead line route, the footprint of pylons is limited and thus the effect on agricultural land is limited.</p> <p>However, <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b> does list BMV land as a 'seek to minimise' constraint in relation to the substation. Following the assessment, however, this was not considered a differentiating factor given the presence of Grades 1, 2 and 3 across the substation siting zones. This is different to scoping this out and demonstrates it was a consideration (but one that did not enable any differentiation).</p>
		<p>The Applicant claims under health and wellbeing, state that there's no significant residual effects to health and wellbeing during construction and operation of the project. The lack of engagement, the length of time for the project, the lack of consideration of alternatives, are causing great anxiety and stress even at the pre-construction stage. How can the Applicant</p>	<p>An assessment of how the Project could potentially affect the health and wellbeing of local residents is contained in <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b>. This includes an assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on mental health and wellbeing during the construction phase. The assessment notes that this may result in heightened levels of stress and anxiety for local residents as a result of potential environmental impacts in their local area (for example, noise, dust, traffic and visual impacts).</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		claim that there are no significant residual effects to health and wellbeing?	A wide variety of measures have been identified to mitigate these impacts (for example use of best practicable means to reduce noise and air quality impacts) and these are outlined in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and in <b>7.3 Outline Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> . With appropriate mitigation, it is not considered that there will be significant health and wellbeing impacts at a population level. The Applicant has sought to reduce concern or uncertainty about the proposals through inclusive and transparent engagement with residents and stakeholders.
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Funding. Where is the money coming from? The costs are six years out of date. Compensation. £180.1 million has been quoted, how has this been worked out?</p>	The Applicant has submitted <b>4.2 Funding Statement (Rev B) [REP1-004]</b> which provides details on how the project would be funded. The Applicant's financial governance, including the treatment of land acquisition and compensation, operates within established corporate, regulatory and audit frameworks.
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>A question on Compliance for EN1 on soils. the statement found in the Document: 5.7 Policy Compliance Document Compliance of meeting EN-1 5.11.34 <i>"The Project minimises impacts on BMV agricultural land as far as practicable and includes mitigation measures to reduce impacts on the soil resource. The permanent loss of BMV land is considered necessary on the basis that there is urgent need for CNP Infrastructure such as the Project. The routeing and siting selection process confirms that there are no other</i></p>	<p>The approach to alternatives is set out in <b>6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Alternatives [APP-127]</b>. At each stage in the options appraisal process, transparent methods were used to inform decision-making. This included technical inputs from engineers, planners and environmental consultants to inform the decisions and design.</p> <p>In relation to EN-1, <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b> states that soils are scoped out on the basis that, with the topics which have been included, this would not have a significant effect on the determination of the preferred route. For the overhead line route the footprint of pylons is limited and thus the effect on agricultural land is limited.</p> <p>However, <b>7.18 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study [APP-356]</b> does list best and most versatile</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><i>suitable sites of poorer agricultural quality that can accommodate the Project.</i>"</p> <p>This should be shown as the case in the document from 2022, Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study Report April 2022: 3.2.29, Pages 43, 44 "<i>Topics such as air quality, soils and geology, and water were scoped out of the Options Appraisal process on the basis that at this phase of the Project with the constraints above already applied, that these topic areas would not have a significant effect on the determination of the preferred route for the connection or substation siting.</i>"</p> <p>As an affected farmer, I would like the Applicant to evidence at what stage were the poorer soils chosen for the route to be able to make this claim. Did the Applicant factor in the actual soil classification, in that grade 3a is a poorer soil to grade 2, even though both are BMV land?</p>	<p>(BMV) land as a 'seek to minimise' constraint in relation to the substation. Following the assessment, however, this was not considered a differentiating factor given the presence of Grades 1, 2 and 3 across the substation siting zones. This is different to scoping this out and demonstrates it was a consideration (but one that did not enable any differentiation).</p> <p>At the routeing and siting stage, detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys were not available, and the assessment used the published Provisional mapping. The results from the detailed ALC surveys undertaken are presented in <b>6.6.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 6.1 - Agricultural Land Classification Report [APP-139]</b>.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The Applicant claimed at the CA Hearing that "<i>we do provide feedback to the land agents</i>". This is not our experience. We have made our requests at every consultation, face to face meetings. We would like to have a direct reply from the Applicant to our numerous requests for moving the line around TB98, TB97 and TB96. We nor our agent have had a clear, direct response to our request,</p>	<p>There have been multiple engagement meetings between the IP, the IP's agent and the Applicant over several years, the most recent of which were on 15 January 2026 to discuss HoT with the IP's land agent, and on 25 February 2026 with the IP and their land agent both in attendance.</p> <p>As noted above, the Applicant responded to this point in <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b>, which stated that moving TB96 (now TB98) north would add an angle pylon into the alignment which would be less consistent with the Holford Rules. The Applicant remains of the view that the alignment is appropriate.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>instead we are expected to locate partial answers in the extensive applicant's documents.</p>	<p>The Applicant also notes that there is some flexibility in design arrangements that can be exploited to reduce / mitigate the area affected and duration. This may include some offsetting of the construction area relative to the pylon which will reduce the likelihood that works will be able to avoid breaching the landowners hedge line. Any refinement to the working arrangements for installation or siting of individual pylons would be considered through detailed design and informed by site specific discussions between the Contractor and the relevant landowner. Records of engagement are maintained, and any aspirational commitments are documented for detailed design purposes, subject to technical, environmental and constructability considerations.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b>  Pages 4491/4492 Ref no 10-39.8 Summary of matters raised: Concern that the proximity of Pylon TB96 to the respondent's property means that no amount of screening and softening will reduce the impact to the landscape to an acceptable level (e.g. impact on property value, noise, traffic, quality).  The Order Limits are only around 85m from our house, so due to the large potential variance of the position of the pylon, the edge of the pylon may be not much more.  The Applicant claims its 175m in the RVAA assessments which is likely to be to the centre of the pylon and the centre of our property, so it's not 200m. There are no other existing buildings between TB96 (now TB98) and to afford screening and filtering views.</p>	<p>As stated in <b>6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-233 and APP-234]</b>, the Applicant recognises that there will be a high magnitude of visual change to views from Whiteheads Farm as a result of the Project, which will include clear views of TB98. As such, a more detailed assessment has been carried out to understand if there is likely to be a breach of the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold (RVAT), in line with guidance outlined in Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (LI TGN) 2/19, however, no breach of the RVAT is expected at this property.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The speaker added detailed comments on the RVAA undertaken for their property and whether this assesses the worst case due to the assumptions made about pylon positions based on the LoD. This is not written in full due to the length of the comments.</p>	
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Pages 4503/4504 Ref no 10-39.18 Summary of matters raised: Suggest that the Pylon TB96 and the haul road are relocated north, removing any oversail or encroachment to the paddocks.</p> <p>National Grid's response: "National Grid notes the respondent's feedback. In order to change the location of TB95 to TB99 to the proposed alignment from the respondent, we would have to increase the length of the overhead line and increase the number of angled pylons, which would be less consistent with the Holford Rules. We have therefore not proposed a change to the alignment in this location. We previously moved the location of pylon TB98 approximately 60 m to the west along the alignment to avoid the paddock.</p> <p>My response: TB98 was moved to the west, but the construction site is still within the paddock.</p>	<p>The Applicant remains of the view that the alignment is appropriate. We also note that there is some flexibility in design arrangements that can be exploited to reduce / mitigate the area affected and duration. This may include some offsetting of the construction area relative to the pylon which will reduce the likelihood that works will be able to avoid breaching the landowners hedge line. Any refinement to the working arrangements for installation or siting of individual pylons would be considered through detailed design and informed by site specific discussions between the Contractor and the relevant landowner. Records of engagement are maintained, and any aspirational commitments are documented for detailed design purposes, subject to technical, environmental and constructability considerations.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
<b>Open Floor Hearing 1 (Session 2)</b>			
C. Banks	No separate OFH as it is included within the Written Representation	The document <b>[REP1-313]</b> on the Planning Inspectorate website states that the document is an expansion on the OFH speech.'	Due to the matters covered in the Oral Statement being included within the IPs Written Representation <b>[REP1-313]</b> , the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
Lockett	<b>[REP1-424]</b>	<p>General comments on consultation, alternatives and risks to infrastructure from climate effects or terrorism/war.</p> <p>This is one of three nationally significant infrastructure projects which are planned within a five mile radius of Mellis in addition to at least two other significant energy infrastructure projects. There has been no coordination between these projects to mitigate the cumulative effects on our community wildlife and biodiversity.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>An assessment of Cumulative Effects undertaken in accordance with the <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> is presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>All cumulative developments assessed in the cumulative assessment (including an assessment on wildlife and biodiversity) are listed in <b>6.17.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 17.2 - Long List and Short List of Other Developments [APP-283]</b>. The Applicant is required to assess the potential environmental impacts of the Project only and set out proposed mitigation, in an Environmental Statement in accordance with the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative effects presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281]</b> does not identify any significant cumulative effects on ecology or biodiversity receptors.</p>
C. Rayner	<b>[REP1-306]</b>	General comments on consultation and alternatives.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Salmons Lane provides the only viable access to my home, another home at the farm, our twelve business units and our 140,000 chicken unit, another 11 houses and a business centre at East Gores. So significant number of vehicles use it every day and also at night.</p> <p>Salmons Lane is a narrow country lane off the A120. It is the only viable route for large vehicles serving the farm and businesses here. We are told there would be periods of traffic management using traffic lights. This is a problem because it is a single track road and traffic management would block the road. The Applicant also plans for a temporary closure of Salmons Lane and a diversion route which is over two miles on mostly single track road. This diversion is unsuitable for the IPs farm traffic, which includes 40-foot articulated bulk lorries and tautliners, and that require access day and night. The Applicant has not provided any details of how this would be resolved, which will affect viability to the business and access to the IPs home.</p>	<p>No construction traffic associated with the Project is proposed to use Salmon's Lane or East Gores Road. Construction vehicles are proposed to access the haul road from Great Tey Road, PAR (H23-A1), to the east.</p> <p>The proposed junctions in this location are crossover points, defined in the <b>7.3 outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP- 309]</b> as "locations where haul roads cross the public highway, but are not proposed for construction HGVs to transition to or from the public highway (except in emergency situations)".</p> <p>All construction traffic will traverse the haul road east to west crossing the private access track serving the IP's farm, then traffic will cross Salmon's lane.</p> <p>Construction traffic crossing via both these bellmouths will be managed to allow continued use of Salmon's Lane and the private access track during construction. It is proposed that for safety reasons the speed limits on Salmon's Lane and East Gores Road would be temporarily reduced to 30mph during construction. It is noted that there is no proposal to use traffic lights on Salmons Lane during construction activities.</p> <p>Due to the narrow carriageway width of Salmon's Lane, a limited duration temporary road closure would likely be required to construct and then remove the crossover point bellmouths. Short closures are also required for installing and removing overhead line netting to enable stringing activities. This has been allowed for in the 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (<b>Revision B</b>). The Applicant cannot commit at this stage to the exact timescales or when the work would be undertaken as that detail will need to be agreed with the contractor. However, these works would be short in duration and scheduled to reduce any disruption.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>The majority of the works associated with constructing the crossover points can be carried out away from the carriageway to avoid further road closures.</p> <p>The proposed diversion during the temporary closure of Salmon's Lane is via East Gores Road, Coggleshall Road, Brook Road and Great Tey Road.</p> <p>At the end of the Project, the crossover points and temporary traffic management would be removed. A short-term road closure is anticipated to be required to carry out this work. This will be confirmed during detailed design, and include further engagement with the landowner. Any closures would be planned and agreed with affected residences and business owners to ensure the minimal amount of disruption.</p> <p>Some work from the private access track is anticipated to be required in order to facilitate this crossing. However, access to the farm will be maintained at all times, and the majority of the work will be done from the fields and timings will be communicated to the relevant parties. Short closures of the private access track will be required for netting activities however the Contractor will liaise directly with the landowner to coordinate these works. Given the narrow characteristics of the private access it is likely that the netting activities could be managed with stop/go banksman controls.</p>
J. and C. Rayner	<b>[REP1-245]</b>	General comments on consultation.	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>For four years, the Applicant has not responded to questions raised about the farm access, drainage, managing field operations and how the IP would operate its farming business. The pylon routes cuts right through the centre of the farm, and approximately 70</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding access, drainage, field operations and the ability to continue farming operations during construction. These topics have been the subject of a series of meetings and dialogue with this IP and their agent (including a HoT meeting with the agent on 19 January 2025, follow up emails and an agreement to meet</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>acres will be unfarmable. The Applicant has not explained how tractors will cross this haul road or how road access would be maintained to the farm.</p>	<p>following the issue of version 2 of the HoT shortly). These meetings have followed on from a site meeting in June 2025 with the IP and their agent. The Applicant does not accept that information has been deliberately withheld but recognises that further clarity is sought to assist forward planning.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the concern that the pylon route passes through the farm holding and that a substantial area of land may be affected during construction. The Applicant does not accept that land will be permanently 'unfarmable' beyond the areas required for permanent infrastructure and rights. Temporary land used for haul roads or construction access would be reinstated following completion of works, in accordance with the DCO requirements and agreed reinstatement standards.</p> <p>In relation to the crossing of haul roads by agricultural machinery, the Applicant confirms that maintaining reasonable access for farming operations is a core principle of the construction approach. Where haul roads intersect existing field access routes, the provision of appropriate temporary or permanent crossing arrangements will be agreed and installed. These arrangements are typically agreed in advance with the landowner and implemented prior to construction works affecting access. The Applicant's appointed land agent, Fisher German has already agreed to meet with affected parties again to review accommodation works and discuss where crossing points may be required as part of the ongoing detailed Heads of Terms negotiations.</p> <p>The Applicant further recognises the importance of maintaining safe and practical access to the farm holding, including during construction. The Applicant does not intend to permanently sever access to agricultural land or farm buildings. Any temporary disruption to access would be managed through</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>agreed access management measures, with alternative routes or arrangements put in place where necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the sensitivity of agricultural drainage systems and confirms that drainage impacts are a material consideration within the Project. Detailed drainage design, protection of existing systems and any necessary temporary or permanent drainage works would be addressed through the relevant drainage management plans, in consultation with the landowner and, where applicable, the relevant drainage authorities.</p> <p>The Applicant remains committed to ongoing engagement with J and C Rayner Farms Ltd and its appointed representatives and would welcome a meeting to discuss their concerns and progress matters.</p>
		<p>The IP objects to a siting of a large compound on one of its fields. The IP requested that this was moved to the other side of that field but were told that this could not change due to two nearby residential properties. The IP has pointed out that these houses are further away than the two houses on the IP's property. There are also two houses in Little Tey, which are near as well.</p>	<p>The compound is approximately midway between properties, but also positioned to reduce interference with farming to the extent possible. Whilst noting the issue raised about traffic past the properties, the Applicant is concerned that there is other activity and movement at compounds that would exacerbate this if the compound was moved as requested to be just across the road from the properties. The Applicant continues to prefer the more central position.</p>
		<p>The IP will lose 2,025 metres of hedging, either grubbed out or cut down and trees including a row of hybrid elms planted in the 80s. These are irreplaceable. It will never be restored in my lifetime, if ever at all.</p>	<p><b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026] and 6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA [APP-236]</b> is based on a reasonable worst-case scenario of vegetation loss, based on a standard overhead line and underground cable design.</p> <p>Following detailed design (which would occur should consent be granted), it is anticipated that the amount of vegetation loss</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>would be reduced and impacts to trees and hedgerows will be minimised as far as practicable. <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> both include commitments to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied, with the priority of avoiding impacts to habitats including trees and hedgerows, where practicable. <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contains commitment GG14, which states '<i>Following detailed design and prior to construction (of relevant parts of the Project), relevant surveys will be undertaken of arboricultural features that may be impacted or need to be removed to ensure any tree/ hedgerow removal is reduced as far as practicable.</i>'</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> sets out a comprehensive mitigation strategy for habitat loss (temporary and permanent) and any impacts, including fragmentation and disturbance, on protected species as agreed with Natural England and Local Planning Authorities. In addition, the Applicant has committed to deliver 10 % BNG with environmental and societal benefits on all construction projects. The 10 % BNG target for the Project is currently voluntary and aligned with National Grid's corporate sustainability commitment.</p>
Owen	<b>[REP1-399]</b>	<p>General comments on and landscape effects environmental effects.</p> <p>The years-long construction phase will be a living nightmare. We don't even have access to the road, as the red boundary lines block our driveway. We will need to ask the Applicant to ask for permission to leave our home and will need to pass a further four checkpoints in just the first mile.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant understands the IP resides in a residential property to the south of Wimble Lane and to the east of Lambert's Lane. The property is situated to the east of the proposed overhead line, outside of the Order Limits. Lambert's Lane can be found within Section B (Sheet 8).</p> <p>The Applicant understands the IP currently accesses their property from the west, via Lambert's Lane, and there is no</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			access to the property from Wimble Lane to the east. The Limits of Deviation for the proposed overhead line impact the access to the west (over Lambert's Lane). The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to further understand the impacts of the construction activity on the properties in this location, including maintenance of access. Further mitigation measures could include crossing points, for example. The general principles for managing private means of access during construction are described within <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> .
		The Bacton high-pressure gas pipeline is just 50m from our cottage, and the pylon route crosses this with a potential blast zone of our home. The crossing point should be further away for health and safety reasons.	The Applicant is aware of the gas pipeline and has factored this into the designs. The works will be undertaken in accordance with the required design standards and in agreement with the relevant pipeline operator.
Buxton on behalf of Macadam	No OFH summary on the Planning Inspectorate website	No separate oral summary has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.	The IP has not submitted an Oral Summary but has submitted a Written Representation <b>[REP1-292]</b> , which covers all the matters during the OFH. Therefore, the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
P. Whittle	<b>[REP1-438]</b> included within the Written Representation	General comments on landscape and cumulative effects.  The application does not show the existing UKPN 132kV overhead line which runs along the eastern edge of the proposed Ardleigh substation site with five pylons. Nor does it show the existing Little Bromley substation immediately to the south of the proposed Ardleigh substation.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  These are existing UKPN assets that are not affected by the Project. These lines potentially appear on the background mapping but will not be shown as Project layers as there are no works proposed to them.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>There is a grade II listed farmhouse in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Ardleigh substation. The Applicant has drawn the red line up against the boundaries of the property and has stated that the project introduces tall infrastructure within the setting of the listed building and there is a significant negative effect but offers no suitable mitigation to reduce this.</p>	<p>Bounds Farmhouse (1147743) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and operation (and maintenance) <b>(6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070])</b>. The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and operation (and maintenance) <b>(6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215])</b>. All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296], 6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297] and the methodology set out in 6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>
		<p>The Applicant has refused to reduce the noise from the Ardleigh substation by building it underground, as proposed at the Orsett substation location.</p>	<p>With regards to operational noise from the proposed substation, this is assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Appendix 14.4 – Tilbury North Substation Operational Noise Assessment [APP-260]</b>. This indicates that significant adverse effects from operational noise are not expected.</p>
		<p>The Applicant plan envisages both overhead and underground cables crossing Hungerdown Lane in the same narrow 50-yard gap, which will involve the loss of mature oak trees and the blocking of a popular walking, cycling, and riding route.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on trees through careful routeing, siting and detailed design, <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA [APP-236]</b> sets out the assessment of arboricultural features supported by extensive surveys undertaken between 2023 and 2025. Mitigation and good practice measures are secured through <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>. The necessary loss of trees is addressed through the Reinstatement Planting Plan, secured under Requirement 9 in <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>. This plan places priority on replanting within the Order Limits.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
G. Whittle	[REP1-356]	<p>General comments on consultation and alternatives and general environmental effects.</p> <p>The harm caused to Ardleigh Village is substantial. It would have a total of 20 pylons within the parish, which would be visible to the 40 listed buildings and all dwellings in the village centre and surrounding area. They would also be visible from the Dedham Vale National Landscape located one mile away.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project around Ardleigh.</p> <p>Ardleigh is within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) C12 Ardleigh and Landscape Character Area (LCA) 7A Bromley Heaths. Significant adverse effects are identified for landscape and visual receptors at Ardleigh, as set out in paragraphs 13.6.138 to 13.6.150 within <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 4 of 4 [APP-232]</b> for visual receptors and paragraphs 13.3.375 to 13.3.391 within <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b> for landscape receptors.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges there will be some views of sections of the overhead line from Dedham Vale National Landscape (DVNL), including some significant visual effects on views looking outwards from the edge of the DVNL; however, these are not judged to have significant effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape over the longer term, as explained in Table A13.1.3 on page 17 onwards of <b>6.13.A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study [APP-235]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the project will be visible from some designated assets within Ardleigh and that their setting will fall partially within the Order Limits. This is assessed within <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment [AS-068]</b>. Where this occurs, the Applicant has assessed the significance of effect on the value of these assets within <b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>[AS-070]. The Project has also assessed the level of harm in <b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b> on designated assets where land that forms part of the setting of designated assets falls within the Order Limits. The assessment has not concluded any substantial harm to heritage assets, although less than substantial harm has been identified as is common for many types of developments and should be considered in the context of the planning balance of the benefits of the Project. As the Project is classified as critical national priority as set out in section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 (2024) the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that CNP infrastructure will meet the test for public benefit that outweighs harm, even if substantial harm were identified, as set out in paragraph 4.2.15-17 of NPS EN-1 (2024). Therefore, the Applicant is confident that the assessment of the historic environment within Ardleigh is appropriate</p>
		<p>We have tried to communicate with the Applicant and met with one of their representatives on 19 June 2024, along with our agent, which confirmed the distance from the edge of our property to the edge of National Grid's proposed site was 10m. The Applicant promised to come back to us with answers to our questions and queries within two weeks. To this date, 20 months later, we have heard nothing.</p>	<p>The Applicant met with the IP in June 2024 and a follow up email was sent to the IP's land agent dated 3 October 2024 including a response from a principal acoustician regarding sound issues as requested. To our knowledge no further response was received from the IP.</p> <p>The second meeting referred to was on 16 July 2025 as part of the s42 consultation. The meeting was held on-site and included the IP's land agent. The IP requested detailed methodology regarding the BT mitigation works and around the haul road installation behind their land holding. Whilst the detail of these mitigation works was not available at the time of the meeting, the requests are logged and will be shared once drafted.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p>	<p>With regards to operational noise from the proposed substation, this is assessed in <b>Environmental Statement</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Volume 6 Environmental Statement, 14.7 Operational Noise Assessment, p9 of 22 refers to our home as “the worse affected receptor.”</p>	<p><b>Appendix 14.3 - EACN Substation Operational Noise Assessment [APP-259]</b>. The assessment also includes consideration of the cumulative effects of the proposed North Falls and Five Estuaries substations. The reference to ‘the worst affected receptor’ is in relation to presenting a worst-case assessment in the ES, rather than presenting individual assessments for all properties where the impact is lower. However, it is accepted that this wording could be better. The assessment concludes that the impact of operational noise is small at this property.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b> The boundary of our Grade 2 listed property is only 10m away from the boundary of National Grid’s proposed substation site. Parts of our house do not have foundations as was characteristic of houses built in the 16th century. At best the house will be in danger of severe large cracks and at worst it will be in danger of falling down.</p>	<p>The Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES (<b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration [APP-256]</b>) did not identify any heritage assets in Colchester, Braintree, Brentwood, Basildon or Thurrock that would be impacted by vibration from the Project. The vibration assessment identified one historic structure, the Grade II listed Little Bromley War Memorial (1493299), in Tendring that has potential to be impacted. Commitments NV01, NV02, NV03, NV04, NV05, and NV20 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> all ensure that measures will be put in place first to avoid impacts from vibration. NV04 provides a means to repair damage in the highly unlikely event it occurs. The pre-condition surveys committed to in NV04 are an important element to ensure there is a check against which any concerns regarding damage can be measured.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b> What compensation will we be offered for this callous disregard of our home?</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges there will be some short term disruption to the agricultural land use during construction. The Applicant is committed to compensate for losses arising as a result of construction, including disturbance, severance, and losses arising from restrictions on land use or agricultural operations on the terms of the Compensation Code. Where ongoing future losses in land productivity can be evidenced</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
A. Bullock	No OFH summary provided	<p>There will be six pylons on our land, which during the construction will take out a third of our arable acreage without any attempt from the Applicant to mitigate the impact by engaging with us and taking on our concerns.</p>	<p>and attributed to the Project, such matters fall to be assessed and, where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code rather than through the upfront easement payment alone.</p>
		<p>The haul road will involve bulldozing the topsoil and parts of the subsoil from our fields and laying hardcore to a width of 8m and 20m wide when including the mounds of soil and fencing. The soil structure and friability will never be the same again.</p> <p>From National Grid's own data, the hardcore could be between 200-710mm deep. Based on average hardcore weights and 20 tonne lorry loads, this is between 160-600 lorry</p>	<p>The Applicant understands the Land Interest is a Category 1 landowner. The Applicant understands the land interest is a dairy and arable farmer and has five pylons proposed on their land (with a portion of a sixth pylon). The total area sterilised by one pylon is 400 square metres (0.09 acres). Therefore, the total area impacted by permanent infrastructure is anticipated to be in the region of 0.53 acres over the arable land holding.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges there will be some disruption during construction and will continue to engage further to seek to understand the Land Interest's specific requirements to accommodate the farm management operations during construction. The Applicant will discuss in more detail Accommodation Works with the Land Interest to ensure access is facilitated to any severed land. Where severed land cannot be farmed the Applicant would be willing to negotiate an appropriate compensation claim for disturbance. Compensation for loss is to be assessed, and where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p> <p>The approach to soil handling is set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix C - Outline Soil Resource Plan [APP-303]</b>. This is based on published good practice and is designed to enable soils which have been handled and stockpiled to be reinstated to return land to its preconstruction condition. This includes aspects of preparing the subsoil which has become compacted prior to placement of topsoil.</p> <p>This plan also confirms that topsoil and subsoil should be stockpiled on like for like (i.e. topsoil can be stored on topsoil) and as such no storage of topsoil or subsoil resources will be</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>loads of hardcore per kilometre. The haul road covers over 2km on our land. Heavy lorries used during construction will push the hardcore into our heavy clay soils. When the haul road is removed at the end of the project, at best 10% will be left in the soil. Anyone with intelligence would call this fly tipping on an industrial scale.</p> <p>There is already an existing track most of the length on our land, which runs parallel to the proposed haul road. Last year, the existing 400kV pylons were upgraded to have three lines on each arm. This was done using steel track matting, which was simply unrolled and rolled up, allowing efficient, clean access. There are clearly better alternatives, as already used by the Applicant. Why are we not being offered this?</p>	<p>on imported aggregate. This will limit the potential for stone migration into soil resources.</p> <p>The dimensions of haul roads are stated in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description [APP-130]</b> as typically being 8m wide, noting as above that any topsoil and subsoil storage would not be on aggregate (as shown on the indicative layout in <b>2.6.3 Design and Layout Plans - Traffic and Transport [APP-043]</b>).</p>
Edwards	<b>[REP1-478]</b>	<p>General comments on alternatives, consideration of the Holford Rules and impacts on ecology.</p> <p>The IP has attached a plan which they claim to be misleading which includes annotations including measurements for the trees shown. This is from Document 2.16. This is not showing a true representation of the trees to be removed to the west of the railway line. There are 23 green dot trees and four red ones. There is no comparison in the magnitude between the green and red dots. Why have these green dots been included if not to make it look like there is minimal</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impacts Plan (Annex D) of <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA Figure A13.6.1 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-065]</b> submitted as errata, show the locations of all the surveyed A and B grade trees. Measurements for the trees is detailed within the Tree Schedule in Annex C of <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA [APP-236]</b></p> <p>The dots are of the same size with the colours used to indicate the assessment category. The * marked on some dots is used</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>impact? Additionally, there are trees in the area marked * which are bigger than any of the green dotted trees mentioned. Imagine if this approach had been taken across the whole route.</p>	<p>to represent veteran trees. This follows a standard industry approach and is not considered misleading.</p>
		<p>The initial baseline assessment for listed buildings said that the operational effects for property 1180592 would be a significantly negative effect, whilst the document included in the application says that it's lower less than substantial harm for this same property. Other properties have similarly been downgraded. What's changed?</p>	<p>Spring Farmhouse (1180592) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>).</p> <p>All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>
Harper	There are no documents on the Planning Inspectorate website under this name	<p>General comments on consultation and alternatives.</p> <p>Essentially, 120 degrees of the farm will be surrounded by pylons. The land will be trashed and a third of the farm won't be able to produce anything for the time the pylons are going up, and then obviously the land impacted afterwards.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant understands the IP is not within <b>4.3 Book of Reference [AS-018]</b> and is therefore not currently impacted by the Order Limits. Should the IP believe he is directly impacted by the Project, the Applicant will endeavour to meet with him to understand how the proposals impact his land holding.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges there will be some disruption during construction and will continue to engage with affected parties to seek to understand specific requirements to accommodate their farm management operations. The Applicant will discuss in more detail the specific Accommodation Works with relevant land interests to ensure access is facilitated to any severed land. Where severed land</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>cannot be farmed the Applicant would be willing to negotiate an appropriate compensation claim for disturbance. Compensation for loss is to be assessed, and where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with landowners around mitigation works and reinstatement provisions. The Applicant's approach to soil management, temporary and enabling works, utilities diversions and the land rights required for the Project is set out within the Environmental Statement and supporting application documents, including the Outline Code of Construction Practice, the Land Plans and the Book of Reference, which identify the nature and extent of the land and rights sought. The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> will be fully developed based on detailed design information to be provided by the Main Works Contractor(s). The final version will be submitted for approval in accordance with Requirement 4 (construction management plans) of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) prior to commencement of development. This approval will take into account comments received through examination.</p>
Cockshaw	<b>[REP1-400]</b>	<p>General comments on consultation, alternatives, costings, general environmental effects and disruption during construction.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>Why does the Applicant plan to eliminate roadside hedges and woodland which they should be working with landowners to preserve.</p> <p>Will the Applicant complete adequate biodiversity surveys for the route and substation sites? What biodiversity will they</p>	<p>Through routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on key ecological features such as hedgerows and woodland. The design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>damage and how will this be compensated to ensure BNG?</p>	<p>As part of the EIA process for the Project, a suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken over the 2022-2025 period. The findings of which informed the design and approach to mitigation. Ecology surveys have covered 97% of the Order Limits, with the remaining 3% assessed based on a reasonable worst-case assessment due to access restrictions. The scope and methodology of these ecology surveys was agreed in advance with relevant stakeholders, including the local planning authorities and Natural England to ensure a robust baseline was determined.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C) and 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts on valuable habitats and species.</p> <p>On completion of works all areas of temporary construction impacts would be subject to replacement planting, replanting the habitat type that was lost. For the relatively small areas of permanent habitat loss, additional planting has been proposed within Environmental Areas surrounding the permanent National Grid asset. Illustrative landscape designs for these areas have been provided within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has committed to deliver 10 % BNG with environmental and societal benefits on all construction projects. The 10 % BNG target for the Project is currently voluntary and aligned with our corporate sustainability.</p>
		<p>Will the Applicant reduce bird strikes by identifying the flight paths and migration routes for geese and swans and installing aerial marker balls?</p>	<p>Collision risk has been assessed within the 6.8 <b>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> with survey results provided in the <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 - Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>. This includes a</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>comprehensive desk study of bird records with data obtained from the British Trust for Ornithology, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and local records centres, resulting in over 26,000 bird records, across a lengthy species list, including geese and swans. NatureScot (2016<sup>1</sup>) guidance was used to determine Target Species and Secondary Species (including geese and swans) with regard to collision risk, and the distribution of these records have been mapped to determine hotspots and assess risk. Wintering / passage bird surveys have been undertaken to determine whether the proposed overhead lines could fragment corridors that are used by birds when moving between habitats along the estuaries / coast and inland, or cause mortality along such routes. The assessment did not identify locations which pose notable collision concern, including for geese and swans. On a precautionary basis, mitigation in the form of orange spacers and bird diverters on the earth wire are proposed at the River Waveney and Ardleigh Reservoir as detailed in <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p>
		<p>Why was the Applicant's consideration of a more direct, less costly, much less disruptive route along the edge of Boxted Airfield abandoned?</p>	<p>The options appraisal process was discussed during Issue Specific Hearing 1, including why certain routes had been discounted and how policy had been considered during the appraisal process. Further details can be found in the <b>8.5.3 Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submission and Response to Action Points for Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-139]</b>. As stated on page 48 of <b>6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Alternatives [APP-127]</b>, additional consideration was given to alternative locations including the former RAF Boxted airfield site. However, this alternative was not progressed due to the requirement for multiple additional</p>

<sup>1</sup> NatureScot (2016) Guidance – Assessment and mitigation of impacts of power lines and guyed meteorological masts on birds.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>corridors to accommodate the three confirmed customer connections, increased environmental effects from longer customer connection routes, and the potential need for additional infrastructure including connections to Lawford Substation. The assessment confirmed that Zone A remained the preferred option as it provides the optimal balance of environmental effects, technical feasibility, and economic efficiency whilst having capacity to accommodate all three customer connections within the surrounding area. Further details can also be found in paragraph 5.5.96 in <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-353]</b>.</p>
R. Bullock	No OFH summary provided	<p>General comments on costing of alternatives.</p> <hr/> <p>The proposed pylon line is 150m from the side of my house and there are areas which the Applicant has designated that they may wish to use, which adjoin and butt up to the fence alongside my house. The IP estimates that if the Project goes ahead, that it would devalue the property by somewhere in the order of £200,000. The IP also run a small B&amp;B business from the property and the loss of business would cost a further £50,000.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <hr/> <p>The Applicant understands the IP resides in a property between Cotton and Mendlesham that is located outside of the order limits. The Applicant has been engaging with the land interest's agent on matters relating to the project.</p> <p>Matters relating to loss of business income, perceived safety concerns, injurious affection or diminution in value are compensation matters. Such matters would be assessed separately, on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and the statutory Compensation Code, and are not matters to be determined through the Examination of the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>The Applicant adheres to the Compensation Code and will compensate for qualifying losses where they can be demonstrated and are attributable to the Project, including claims relating to depreciation in value or the loss of development potential, assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
Seddon	<b>[REP1-489]</b>	Q1) In Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual Assessment, the Applicant identifies the	These points are addressed in the <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> .

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		landscape character type surrounding Offton as an area that will experience a significant negative impact. Only two locations have been identified at this level of severity, the other is Dedham Vale. However, the mitigation approach between the two areas differs substantially. In Dedham Vale, undergrounding is proposed to reduce the acknowledged harm to landscape, heritage, and community value. In Offton, the proposal remains overhead pylons.	
		Q2) Offshore coordination, improved cabling techniques and HVDC undergrounding should be independently evaluated alongside the Applicant's proposed technology.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Q3) The project proposes to demolish the existing 132kV line on the west of the hamlet and to re-route this underground to the east of the hamlet. The new 50m high pylons will then run in the line vacated by the 132kV line. Can we please have an explanation of why this has been proposed, rather than burying the 400kV line to the east of the hamlet and leaving the existing 132kV pylons in place?	Undergrounding of the existing 132kV overhead line would require lower costs and a smaller footprint than undergrounding the proposed 400kV overhead line. This is because the proposed line will require the cables to be further apart (due to the higher voltage) and would also require CSE compounds to be constructed. The disproportionate costs and environmental effects associated with these mean that the preference is to underground the 132kV overhead line at this location and to use that route for the proposed overhead line. Further details can be found in paragraphs 5.4.89-92 in <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> .
Nainby-Luxmoore	There are no documents on the Planning Inspectorate	General comments on consultation, alternatives and ecological impact.  The IP has asked for siting details of the pylons crossing its land. The Applicant has	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  A permanent access route is required across the driveway. After the hearing on 13 February 2026 the IP's questions were

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	website under this name	<p>refused to send details of where pylons RG192 and RG193 were going to be sited. The whole track crosses my drive, and two of the pylons are 100 yards from my house and the Applicant plans to compulsorily purchase a right to cross my drive.</p> <p>The Applicant has unlawfully started work in Norfolk already and that is why they have not costed or seriously appraised any alternatives.</p> <p>The Applicant will not physically be able to get their construction vehicles up my drive. I will not allow the Applicant to block the only access route to my property.</p>	<p>addressed via an email with a detailed plan and written explanation by the Applicant, together with the offer of an explanatory meeting if required. No response has been received to date.</p> <p>Work has not commenced on the project.</p> <p>There are no proposals for access of construction vehicles at the respondent's driveway for the main works, as access during the construction works will be via the temporary haul route using crossing points proposed at Bildeston Road to the north, and Offton Road/Hadleigh Road to the south.</p> <p>The DCO requirement along the IP's driveway is related to the need for a permanent access route to a proposed pylons RG191, RG192 and RG193.</p> <p>Temporary access is also required for the 132kV UKPN works, to dismantle towers PI28, PI29 and PI30. No works are proposed to the driveway; access would utilise existing access points and routes. UKPN will be liaising with all affected landowners regards their works.</p> <p>The driveway is included within the Order Limits and is shown on Section B of the <b>2.5 Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans [APP-034]</b> but no physical alterations or new site accesses are being proposed. Any need for access would therefore be for occasional operational inspection and maintenance requirements only, generally via small vehicles, vans and pick-ups.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
Spooner	[REP1-425] (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	<p>General comments on consultation and alternatives, especially around Ardleigh.</p> <p>Why does the routing of the line not follow a major route such as the A12? The routing of all the infrastructure, the movement of the pylons, the aggregate to support the building of the haul route would be minimised.</p> <p>Where is all the aggregate coming from? It's going to come from all over the country, as what is available within Essex is very limited. Where's all the steel pylons coming from? Who's manufacturing them?</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The options appraisal process was discussed during Issue Specific Hearing 1, including why certain routes had been discounted and how policy had been considered during the appraisal process. Further details can be found in the <b>8.5.3 Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submission and Response to Action Points for Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-139]</b>. Reasons why the route following the A12 was discounted are set out <b>6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Alternatives [APP-127]</b>.</p> <p><b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333]</b>, provides consideration for the sourcing of aggregate required for the construction of the Project. As indicated in paragraph 4.7.31 in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description [APP-130]</b>, <i>'materials would be resourced from within the region where practicable, it is recognised that certain temporary materials, such as hardcore for the haul roads and temporary construction compounds, may need to be resourced from outside the region'</i>.</p> <p>Within <b>7.11 Transport Assessment - Appendix G - Multi-Modal Transport [APP-340]</b>, a number of quarries with suitability of material for the Project have been identified. The majority of these quarries are located to the north / north-west of the Project. The road strategy assessed in the <b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333]</b> assumes that all stone will be sourced from these quarries, as the source of stone was not identified prior to DCO submission.</p> <p>The assessment of the temporary impact of the Project construction traffic on the SRN/MRN of sourcing stone from these locations has been considered in Section 7.6 within the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
L. Marshall	No OFH summary provided	<p>I live in a grade II listed building and will be directly opposite one of the largest compounds (8 acres) for the undergrounding section. I will have about 180 lorry loads going in and out opposite the house for a period of potentially two years. There is absolutely no information about on-site movements.</p> <p>There is ample opportunity to move this site further away from the listed building, as it is a 30-acre field. The site has been moved 20m away (it was 10m from the house) but I'm sure it could be moved further away to reduce the vibrations to the property (which has no foundations).</p> <p>There were some works 300m from our house, which was vibrating through the vibrating rollers. It was absolute hell to live through for about three weeks, and this is going to be two years.</p>	<p><b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333].</b> This assessment considers the routes likely to be taken from the quarry locations to the Project along the SRN/MRN connecting to the PARs. The approach to the PARs from the SRN/MRN is common to all routes regardless of the quarry location. Therefore, the differences between the routes are only relevant outside of the Study Area identified within the <b>7.11 Transport Assessment [APP-333]</b>.</p> <p>With regard to construction noise and vibration, this is assessed in <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration [APP-256]</b>. Construction noise and vibration will be managed via the commitments in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b>. These measures ensure that BPM will be employed by the contractor(s) to reduce the effects of noise and vibration during construction as far as practicable. Further detailed construction noise and vibration assessments will be undertaken by the contractor based on their specific methodologies. Specific mitigation measures will be identified during these assessments and incorporated in the final NVMP.</p> <p>With regard to potential building damage due to vibration, this has been assessed as part of the construction vibration assessment to identify locations with potential risk. Suitable control measures are in place in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b> to ensure that this is reassessed by the contractor(s), and suitable mitigation measures and monitoring are put in place should a risk of potential damage be identified.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>With regards to this specific property, it has been identified as experiencing potential adverse effects from noise, but these would not significant. With regards to vibration the assessment indicates that levels would be negligible and not significant with regards to both disturbance and potential building damage. As outlined above, this will be subject to further review and assessment by the contractor(s).</p>
		<p>The haul road is directly on top of where the water runs off and where it congregates into a underground stream in my property. The runoff water is going to flood my garden. The compound is over an ex-quarry, which partly over a site that was landfilled, so that is a concern and the Applicant has not checked it yet.</p>	<p>As detailed in <b>8.2 Drainage Strategy [REP1-072]</b>, channel drains along the edges of the haul roads will be provided to collect runoff. The channels will coveys flows into proposed attenuation ponds which include a treatment element to clean anticipated pollutants from the road. The haul roads have been subdivided into sections based on the existing longitudinal ground profile and anticipated low points along the route, with ponds located to drain each section. This system will mitigate the potential increase in runoff rate as a result of the increase in impermeable area, providing storage for the 100 year plus climate change rainfall event.</p>
		<p>I was outside the Order Limits, therefore, I wasn't allowed a site visit. But then I got a letter with compulsory purchase powers if I didn't agree to certain things. It looked as if they wanted to widen the road, but apparently the Applicant just wants to cut the hedges. I've still not got anything in writing, as the HoT don't tell me.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that following a design review that the only works on the IPs land are for the visibility splay, which is likely to require a temporary access easement to undertake vegetation clearance. This was confirmed in writing in the HoT pack issued to the IP in August 2025. The pack included two plans, one showing the temporary rights being sought and the other showing the absence of any permanent rights being requested.</p> <p>The IP has a land agent appointed to assist with interpretation of the documents issued to date.</p>
L. Marshall	<b>[REP1-408]</b>	<b>[REP1-408]</b> does not contain the OFH summary but instead provides figures to	These points are addressed in the Applicant's response to Dedham Vale Society open floor hearing comments above.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	No OFH summary provided	compare discrepancy between north vs south impact on the ZTV.	
J. Nichols and T. Nichols	<b>[REP1-387]</b> <b>[REP1-482]</b> Combined in the same line as the same issue was raised by both IP	The pylons (TB224/5) run directly across my garden. We have requested that pylon TB224 is repositioned approximately 10m further away, so that the lines pass over the adjacent lay-by rather than across my garden. Given the surrounding landscape, which consists of extensive open fields, it is difficult to understand why such a small adjustment cannot be made.	Representatives of the Applicant have met the IP on site. The westwards positioning of pylons (TB224 and TB225 which are to north and south of the dual carriageway) is restricted by a gas pipeline which would require a minimum offset between it and the overhead line. This has currently been established at around 30m to 40m. It may be possible, during detailed design, that the contractor, in discussion with the statutory consultee and confirming the position of the gas pipeline, may be able to further reduce the offset. <b>Commitment GG34 in 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> states that <i>'the Project has committed to moving specific pylons and restricting the movement of specific pylons or infrastructure along the longitudinal Limits of Deviation: TB223 to TB225 – Responding to the residential visual amenity assessment restrict eastwards movement of the overhead line and pylons as far as practicable'</i> .
		The pylons would significantly devalue our property. It is widely understood that the homes with overhead electric lines are far harder to sell. It's a general financial loss that would stay with us long after the project is complete.	The Applicant recognises that visual impact from overhead lines and pylons can cause concern for communities and may lead to perceptions of property value loss. However, property values are influenced by many factors, making it hard to attribute depreciation to a single cause like infrastructure development. UK law does not include for compensation in cases of a loss of view or changes to a view. Under the Compulsory Purchase Code, property owners and businesses may be able to claim compensation for any loss in value directly caused by the Project if they meet the criteria.
Bolwell-Davies	<b>[REP1-480]</b>	General comments on environmental effects on farmland and landscape.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Why the Applicant has not included farmland birds in any of their 400 documents? What mitigation are they going to put in place for farmland birds?</p>	<p>Farmland birds were included in the Project's bird assessment work. They were recorded and assessed within both the breeding bird surveys reported in <b>6.8.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.7 – Breeding Bird Report [APP-166]</b> and the wintering and passage bird surveys reported in <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP167–APP170]</b>, with the overall evaluation presented in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS 026]</b>. The survey scope and methods were consulted on and agreed with relevant stakeholders, including Natural England, to ensure coverage of key farmland habitats and species across arable and pastoral land within the route corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation for farmland birds is secured through the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>, including measures such as timing restrictions to avoid the main breeding season where practicable, protection of retained habitats during construction, and targeted habitat reinstatement. Effects on farmland birds are largely temporary, linked to construction. Habitats will be reinstated after works, except where permanent infrastructure is necessary.</p>
		<p>The Applicant purportedly stated that they would fell over 1 million trees and 1.6 million hedgerows plants as part of the project. Writtle has many protected lanes including Nathan's Lane, which have beautiful over 100-year-old oak and ash trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the age of the trees to be felled?</li> <li>• What is the Applicant doing to replace 100 year old trees as part of BNG?</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant does not recognise the numbers of tree and hedgerow loss suggested here. Full details on the tree and hedgerow impacts can be found within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> and <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 – Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA [APP-236]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to delivering at least 10% BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits, despite it not yet being mandatory for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project applications.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>While blocks of woodland will be mitigated/compensated through the standard multipliers applied through the BNG metric, the Applicant has made the commitment to 3:1 replacement planting for individual trees and small groups of individual trees within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> which is secured by Requirement 4 within <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation/compensation for ancient woodland and veteran trees are considered separately within the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Appendix B - Ancient Woodland and Veteran Tree Strategy [APP-323]</b>.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the significant risk? Explosion, fire, risk to Human life?</li> <li>• What is the Applicant planning to do to mitigate or eliminate this risk?</li> <li>• What risk management policies and procedures will be put in place?</li> <li>• How is the Applicant planning to consult and reassure residents?</li> </ul>	<p>The Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 require the environmental assessment to identify, describe and assess, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the vulnerability of the proposed development to 'major accidents and disasters'. All potential effects were scoped out from further assessment as there are no likely significant effects, as described in <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-296]</b>. A standalone major accidents and disasters chapter is therefore not included within <b>Volume 6 Environmental Statement [APP-123 to APP-298]</b>.</p> <p>In addition, existing National Grid processes are designed to identify potential security and safety risks during construction and operation (and maintenance) (including risks from major accidents and disasters) and to design these out at each stage of project development. This informs a suite of National Grid policies and processes, which contain details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing, and operating assets such as proposed on the Project.</p>
		<p>Pylons (172-178) have been placed on high ground despite being asked to move them,</p>	<p>The proposed overhead line diverts around Edney common and avoids ancient woodland. This is shown on Figure 9.5 and</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>contrary to the requirement of the Holford Rules. Sadly, the line will be seen from Hylands Park, parklands designed by landscape gardener Humphry Repton.</p>	<p>explained in paragraph 9.3.4 in <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> and also in paragraph 5.4.196 and Figure 5.29 in <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of effect on landscape and views as well as on heritage relating to the Project near to Hylands Park can be found in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>, and <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 – Historic Environment [APP-208]</b></p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>2a. Farmland birds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can I ask the Applicant why they have not included Farmland birds in any of their 400 documents?</li> <li>• What mitigation are they going to put in place for Farmland birds?</li> <li>• Is the Applicant aware that there is a National Survey by the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust called the Big Farmland Bird Count?</li> </ul>	<p>Farmland birds were included in the Project's bird assessment work. They were recorded and assessed within both <b>the breeding bird surveys</b> reported in <b>6.8.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.7 – Breeding Bird Report [APP-166]</b> and the wintering and passage bird surveys reported in <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP167 to APP170]</b>, with the overall evaluation presented in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>. The survey scope and methods were consulted on and agreed with relevant stakeholders, including Natural England, to ensure coverage of key farmland habitats and species across arable and pastoral land within the route corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation for farmland birds is secured through the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>, including measures such as timing restrictions to avoid the main breeding season where practicable, protection of retained habitats during construction, and targeted habitat reinstatement. Effects on farmland birds are largely temporary, linked to construction. Habitats will be reinstated after works, except where permanent infrastructure is necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware of broader initiatives such as the Big Farmland Bird Count and recognises the interest in farmland</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>2b. Bird Strikes: Quite simply Power lines maim and kill birds. Please see the attachment showing the swan. In the 21st century there is no place for building new overhead power lines when there are more viable, efficient methods of transmitting electricity, this is cruelty to birds and other animals who are impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the Applicant planning to do to mitigate Bird strikes?</li> <li>• Have they considered cable ploughing HDVC undergrounding as an alternative to cruel Overhead powerlines?</li> </ul>	<p>bird trends. However, the Project relies on its own EIA-led survey programme, which includes a suite of bird survey work, supported by a robust desk study.</p> <p>In response to bird strikes, collision risk has been assessed within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> with survey results provided in the <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 - Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>. This includes a comprehensive desk study of bird records with data obtained from the British Trust for Ornithology, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and local records centres, resulting in over 26,000 bird records, across a lengthy species list, including swans. NatureScot (2016) guidance was used to determine Target Species and Secondary Species (including swans) with regard to collision risk, and the distribution of these records have been mapped to determine hotspots and assess risk. Wintering / passage bird surveys have been undertaken to determine whether the proposed overhead lines could fragment corridors that are used by birds when moving between habitats along the estuaries / coast and inland, or cause mortality along such routes. The assessment did not identify locations which pose notable collision concern, including for swans. On a precautionary basis, mitigation in the form of orange spacers and bird diverters on the earth wire are proposed at the River Waveney and Ardleigh Reservoir as detailed in <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>In response to the second bullet, <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b> Offshore 1 and all HVDC alternatives in other options all considered a marine cabling HVDC base cost. The standard installation method for HVDC in a marine environment is cable ploughing, so this was</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>2c. Red listed Protected Birds: Along the pylon line Red listed protected birds have been identified on iNaturalist UK, Sounds, photos and videos have been recorded and uploaded and independently verified as part of the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the Applicant going to mitigate red list protected birds when their habitats are being destroyed by the Applicant?</li> </ul>	<p>considered within these options, <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b> sets out why the Applicant's project was taken forward following the assessment.</p> <p>Red-listed birds have been included in the Project's bird assessment work. They were recorded and assessed within both the breeding bird surveys reported in <b>6.8.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.7 – Breeding Bird Report [APP-166]</b> and the wintering and passage bird surveys reported in <b>6.8.A8 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8 – Wintering and Passage Bird Report [APP-167 to APP-170]</b>, with the overall evaluation presented in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>. The assessment has included a comprehensive desk study of bird records with data obtained from the British Trust for Ornithology, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and local records centres, resulting in over 26,000 bird records, across a lengthy species list including red-listed species.</p> <p>In addition, a suite of breeding and wintering bird surveys have been completed, with red-listed birds being categorised as target species and as such, a primary focus in the assessment. Mitigation for these species is secured through the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>, which includes avoiding the breeding season where practicable, protecting suitable habitat during works, reinstating habitats after construction except where permanent infrastructure is required, and installing orange spacers and bird diverters on the earth wire at the River Waveney and Ardleigh Reservoir, to avoid collisions of red-listed species at these locations.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>2d. Oil Pipeline: The oil pipeline is marked on the Margaretting Road. The pipeline is straight across the map and the one closest to Little Oxney Green and has apparently to be bonded due to the Overhead AC Pylon Line.</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware of the pipeline and has factored this into the designs. The works will be undertaken in accordance with the required design standards and in agreement with the relevant pipeline operator.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>2e. There is a Flypast over the Village on its way to Buckingham Palace for National, Royal or Military Commemorations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Applicant informed the Ministry of Defence (MoD)?</li> <li>• How is the Applicant going to mitigate the Flypasts?</li> </ul>	<p>The MoD has been consulted about the project.</p> <p>Fly-pasts are normally counted as air displays, in the context that is described by the submission. As such, they are not only governed by the normal Rules of the Air but also additional risk assessment by the display operator. Depending on the nature of the fly-past and the obstacle environment in the locale (including but certainly not limited to overhead lines), a minimum height for operation is typically determined. It's likely that this could be around 500ft (152m) but may be lower, depending on the display authorisation held by the performing pilot. A minimum for displays away from an aerodrome by a suitably qualified pilot could be as low as 200ft (61m) but only where the obstacle environment is known and obstacles can be cleared by a suitable margin, determined by the display pilot.</p> <p>In the example given, a fly-past centred on the village of Writtle could safely descend and climb to perform low fly-pasts, as the overhead line is approximately 1600m at its closest point relative to the village. Therefore, the overhead lines will have a negligible impact on fly-pasts.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p>	<p>The Project has sought to avoid situating pylons in locations that are at risk of flooding and in a small number of locations where this has not been possible mitigation has been secured</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>2f. Flooding: With the proposal of 23 pylons around Writtle itself and known flooding hotspots and thousands of tonnes of gravel for haul roads and thousands of tonnes of concrete, I am very concerned about the impact of flooding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has flood risk been assessed for areas where pylons are proposed in flood-prone land?</li> <li>• What measures will be put in place to ensure that construction does not worsen existing flooding issues?</li> <li>• How will access routes be maintained for residents if floodwater blocks roads and surrounding land, particularly where pylons and associated infrastructure may restrict safe exit routes?</li> <li>• Given the increasing frequency of extreme weather events, it is essential that infrastructure projects do not compound existing flood vulnerabilities. How are these risks are being addressed?</li> <li>• How will the Applicant protect villages that are already prone to flooding where new pylons are being installed in fields that regularly flood?</li> </ul>	<p>in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>. In these areas, as agreed with the Environment Agency, floodplain compensation storage will be provided to replace the lost volumes of storage for floodwaters. These losses have been calculated using data from Environment Agency flood models and land within the Order Limits has been identified to accommodate the compensation.</p> <p>A range of other measures are secured to manage the impacts of the Projects construction on flood risk and the land drainage regime. These are detailed in <b>7.9 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-331]</b> and <b>8.2 Drainage Strategy DCO [REP1-072]</b>. Key measures include a range of Sustainable Drainage Systems to manage runoff from the construction swathe (the designs of which include allowances for the predicted effects of more extreme rainfall due to climate change) and measures for silt control to prevent blockages of waterways and drainage paths. The controls detailed in the Strategy are secured through commitments that are included within the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The Pylon line is very close to Broomfield Hospital. Apparently, the line had a minor</p>	<p>The overhead line design is such that EMFs reduce quickly with distances from the overhead line. The proposed overhead line is over 600m from the hospital. As demonstrated in <b>Figures 6.1 and 6.2 of 7.8 Electric and Magnetic Field</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>adjustment, so that the Essex Air Ambulance could land, but I would welcome assurances that the AC line does not affect hospital equipment.</p>	<p><b>Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>, the EMFs will have reduced to a background level, lower than the EMFs found in a typical home at the hospital's location. Given this, the overhead line would present no issues to the operation of Broomfield Hospital's equipment.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The only access to Broomfield Hospital is from Chelmsford along Broomfield Road and in the other direction through the Waltham Gap, which is a pinch point and where the overhead Power lines are proposed. I would equally like to fully understand how this will be achievable, without majorly impacting on the hospital and services it provides and potential for loss of life?</p>	<p>The Applicant is proposing to route construction vehicles along PARs, from the major and strategic road network to site access points, where construction vehicles will join the internal haul road. The Applicant is not proposing any PARs along the B1008 Broomfield Road from Chelmsford. Construction traffic south of Chelmsford is directed to the Site Access Points along the A138 and A1060. From the North, the Applicant is proposing to route construction traffic to the Site Access Point from the B1008 Braintree Road, Chelmsford Road. The Applicant is not proposing to route construction vehicles south along the B1008. The Applicant has assessed the operation of two junctions in the locality of the hospital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 59: A131 Braintree Road/B1008 Essex Regiment Way</li> <li>• Site 61: B1008 Min Road/Chelmsford Road/The Street</li> </ul> <p>The 7.11 <b>Transport Assessment [App-333]</b> provides detail the conclusion of the assessment. The Applicant is not proposing any physical mitigation at these locations, with the junctions not operating significantly over the capacity levels in the future baseline with committed developments, with the addition of the construction traffic.</p> <p>The Applicant has developed <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [App-309]</b>. Where Section 5.10 details the engagement proposed with the blue light services. The blue light services will be given written notice of planned or temporary road closures and AIL deliveries. The Applicant anticipates that the Main Works Contractor(s) will develop an incident management plan, in agreement with the blue light</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			services to develop a procedure for any incidents on the road network proposed to be utilised by the Project.
Crook	[REP1-362]	<p>General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>The pylons would curve around Writtle, and on one of the visualisations from the Highwood Road, you would see at least 18 pylons, far exceeding the visible distance from the Applicant's documentation (Doc 7.12 Part 6, P.131).</p> <p>I have serious concerns over the risk of EMF to my family, with the property being just over 100ms from the proposed route. The National Grid EMF expert could not provide me with sufficient evidence of the consultations to resolve my concerns. I also have not heard a convincing answer as to why pipelines hundreds of metres from the pylons would have to be protected, yet I will not be affected in my own home.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>Viewpoint 6.09: The Causeway, Edney Common is located between The Causeway and Highwood Road. A photomontage is provided from Viewpoint 6.09 in <b>7.12 Visualisations - Part 6 of 9 [APP-348]</b>. Significant effects are identified on receptors at this viewpoint, as set out in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 4 of 4 [APP-232]</b>. During operation, the Project would be visible in middle distance views to the east and in long distance views to the north, as the proposed overhead line passes to the west of Writtle.</p> <p>National Grid look to authoritative and independent scientific organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) to review the worldwide body of scientific evidence on EMFs and health. We believe important decisions on health should be made independently of industry, as is the case in the UK.</p> <p>Health considerations are given a high priority in the process by which we arrive at any proposals for new electricity circuits. Assessment of compliance with national guidance and policies is key to our approach. The UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for managing EMFs, which include which includes both numerical exposure guidelines to protect against established, acute effects of EMFs, and precautionary policies to provide appropriate protection against the possibility of chronic effects of EMFs at lower levels, including, specifically, the possibility of a risk for childhood leukaemia. These are</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>incorporated into the decision-making process for Development Consent in EN-5.</p> <p>Our approach ensures all our assets comply with those policies, which are set by Government on the advice of their independent advisors UKHSA. This ensures that health concerns are properly and adequately addressed. The evidence concerning compliance with these policies, including the numerical guidelines is included in the <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>.</p> <p>The risks to pipelines from EMFs are considered separately under different guidance.</p>
		<p>Flooding is of great concern as the fields flood in winter. Having hundreds of tonnes of concrete and the haul road is likely to significantly increase the flooding and also potentially affect my property.</p>	<p>As detailed in <b>8.2 Drainage Strategy DCO [REP1-072]</b> the Project will embed a range of measures and controls to manage runoff from the construction swathe, including its construction compounds and haul roads, so as to avoid contributing to any existing local flooding and drainage issues. The controls detailed in the Strategy are secured through commitments that are included within the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>.</p>
		<p>Hundreds of lorries per day will pass within metres of the house, a property designated as a heritage asset, which will be affected by the vibrations.</p> <p>There will be the noise and dust every day for the years of construction. I live in the direction of the prevailing wind from the proposed route across open fields.</p>	<p>With regards to construction noise and vibration, this is assessed in <b>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.14) [APP-256]</b>. Construction noise and vibration will be managed via the commitments in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and associated <b>Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan [APP-306]</b>. These measures ensure that BPM will be employed by the contractor(s) to reduce the effects of noise and vibration during construction as far as practicable. Further detailed construction noise and vibration assessments will be undertaken by the contractor based on their specific methodologies. Specific mitigation measures will be identified during these</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			assessments and incorporated in the final Noise and Vibration Management Plan.
		I strongly contest to not being affected - as a result of the plans, I am unlikely to be able to sell the property and if I did, could well have negative equity.	<p>The Applicant's financial governance, including the treatment of land acquisition and compensation, operates within established corporate, regulatory and audit frameworks.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to compensate for losses arising as a result of construction, including disturbance, severance, and losses arising from restrictions on land use or agricultural operations on the terms of the Compensation Code. Where ongoing future losses in land productivity or businesses can be evidenced and attributed to the Project, such matters fall to be assessed and, where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p>
Doran	[REP1-493]	General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Our home that we have invested our life's work into is currently virtually unsellable. We have been advised if we were able to sell it would be at a loss of around £220,000.	<p>The Applicant's financial governance, including the treatment of land acquisition and compensation, operates within established corporate, regulatory and audit frameworks.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to compensate for losses arising as a result of construction, including disturbance, severance, and losses arising from restrictions on land use or agricultural operations. Where ongoing future losses in land productivity or businesses can be evidenced and attributed to the Project, such matters fall to be assessed and, where justified, compensated in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p>
		As it is currently proposed we will be approximately 100m from pylon TB160, destroying the pristine countryside and putting us at risk of the huge EMF effect of 400KV systems.	The UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for managing EMFs, which are incorporated into the decision-making process for Development Consent in EN-5. These policies, which include exposure limits, have been set by an independent authoritative scientific body (UKHSA) who

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>This Pylon could easily be re-located much further across the field, which would at least alleviate the risks to us and our neighbours from EMF's.</p>	<p>carefully review all science around magnetic fields and health. After decades of research into EMF and health there are no established health effects below the exposure limits. All the infrastructure proposed as part of this project complies with the requirements of EN-5 and evidence of compliance even when located directly underneath the overhead line is available in the <b>7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>. In addition to compliance with the Government's exposure limits, the overhead line design, as detailed in <b>Section 6.2 of 7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b> ensures that the EMF reduces quickly with distances from overhead line.</p> <p>The reasons for the routing near pylon TB160 (now TB162) is set out in Section 9.3 of the <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>.</p>
		<p>OFGEM has approved EGL2, a 500km+ undersea cable link. More than double the length of Norwich to Tilbury. This has a forecast build cost, including all the infrastructure, of £4.3 billion. This casts huge doubt on the figures quoted for Norwich to Tilbury. The projected cost for pylons are in the region of £895 million, whereas the projected cost of undergrounding the whole project where possible has been estimated to be in the region of only £330 million</p>	<p>The EGL2 project is for 2GW HVDC link only requiring two sets of convertors (one each end) and one set of Bi-pole cables (two Cables over the 500km).</p> <p>The sub optimal offshore alternative for Norwich to Tilbury, Offshore 1, requires 6GW of capacity. This requires six sets of convertors (three at each end) and three sets of Bi-pole cables (six cables over 220km). Therefore, because of the higher capacity Offshore1 would contain more cables and more convertors than EGL 1 requires.</p> <p>The same methodology is used by the Applicant to assess strategic options applying the same set of cost considerations for all projects in England and Wales and as used in <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review Appendix D: Economic Appraisal [APP-357]</b>. This also sets out the lifetime cost issues addressed by our methodology. Including maintenance costs for each</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>technology. <b>Appendix C -Technology Overview [APP-357]</b> provides detail of each technology.</p> <p>The cost differential between the proposed Project and all HVDC alternatives is stark, and is set out in the economic appraisal in <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b>. The following costs were set out at Issue Specific Hearing 1 with all data from <b>[APP-357]</b> and all cost information is in <b>Appendix D — Economic Appraisal [APP-357]</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wholly Overhead Line — Project Total: £894.50m</li> <li>• Wholly 4-Ended HVDC Option Project Total: £5,854.50m</li> <li>• Offshore 1 — Sub-optimal 2-Ended HVDC Option Norwich to Tilbury: £4,096.50m</li> <li>• Offshore 1 — 3-Ended HVDC Option Norwich to Bramford to Tilbury: £5,361.10m.</li> </ul> <p>The additional cost of making the offshore option technically comparable is also quantified. Paragraph 14.4.6 of <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b> states '<i>Should this circuit at full 6000 MW capacity [be] made multiterminal to provide the same system flexibility as the AC circuit options [there] would be a need for an additional three sets of HVDC convertor stations and three sets of 50km HVDC cable to connect to Bramford, to make multi-terminal HVDC links. This would add an additional £1,265.1m of capital cost and increase circuit lifetime cost by £1,587m. This would give overall capital costs of £5,361.1m (£4,096.5m + £1,265.1m), and overall lifetime cost of £6,248m (£4,661m + £1,587m).</i>'</p>
Pardoe	There are no documents on the Planning Inspectorate	I request a review and change to the proposed pylon TB141 and associated pylons and the high-voltage cables overhead at the Waltham Gap. This is on the basis of	Health considerations are given a high priority in the process by which we arrive at any proposals for new electricity circuits. The UK has specific policies for managing EMFs, which includes both numerical exposure guidelines to protect against

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	website under this name	<p>negative health impact of the cables, in particular the detrimental lower-height, wider-spread pylons proposed through the 100m-wide Waltham Gap.</p> <p>Low-level electromagnetic field exposure from overhead cables causes well-established biological and health effects, so cables and pylons must be treated as a health hazard. The harmful effects on human health are reduction in melatonin, phosphenes or flashing lights caused by EMFs activating the optic nerve, noise pollution from the cables, worse in wet weather and long periods of dry spells, which is exactly the climate of Essex and the Waltham Gap, four-fold increase in female infertility for those living within 500m of cable, increasing depression and anxiety, a non-statistically significant increase in adult cancers, and all of these effects multiplied as health hazards to children. The closer you are to a cable, the stronger the electromagnetic field.</p> <p>At the Waltham Gap, many of the 5,000-plus local residents will pass within just a few metres from pylon TB141 every day, and the cables will only be a maximum of 25m away. It's not acceptable that we will all be exposed to higher density EMFs and increased health hazards than the normal population.</p>	<p>established acute effects of EMFs, and precautionary policies to provide appropriate protection against the possibility of chronic effects of EMFs at lower levels, including, specifically, the possibility of a risk for childhood leukaemia. These policies which were adopted by Government on recommendation by UKHSA and are incorporated into the decision-making process for Development Consent in the EN-5.</p> <p>The exposure guidelines in place are based on preventing established biological effects, which specifically cover magnetophophenes, flickering flashes of light perceived in the visual field. These occur when the retina or visual cortex is exposed to high time-varying magnetic fields inducing weak electric current, which in turn stimulate retinal cells. The exposure limits are set to prevent these effects occurring with a considerable 5-fold safety factor applied to the public limits.</p> <p>Research into the potential health effects of EMF has been carried out for decades and National Grid look to independent authoritative review bodies such as the UKHSA to review that science and for Government to advise on appropriate protective measures based on the outcomes of these reviews. Summaries of the scientific evidence and review body outcomes are provided in <b>Section 2.6 of 7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>. These review processes consider the totality of the scientific evidence, rather than being based on selected individual studies, though all relevant individual studies are taken into account. These reviews include research covering, but not limited to melatonin, adult cancers, fertility and childhood cancers. It is important to note that after decades of research into EMF and health, no health effects have been established below the Governments adopted exposure limits.</p> <p>Our approach ensures all our assets comply with those policies, which are set by Government on the advice of their</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			independent advisors UKHSA. Irrespective of the technology used National Grid will always ensure that all of its equipment is designed to comply with Government's policies on EMF. This ensures that health concerns are properly and adequately addressed. The evidence concerning compliance with these policies, including the numerical guidelines is included in the <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b> .
C. Micklem	<b>[REP1-310a]</b> (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	<p>General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental impact assessment of April '24, National Grid concluded that the potential negative residual effect from construction, operation and maintenance is likely to be significant on the landscape, visual, and historic environments in Great and Little Waltham. In no other location would there be more permanent negative effects on this scale. It contains the only two conservation areas along the whole route that will be permanently negatively impacted, the only registered parkland along the route that will be negatively impacted and one of the five scheduled monuments, and likely there's going to be 70 permanent negative effects in this area.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>Through routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce as far as practicable potential impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets. The Applicant acknowledges that the settings of some designated assets fall partially within the Order Limits and this is assessed within <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment [AS-068]</b>. Where this occurs, the Applicant has assessed the significance of effect on the value of these assets within <b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>. The Project has also assessed the level of harm in <b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b> on designated assets where land that forms part of the setting of designated assets falls within the Order Limits. The assessment has not concluded any substantial harm to heritage assets, although less than substantial harm has been identified as is common for many types of developments and should be considered in the context of the planning balance of the benefits of the Project. As the Project is classified as critical national priority as set out in section 4.2 of NPS EN-1 (2024) the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>CNP infrastructure will meet the test for public benefit that outweighs harm, even if substantial harm were identified, as set out in paragraph 4.2.15-17 of NPS EN-1 (2024).</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>
		<p>The presence of two conservation areas in one short section is not coincidental. It reflects the historic cohesion and sensitivity of this landscape. Rule 2 of the Holford Rules states, 'Avoid small areas of high amenity value or scientific interest, and, where</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>possible, choose routes which minimise the effects and settings on archaeological and historical interests, including conservation, listed buildings, listed parks and gardens, ancient monuments', and in section F, between pylons 132 and 144, there are the following within 1km of pylons: two Grade I listed buildings, two Grade II* listed buildings, 73 Grade II listed buildings, one Grade II listed parkland, one scheduled monument, two conservation areas and three woodlands.</p>	
		<p>Hidden amongst the 552 documents for the DCO, the Applicant has stated, 'Flexibility has been retained to revert to standard lattice pylons. This may include removing one of the three pylons and a slight change of location for the remaining two'.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b>.</p>
		<p>In many of the documents, the Applicant appears to rely heavily on the Grade I listed status of Langleys to justify the lower pylons. However, as the current owner of Langleys, our views as the long-term custodians of this estate have been largely ignored. Instead, the Applicant has chosen to prioritise Historic England's position, despite the fact that Historic England have not engaged with us directly or even submitted a response to the DCO.</p> <p>If the current route is kept, we would prefer the tall pylons between 136 and 142 rather than the current low-height pylons and that TB143 is moved further north to help mitigate</p>	<p>These points are addressed in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		the impact on the Grade II listed Ball's Farmhouse.	
J. Micklem	No OFH summary on the Planning Inspectorate website	No separate oral summary has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.	The IP has not submitted an Oral Summary but has submitted a Written Representation <b>[REP1-386]</b> , which covers all the matters during the OFH. Therefore, the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.
Pym	<b>[REP1-412]</b>	General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives including use of Green Book. Also comments on resilience of overhead lines from weather and interference.	These points are addressed in <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .
		Inadequate survey coverage: Less than 1% of the land has been surveyed. National Grid has surveyed, at best, around 45 hectares on foot. That means over 99% of the affected landscape has never been visited by an ecologist.	The ecological survey coverage suggested here as 1% is inaccurate. As part of the EIA process for the Project, a suite of ecological field surveys have been undertaken over the 2022-2025 period. This includes surveys across 97% of the land within the Order Limits, as well as a suite of protected species surveys. The survey results are presented within <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> , with full survey details provided within the relevant technical appendices.
		Hedgrows, trees and wildlife corridors: We still have no disclosure of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how many trees, hedgerows and bushes will be removed</li> <li>• where this will occur</li> <li>• when replacements will be provided</li> <li>• how long they will take to establish</li> </ul>	The Applicant does not recognise the figures stated in this comment, the actual habitat impacts are included within <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> and <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236]</b> . It should be noted that these assessments are based on a reasonable worst-case scenario of vegetation loss, based on a standard overhead line and underground cable design. Following detailed design (post-

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• who will maintain them</li> <li>• or where displaced wildlife is expected to go in the meantime.</li> </ul> <p>Astonishing figures of allegedly 1.8 million trees and 6 million hedges were allegedly leaked and then retracted. The Applicant should be asked directly: what is the estimated ecological destruction in trees, hedges and wildlife?</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant should be required, before any final decision is made to detail their alternative proposals, to replace the damage to the environment.</p>	<p>consent) it is anticipated that the amount of vegetation loss would be reduced and impacts to trees and hedgerows will be minimised as far as practicable. The <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> both include commitments to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is applied, with the priority of avoiding impacts to habitats including trees and hedgerows, where practicable.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> sets out a comprehensive mitigation strategy for habitat loss (temporary and permanent) and any impacts, including fragmentation and disturbance, on protected species as agreed with Natural England and Local Planning Authorities.</p> <p>On completion of works all areas of temporary construction impacts would be subject to replacement planting, replanting the habitat type that was lost. For the relatively small areas of permanent habitat loss, additional planting has been proposed within Environmental Areas surrounding the permanent National Grid asset. Illustrative landscape designs for these areas have been provided within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has committed to deliver 10 % BNG with environmental and societal benefits on all construction projects. The 10 % BNG target for the Project is currently voluntary and aligned with National Grid's corporate sustainability commitment.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a 5-year monitoring period for tree and hedgerow replacement planting as stated in <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Environmental Areas will be subject to a 30-year</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			monitoring period in line with the BNG Strategy detailed within <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299]</b> .
Steel	<b>[REP1-419]</b>	At the Waltham Gap, the Applicant has replaced the standard 50m pylons, TB136 to 142, with lower 40m lattice pylons, which require a wider stance and a heavier frame. Reinstating just two standard height pylons in this section would allow TB141 to be moved further from the conservation area and main road into the middle of the field.	These points are addressed in the <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
Maguire	<b>[REP1-430]</b>	General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives.  We should be insisting on an independent audit using the Treasury Green Book to protect the environment and communities and for best practice and best outcome.  Regarding health. This is an issue to myself regarding pacemakers, and I'd really be grateful if you would take on board the studies by Professor Denis Henshaw that states that living near pylons increases the risk of childhood and adult leukaemia. Also, in 2007, he advised the UK government not to build new houses near existing pylons. Unfortunately, our houses are already there. I'd like to draw your attention to the Draper report as well, that states that living under 200m away from an overhead line or near an overhead line increases your risk of cancers by 70%.	These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  These points are addressed in the <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .  EN-5 provides clear guidance from the Government's competent authority on EMF and heart devices stating: <i>'2.9.58 The Department of Health and Social Care's Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency does not consider that transmission line EMFs constitute a significant hazard to the operation of pacemakers.'</i>  National Grid are unaware of any reported instances of an overhead line interfering with a correctly fitted modern electronic implantable device such as a pacemaker or ICD. Further details of EMF and medical devices is provided <b>Section 2.10 in 7.8 Electric and Magnetic field Compliance Report [APP-330]</b> .  National Grid take these issues very seriously and will continue to engage with anyone who has concerns, to provide

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>reassurance that there will be no EMF impact to medical devices from National Grid equipment.</p> <p>Research into the potential health effects of EMF has been carried out for decades and National Grid look to independent authoritative review bodies such as the UK Health Security Agency to review that science and for Government to advise on appropriate protective measures based on the outcomes of these reviews. Summaries of the scientific evidence and review body outcomes are provided in Section 2.6 of <b>7.8 Electric and Magnetic Fields Compliance Report [APP-330]</b>. These review processes consider the totality of the scientific evidence, rather than being based on selected individual studies, though all relevant individual studies are taken into account. It is important to note that after decades of research into EMF and health, no health effects have been established below the Governments adopted exposure limits.</p> <p>The UK has undertaken its own review of what precautionary measures should be applied to electricity infrastructure considering uncertainty in science, including evidence on childhood leukaemia. In 2009<sup>2</sup>, the outcomes of the Department of Health's established Stakeholder Advisory Group to Government on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and magnetic fields (SAGE) were published. The aim of the process was to bring together a range of stakeholders, which included Professor Henshaw to identify and explore the implications for a precautionary approach to Extremely Low Frequency EMF and make practical recommendations for precautionary measures. SAGE looked at a range of precautionary measures and made recommendations to Government on those which should be adopted.</p>

<sup>2</sup> SAGE (2009) Government Response to the Stakeholder Advisory Group on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields Recommendations, Department of Health

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Government adopted several of the recommendations SAGE had made for precautionary measures. Those measures specific to high voltage power lines include 'optimal phasing' of power lines and providing more advice on EMFs. Other precautionary measures, specifically the introduction of corridors around new and existing overhead lines, were considered but were judged to be disproportionate in light of the evidence and were not adopted.</p> <p>Based on the science and recommendations by SAGE, the UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for protecting against EMFs, which includes both numerical exposure guidelines to protect against established, acute effects of EMFs, and precautionary policies to provide appropriate protection against the possibility of chronic effects of EMFs at lower levels, including, specifically, the possibility of a risk for childhood leukaemia. We believe it is right that the decision on what is acceptable or not is made independently of National Grid by authoritative review bodies, rather than our own assessment of the science. All these review bodies, including UKHSA who specifically advise the UK government, would be able to revise their conclusions if new scientific results justified so doing. The fact that they have not done so indicates that no new studies have been published that significantly change the conclusions already reached. The evidence concerning compliance with these policies, including the numerical guidelines and precautionary policies is included in <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>.</p>
P&J Lanham	<b>[REP1-434]</b> (incorrectly labelled as	The project will stop my fishing lake activity, make my cattle business non-viable and my turkey business contract will be cancelled. We have had several meetings with the	This matter is covered in greater detail within the IPs Written Representation <b>[REP1-435]</b> , the Applicant has responded to the points raised in <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> to avoid duplication.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	Written Representation)	<p>Applicant and asked questions about several aspects, but we are given the same answers, that they don't know and will let us know, but they never get back to us.</p> <p>You expect us to sign an agreement, but we have no input into this agreement. We are only a small farm, but we have been farming on this site since 1980, and if this project goes ahead as is, we will have to stop farming.</p>	<p>The Applicant has held a number of meetings with the IP and their land agent over several years, including on-site visits, to better understand the potential impacts to the IPs businesses. The Applicant has continued to express a willingness to engage further to explore mitigation measures and appropriate accommodation works, including the understood need for biosecurity relating to the turkey farm and cattle, and other practical agricultural matters.</p> <p>The Applicant has ongoing dialogue with IP's land agent regarding acquisition of land rights through the issue of HoT, to gather feedback regarding matters such as the impacts to the fishing lake and turkey farm. The ability to claim compensation for proven losses is covered within the Applicant's Land Rights Strategy, a copy of which has been provided to the IP and agent, alongside claims under the relevant legislation.</p>
Wislocki	There are no documents on the Planning Inspectorate website under this name	<p>This is in relation specifically to Linton, Lower Dunton Road, just on the western side of Basildon, just north of the main railway line. We believe this site is developable in as much as it is in the allocation in Basildon's draft local plan, which looks very likely to be adopted. The site was purchased by my client and business partner some years ago with the definite intention to develop it, and we believe that that opportunity to develop is becoming very real and quite imminent.</p> <p>There is frustration with the lack of engagement on the project. The promoter's agents have met with us on site and appear to understand everything we were saying to them, but were quite unable or unwilling to</p>	<p>The Applicant has been made aware of the previous plans for development on the site which if those plans progressed would conflict with the proposed diversion route for a 132kV underground cable. For the avoidance of doubt we are aware of the potential adoption of the site within the Basildon Local Plan. Our experience is that there is typically flexibility within both the layout of proposals such as Lynton and in the diversion works that are required for the Project, indeed this is inherently identified in the constructive representation. The Applicant would welcome a meeting to explore this further in conjunction with UKPN (the owner and operator of the line) to work to a mutually agreeable solution.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the distinction, and the involvement of separate agents, has given rise to uncertainty regarding responsibilities and the appropriate route for engagement.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>explain any of the rationale in terms of the actual design as it affects our land. We made some suggestions, but we are not at all clear that any of our comments have actually reached the people who are actually responsible for the technical aspects of this scheme, and in fact, when a subsequent iteration of the proposal was issued, it was marginally worse, not better. It appeared to be a step backwards, not forwards, so we simply don't believe that there is any realistic engagement or dialogue.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the works in question fall within the scope of the Norwich to Tilbury Development Consent Order, which is being promoted by National Grid as the Applicant. Where third-party works are required to facilitate the delivery of the authorised development such as works undertaken by UKPN these are addressed within the DCO framework through protective provisions and third-party agreements. National Grid retains overall responsibility for promoting the DCO and for ensuring that land and rights required for the Project are secured in a coordinated and lawful manner.</p> <p>The Applicant remains the DCO Applicant and is responsible for the overall coordination of land rights required for the Project. Fisher German act as National Grid's appointed land agents. UKPN is responsible for delivering certain statutory undertaker works and may appoint its own agents to negotiate land rights specific to those works, but this does not sit outside the National Grid DCO framework.</p> <p>All engagement, consultation and acquisition of land or rights for works authorised by the DCO whether undertaken directly by National Grid or by UKPN as a third party are governed by the DCO and associated statutory processes.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the landowner will have a further opportunity to engage directly with the Applicant, in addition to any engagement with UKPN's appointed agents, to ensure transparency and accountability.</p>
<b>Open Floor Hearing 3</b>			
Ramsay	There are no documents on the Planning Inspectorate	<p>General comments on consultation and consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>There is an area of ancient woodland near Bunwell which may be affected by the project. Ancient woodland is precious and</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The potential impacts to ecological features, including designated sites, ancient woodlands and bats are fully assessed within <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
	website under this name	should not be damaged by the pylons, and the ecological impact of the project needs to be re-evaluated more broadly. Mitigation is needed for bat species, whose flight lines are disrupted and habitats divided, and the nearest pylon would be less than 200m away from Shelfanger Meadows SSSI, a crucial grassland habitat.	<p><b>8: Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026].</b> Bunwell Wood is located 100m away from the Order Limits and no impact pathways have been identified. The Applicant can confirm the Bunwell Wood ancient woodland will not be impacted by the Project and a 15 m exclusion buffer will be maintained.</p> <p>Impact pathways to Shelfanger Meadows SSSI are limited to potential hydrological links. Mitigation measures to protect water quality are secured through commitment W01 to W16 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>. Additionally, the design of temporary crossings would reduce temporary effects on the watercourses' flow regimes and channel forms. No residual significant effects have been identified on any SSSI's across the Project, including Shelfanger SSSI, following the implementation of mitigation.</p> <p>A detailed bat activity survey has been undertaken across the Project as set out within <b>6.8.A10 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.10 - Bat Activity Report [APP-172]</b>. Artificial bat flyways are proposed at key locations where the survey data has indicated a high usage feature by foraging/commuting bats, to ensure connectivity is maintained during construction. The approach to bat commuting/foraging mitigation and the proposed locations for the bat flyways, has been agreed with the Local Planning Authorities through consultation on the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p>
		Safety issues should also be fully evaluated, including the impact on Norfolk Gliding Club at Tibenham, given the serious dangers of collisions.	The Applicant has responded to the points regarding safety of the local airfields in its response to Norfolk Gliding Club in the <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> .
		The proximity of pylons to individual homes in Gislingham is causing particular stress to individuals, and at Mendlesham the proximity	An assessment of effects on residential visual amenity for properties within 200m of the Project centreline is provided in <b>6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 -</b>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		of the new pylon line to the existing line creates a problem of scale for residents.	<b>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-233 and APP-234]</b> . Due to the redaction, we are unable to comment on residential visual amenity in detail for specific properties, but can provide further comment if the locations are provided.
		The highways of Norfolk and Suffolk are not capable of taking the heavy vehicles and amounts of traffic that will be required to erect the pylons on the route proposed. Many constituents are worried about the construction phase of the project and its aftermath, so I'd ask how the potential damage and road safety concerns will be addressed.	The construction routeing strategy is detailed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> , where construction traffic is routed on PARs from the MRN/SRN to the Site Access Points. Each PAR has been assessed for its suitability to have two-way HGV movements. Where required, additional traffic management and mitigation are proposed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> . The construction traffic will travel along the internal haul road, crossing the public highway using crossover points. As set out in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> , a driver information pack will be issued to all staff working on the project. This will include details of hotspots for pedestrians and cyclists to inform the driver. Pre- and post-construction surveys are proposed to be undertaken on routes which are anticipated to be used by HGVs and AILs. The scope of these surveys is to be agreed with each local highway authority. In accordance with mitigation measure GG06 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> , a record of condition will be carried out (photographic and descriptive) of the working areas that may be affected by construction activities. This record will be available for comparison following reinstatement after the works have been completed to enable the standard of reinstatement to meet the condition in the pre-condition survey.
		Individual families are worried that their homes will be devalued.	These points are addressed in the <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		There are documented concerns that pylons are vulnerable to storms and man-made threats, whereas undergrounding cables would provide reassurance against these and other concerns.	These points are addressed in the <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (document 8.4.1 revision B)</b> .
Magee	<b>[REP1-335]</b>	Heron Meadow is a retreat centre, a sanctuary for healing and learning in nature. The Norwich to Tilbury proposal is an existential threat for my business, which I will be forced to close. I will be obliged to pursue the Applicant for loss of my investment and livelihood.	<p>The IP's land does not fall within the project order limits. Applicant met with the IP on site during February 2024 to understand the impact on this property. As a result of this meeting a change request was submitted at that time to lessen the impact of view of the pylons. The response was provided in the <b>7.21 2024 Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b>.and the Consultation Report has provided further information on routing and siting since that time.</p> <p>Further public consultation opportunities have been provided since the 2024 meeting. No further interaction has been requested by the IP at this time with regards to a potential business loss claim. Notwithstanding which, matters relating to loss of business income, perceived safety concerns, injurious affection or diminution in value are compensation matters. Such matters would be assessed separately, on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and the statutory Compensation Code and are not matters to be determined through the Examination of the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>The Applicant adheres to the Compensation Code and will compensate for qualifying losses where they can be demonstrated and are attributable to the Project, including claims relating to depreciation in value or the loss of development potential, assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
		There is a wealth of peer-reviewed papers on powerwatch.org demonstrating the harmful	Research into the potential health effects of EMF has been carried out for decades and National Grid look to independent

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>effects of EMF at 50Hz. Exposure to low-frequency EMF has been shown to increase progression of melanoma cancer cells, to raise incidence of leukaemia, to damage fertility, implicated in the rise of autism in children, negatively influence heart rate variability and cardiovascular performance, cause sleep disturbance, depression, anxiety, headaches, and irritability. A 2016 Italian study to determine the safe distance from HV lines for schools suggested 200m as a minimum for 300kV power lines. The Norwich to Tilbury line will carry 400kV.</p> <p>Further details of EMF studies are provided in the Appendix to the oral summary.</p>	<p>authoritative review bodies such as the UKHSA to review that science and for Government to advise on appropriate protective measures based on the outcomes of these reviews. Summaries of the scientific evidence and review body outcomes are provided in <b>Section 2.6 of 7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>. It is important to note that after decades of research into EMF and health, no health effects have been established below the Governments adopted exposure limits.</p> <p>Several individual studies have been published over the last decade investigating a range of health outcomes, some of which are noted in the appendix provided. Review bodies consider the complete body of scientific evidence, allowing a balanced conclusion on risks to be draw, rather than relying on individual papers or a subsection of scientific literature.</p> <p>The UKHSA and Department of Health are responsible for ensuring that current guidelines and policies are reflective of the body of scientific research and provide adequate protection against EMFs.</p> <p>The UK Government's latest policy on EMF as it relates to new electricity infrastructure is set out in EN-5, which was reissued in December 2025 and came into effect in January 2026. This latest policy is reflective of the measures Government and their public health experts considered appropriate.</p> <p>As noted at the hearing, some European countries have also introduced precautionary measures in addition to exposure limits. It is for each country to introduce the policies they consider appropriate. The UK has undertaken its own review of what precautionary measures should be applied to electricity infrastructure. In 2009, the outcomes of the Department of Health's established Stakeholder Advisory Group to Government on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and magnetic fields (SAGE) were published. The aim of the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>process was to bring together a range of stakeholders to identify and explore the implications for a precautionary approach to Extremely Low Frequency EMF (electric and magnetic fields) and make practical recommendations for precautionary measures. SAGE looked at a range of precautionary measures and made recommendations to Government on those which should be adopted.</p> <p>The Government adopted several of the recommendations SAGE had made for precautionary measures. Those measures specific to high voltage power lines include 'optimal phasing' of power lines and providing more advice on EMFs. Other precautionary measures, specifically the introduction of corridors around new and existing overhead lines, were considered but were judged to be disproportionate in light of the evidence and were not adopted.</p> <p>Based on the science and recommendations by SAGE, the UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for protecting against EMFs, which includes both numerical exposure guidelines to protect against established, acute effects of EMFs, and precautionary policies to provide appropriate protection against the possibility of chronic effects of EMFs at lower levels, including, specifically, the possibility of a risk for childhood leukaemia. We believe it is right that the decision on what is acceptable or not is made independently of National Grid, rather than our own assessment of the science. The evidence concerning compliance with these policies, including the numerical guidelines and precautionary policies is included in the <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>.</p>
		<p>Animals, inclusive of large vertebrates such as cows, also birds, insects and other invertebrate life, orientate and navigate using</p>	<p>While some animal groups, particularly migratory birds and certain reptiles and amphibians, are known to possess a magnetic sense that enables them to detect the earth's</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>their sensitivity to geomagnetic fields. Proximity of the high voltage power lines interferes with their behaviours and their ability to navigate.</p>	<p>geomagnetic field and contributes to orientation and navigation, the weight of current scientific evidence does not demonstrate that extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields (ELF EMF) generated by high voltage power lines interfere with these behaviours under real world conditions. A recent review by Pophof <i>et al</i><sup>3</sup>, 2023 detailed studies reporting disruption of navigation are primarily associated with non power line frequencies (e.g. kHz–MHz radiofrequency ranges) or laboratory experiments applying field strengths substantially higher than those encountered near transmission infrastructure. Field based studies near operational overhead lines generally find no consistent or repeatable effects on navigation or orientation attributable to ELF EMF, with observed behavioural changes more plausibly explained by habitat alteration, landscape features, noise, or other environmental factors rather than electromagnetic exposure itself. The reference quoted which originated from the research by Burda <i>et al.</i>, 2009<sup>4</sup>, could not be independently replicated, with the authors pointing to several methodological issues with the study (Hert <i>et al.</i>, 2011<sup>5</sup>).</p> <p>In the UK, the body of research regarding EMF, human health and impacts to ecosystems is reviewed by authoritative groups, such as the UKHSA, who advise Government on the measures that should be put in place to protect against EMF exposure based on that body of evidence. Government have acted on that advice and set EMF policies and guidelines</p>

<sup>3</sup> Pophof, B. Henschenmacher, D. R. Kattnig, J. Kuhne., A. Vian, and G. Ziegelberger (2023) Biological Effects of Electric, Magnetic, and Electromagnetic Fields from 0 to 100 MHz on Fauna and Flora: Workshop Report. *Health Physics*. 2023 Jan 1;124(1):39-52.

<sup>4</sup> H. Burda, S. Begall, J. Cervený, J. Neef, and P. Nemeč (2009) Extremely low-frequency electromagnetic fields disrupt magnetic alignment of ruminants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2009 Apr 7;106(14):5708-13. March 19, 2009

<sup>5</sup> J. Hert, L. Jelinek, L. Pekarek, and A. Pavlicek (2011) No alignment of cattle along geomagnetic field lines found. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Psychology*. 2011 Jun;197(6):677-82. February 12, 2011.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>which are detailed in EN-5. This sets out clear guidance on the EMF requirements Industry need to meet when developing new infrastructure and is detailed in <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>. Within this guidance, both human health and impacts to ecosystems are considered. It is important that decisions on EMF exposures are made independently of industry. EN-5 states: <i>'2.9.59 There is little evidence that exposure of crops, farm animals or natural ecosystems to transmission line EMFs has any agriculturally significant consequences.'</i></p>
		<p>I've repeatedly asked for a disclosure of the carbon footprint for Norwich to Tilbury, inclusive of the production and shipping of steel and millions of tonnes of cement.</p>	<p>The carbon assessment can be found in <b>6.4.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 - Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-131]</b>.</p>
Cheeseman	<b>[REP1-426]</b>	<p>I object to the proposal to install six 50m high pylons through the middle of our farm. Foulden Hall is a Grade II* listed building. It's a building of national importance, and the site includes two Grade II barns, one of which is a recognised Norfolk longhouse. The other, wrongly named by the applicant as a piggery, is in actual fact a three-storey dower house, with a cob barn attached to it which has a date stamp inside it of 1134. These form a rare and coherent historic farmstead.</p> <p>The proposal to put pylons by reason of their scale, height, and industrial appearance would introduce dominant vertical structures into a historic landscape. They would intrude into a key view of listed buildings and permanently alter a historic skyline. They would clearly result in harm to the setting of a</p>	<p>Flordon Hall (1050698) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a moderate adverse, significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and mid less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>designated heritage asset, which the NPPF states must be given great weight.</p> <p>We asked the Applicant if the route could be changed by moving the pylons 500m northwest (still on our land) but they would be far less intrusive. When they did eventually reply, they said it couldn't be done for all sorts of spurious reasons, not least of which because it was going to be moved close to a Grade II* listed property. That property is far further away than the 200m that the pylons are going to be next to our own.</p>	<p>assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>As named on the National Heritage List Piggery 60 Yards South of Flordon Hall (1172231) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Barn to Flordon Hall (1373055) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><b>11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>. The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment)</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The Applicant intends to close the only route into and out of the farm and to our tenanted cottages. This could potentially cause serious harm to life as it restricts all traffic including Fire and Medical services but also all farm deliveries post and refuses collection and the movement of farm vehicles effectively stopping us from working.</p> <p>This proposal would cause long-term harm to the viability of the farm. In addition to the multitude of CA, Pylons and easements would restrict machinery movement, disrupt established drainage patterns, sterilise productive land, and impose permanent constraints on farming practice. These are enduring effects that undermine the viability of an active agricultural enterprise.</p>	<p>The Applicant met with the IP's agent on 5 February 2026 to progress HoT negotiations. The IP was unable to attend. An arranged site meeting was cancelled by the IP. The main topic at the meeting with the IP's agent was the potential to change the route alignment. A crossing point for the driveway was discussed as suitable mitigation if required, and continuity of access was acknowledged as of importance to all residents including the IP. The Applicant's agent will seek to clarify with the IP's agent that there is no intention to close the driveway as stated here.</p> <p>The Applicant is concerned to hear of the IP's fears as these were not raised at the meeting on 5 February 2026 with the IP's agent. The Applicant will request a further on-site meeting to discuss the concerns and review mitigation to minimise impacts to the working farm and ensure driveway access.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Our land is crossed by a natural chalk stream that feeds the River Tas, itself a rare and protected chalk stream river. Chalk streams are explicitly recognised in national policy as</p>	<p>The River Tas and its tributaries would be protected from pollution during construction of the Project by the range of control and management measures that are secured through inclusion of commitments within the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>. Measures include those to control runoff from worksites that may contain elevated concentrations of silt, as well as controls on potentially</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>irreplaceable habitats, and that precautionary principle must apply. Once disrupted, such systems cannot simply be reinstated through mitigation. The Applicant has acknowledged the chalk stream but failed to demonstrate how they will protect the stream and given where they intend to put pylon RG 24, it is extremely likely that they won't be able to.</p> <p>The project would result in unjustified harm to designated heritage assets, irreversible damage to a sensitive chalk stream environment, decimate rare wildlife and would materially affect the operation of a viable agricultural holding.</p>	<p>polluting activities such as refuelling and working with concrete, including protocols for unplanned events/spillages.</p> <p>Any works within 8 m of the River Tas channel would be governed by the parameters of a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency (as detailed in <b>5.5 Consents and Licences Required Under Other Legislation [APP-084]</b>). No significant residual ecological effects on the chalk stream habitat have been identified within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>Regarding designated heritage assts, please see the Applicant's comments on <b>[REP1-426]</b> two rows above in this table.</p>
M. Day	<b>[REP1-414]</b>	<p>General comments on consultation, consideration of alternatives, including costings.</p> <p>In reality, on top of the long-term landscape impact, the project requires approximately 2 million square metres of stone Type 1 MOT to be laid across our countryside. That's the equivalent of about 400 football pitches, just to give it some context, and that's going across farmland, footpaths, hedge roads, just for build access.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is undertaking GI surveys to inform the detailed design stage, to refine the temporary haul road designs and identify opportunities to reduce material volumes required where site specific conditions are suitable and practicable to do so. The GI survey data was not available at the time of developing the draft DCO Designs, and as such, the Applicant has undertaken a worst-case assessment. This assessment presented a temporary haul road depth of 400mm thickness. To reduce the material required to construct the haul road, the width of the haul road has been reduced for overhead line construction from 8m width with two-way traffic flows throughout, to typically 6 m wide, with passing places (widening to 8m) provided at typical intervals of 200m. The frequency of passing places is to be determined by site-</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Significant property acquisition costs were being attributed to a separate property portfolio budget rather than into the project's own cost line. I understand that the vendors have also been required to sign NDAs to conceal these transactions. This suggests that the true project budget is being artificially suppressed by off-book accounting. If some costs are being hidden in a separate P&amp;L to make the pylons appear cheaper than the alternative option, then the Planning Inspectorate can't really make any valid value for money assessments</p>	<p>specific conditions and the forward visibility along the haul roads at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Applicant's financial governance, including the treatment of land acquisition and compensation, operates within established corporate, regulatory and audit frameworks and does not alter the total economic cost of delivering the Project. Property acquisition, compensation and land rights costs are integral to the delivery of nationally significant infrastructure and are incurred whether agreements are reached voluntarily or, if necessary, through compulsory acquisition powers. The allocation of those costs within the Applicants accounting structures does not remove them from the overall cost of the Project, nor does it reduce the actual expenditure required to deliver the proposed works.</p> <p>Confidentiality provisions, including non-disclosure agreements, are a standard feature of commercial land transactions across the infrastructure sector. They are used to protect the private financial affairs of individual landowners and to enable negotiations to proceed on a without-prejudice basis. Such provisions do not conceal the existence of land acquisition costs, nor do they prevent those costs from being properly recorded, audited and reported within National Grid's regulated financial framework.</p>
		<p>The scale of the visual impact of this project is staggering. Based on a flat rural landscape, a 50m pylon becomes a very dominant feature for at least one mile in any direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That is over 200 square miles of land where the industrialised skyline will become the dominant feature. •</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project on people's views.</p> <p>Through the approach taken to routeing and siting, the Applicant has sought to reduce (as far as practicable) the potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors. EN-5 recognises that it is not possible to fully mitigate the landscape and visual effects of electricity transmission infrastructure.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we extend this to where the pylons are prominent (let's say 2 miles), we are looking at an impacted area the size of Dartmoor National Park.</li> <li>If we go to the total visibility of around 6 miles (it's very flat in East Anglia after all) this project creates a negative visual footprint roughly the size of the entire county of Kent or Suffolk.</li> </ul>	<p>Effects on landscape and visual receptors are reported in the LVIA in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>. Significant effects are identified up to a distance of approximately 1.5 km for landscape receptors, and up to a distance of approximately 2 km for visual receptors.</p> <p>The Project will diminish with distance, as it becomes a smaller part of the view as a result of perspective. Intervening screening vegetation, for example hedgerows and hedgerow trees, will also filter and screen views towards the Project. For visual receptors, effects beyond approximately 2 km would not be significant.</p>
		<p>The applicant claims this project is for "Green Energy," yet the infrastructure itself is environmentally toxic. The grid relies on Sulphur Hexafluoride (SF6), a gas 23,500 times more potent than CO2.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the global warming potential of SF6. It has been assumed that no SF6 equipment will be used in the Project, as presented in <b>6.4.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 - Greenhouse Gas Assessment [App-131]</b> in accordance with National Grid policy. SF6 alternatives such as C4 or G3 have a 99% lower global warming potential than SF6.</p>
Fisher	[REP1-397]	<p>General comments on alternatives and general environmental effects.</p> <p>Forngett St Peter will be sandwiched between the existing and the proposed pylon lines, creating a dense industrial wirescape in clear breach of the Holford Rules. 45 existing pylons can be seen from the fields behind my house, and the Applicant states that there could be visibility of up to 70 pylons from the more elevated parts of the village, and that for the vast majority of the route, there will be a significant impact on landscape character.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting, including consideration of the Holford Rules. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project near Forngett St Peter.</p> <p>Forngett St Peter is located within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) A6 Forngett St Peter, Landscape Character Area (LCA) A1 Tas Rural River Valley and LCA B1 Tas Tributary Farmland. Moderate and significant (adverse) effects are identified for</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The computer-generated visualisations of the proposed route through Forncett provided at the consultations did not include the existing pylon line to show the true cumulative effects, and it's just one example of the many deficiencies in the consultation process.</p>	<p>these receptors between 0.5 – 1.5 km, the distance which Forncett St Peter falls within. Effects on the landscape character of LCA A1 Tas Rural River Valley, which the eastern part of Forncett St Peter falls within, are assessed as not significant at operation and construction, as theoretical visibility is reduced along the floor of the Tas Valley and from larger areas of woodland. This is set out in paragraph 13.4.60 to 13.4.71 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b> and paragraphs 13.3.111 to 13.3.154 in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>.</p> <p>Existing overhead lines are considered as part of the landscape and visual baseline, against which the effects of the Project are assessed, as set out in Section 13.5 in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>Viewpoint 1.08: Mill Lane, Forncett St Peter is representative of visual receptors in the Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary area. At the consultation stage, a wireline was provided for Viewpoint 1.08. Since then, detailed photomontages have been produced showing views towards the Project from this location, as shown in <b>7.12 Visualisations - Part 1 of 9 [APP-343]</b> and <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>. The visualisation is oriented towards the Project and, as the existing overhead line to the east of Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary is not located within these views, it is not visible within the frame of the photomontage. This information together with the written reporting, ZTV plans and other graphical materials is considered sufficient and proportionate,</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>We're told the costings for this project are about £5 million per kilometre, yet costings for Bramford to Twinstead appear to be about £24 million per kilometre. How can Norwich to Tilbury be five times cheaper? What has the Applicant not included in its costings of this project?</p>	<p>enabling the assessor, and in turn the decision maker, to make a well-informed judgement.</p> <p>Visual effects at Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary are considered as part of VRA A6 Forncett St Peter. Moderate and significant (adverse) effects are identified on these receptors, reducing to not significant from within the Tas Valley, including to the east of Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary, as set out in paragraphs 13.4.60 to 13.4.71 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>. Existing overhead lines are considered as part of the landscape and visual baseline, against which the effects of the Project are assessed, as set out in Section 13.5 in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>A full and transparent cost model is provided in both <b>7.20 2023 – Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP357]</b> and <b>7.17 Strategic Options Backcheck and Review Appendix D Economic Appraisal [APP355]</b>. The appendix sets out in transparent detail, how options appraisal costs were evaluated. The Bramford to Twinstead project undertook a strategic options evaluation which formed part of its DCO submission in document 7.2.1 Strategic Options Report. When originally evaluated in 2011, the following table of costs was produced, (extracted for ease of reference):</p>

Common Works		
As described in chapter 8		£407.7m
Potential Strategic Option - Transmission Reinforcement Assets		
Resolving East Anglia Transmission Boundary and Negative Phase Sequence Currents	2 Additional AC Connection Bays at the Bramford 400kV Substation	£11.7m
	Construction of a new Bramford - Twinstead Tee 28km 400kV double circuit overhead line	£50.3m
Potential Strategic Option - Contingent Transmission Works		
Reconductoring of all Sizewell to Bramford Overhead Line Circuits		£75.2m
<b>TOTAL - excluding common works</b>		<b>£137.2m</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£544.9m</b>

**Table 10.1 – PS2a (AC Overhead Line) Capital Cost Summary**

As shown in this evaluation table, at the strategic option stage of Bramford to Twinstead, the overhead line section was evaluated as 28 km at £50.3m or £1.7m/km in 2011. The final project included significant amounts of cable and other impacts that developed in the detailed design and construction phases.

**7.17 Appendix B Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP355]** evaluates overhead line elements of £3.98m/km in 2020/21 cost base. Therefore, there is no discrepancy around the cost appraisal approach that has been undertaken in the projects referred to within the question.

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			It should be noted that Appendix D in the Bramford to Twinstead report was used to derive the 2020/21 cost base report and uses the same methodology and appendix layout.
Juby	[REP1-417]	<p>Sticky particles: The pylons create things called corona ions, which can react to particles in the air. These sticky particles can be inhaled by human beings or land on their skin, and these particles can be carcinogenic. This is a theory that's been put forward by Professor Henshaw of Bristol University for over 25 years, but it's also been followed up by other universities in Canada, California and in Europe.</p> <p>The Applicant will say that there is no evidence to support this theory, but equally as well, the scientific community is divided on this –but there are equally as many in favour of this theory, explaining what is happening. This theory is so prevalent that other countries have taken it upon themselves to do something about it.</p> <p>In Roydon they will be concentrated up the line of pylons and blown over Roydon by prevailing winds. Further concentrated by the fact that Roydon is surrounded on three sides</p>	<p>In the 1990s, the Bristol University Human Radiation Effects Group published a series of papers suggesting that the electric fields from high-voltage overhead lines might influence the behaviour of airborne particles in such a way as to be harmful to human health. The main example given was radon daughter products, but, if the theories were valid, they could also apply to other airborne particles, for example from pollution generated by road traffic. The suggestions made were that electric fields increase the concentration of harmful particles in the atmosphere near the source of the field and make harmful particles from the atmosphere more likely to stick to the skin. Additionally, it was suggested that overhead lines produce “corona ions” which make particles in the atmosphere, such as radon daughter products more likely to stick in the lungs.</p> <p>National Grid believe it is right that the decisions on public health matters are made independently of Industry, rather than based on our own assessment of the science. The evidence on these theories has been reviewed by authoritative, independent scientific bodies and in 2004<sup>6</sup> the then National Radiological Protection Board's Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation, concluded:</p> <p><i>“...it seems unlikely that corona ions would have more than a small effect on the long-term health risks associated with particulate air pollutants, even in the individuals who are most affected. In public health terms, the proportionate impact will</i></p>

<sup>6</sup> National Radiological Protection Board (2004) Particle Deposition in the Vicinity of Power Lines and Possible Effects on Health, Report of an independent Advisory Group on Non-ionizing Radiation AGNIR and its ad hoc Group on Corona Ions. 2004. Documents of the NRPB, 15 (1) 54pp

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p><i>be even lower because only a small fraction of the general population live or work close to sources of corona ions.”</i></p> <p>and</p> <p><i>“Any health risks from the deposition of environmental particulate air pollutants on the skin appear to be negligible.”</i></p> <p>In 2007 the WHO published Environmental Health Criteria on EMFs and concluded:</p> <p><i>“High-voltage power lines produce clouds of electrically charged ions as a consequence of corona discharge. It is suggested that they could increase the deposition of airbourne pollutants on the skin and on airways inside the body, possibly adversely affecting health. However, it seems unlikely that corona ions will have more than a small effect, if any, on long term health risks, even in the individuals who are most exposed.”</i></p> <p>The overall summary of the evidence by the authoritative groups is against EMFs having an adverse health effect via this mechanism and more recent epidemiological studies (Toledano et al., 2020; Swanson <i>et al.</i>, 2014) support these conclusions.</p> <p>Corona ions, as described have been the subject of a significant amount of research, with the Government Scientific Advisors completing a significant review of the evidence in 2004. This research has been considered by the Government’s Scientific Advisors when recommending EMF policies which should be applied to electricity infrastructure, as set out in NPS EN-5.</p> <p>As already stated, the Applicant believes it is right that the decisions on public health matters are made independently of Industry, rather than our own assessment of the science. The evidence concerning compliance with the EMF policies, including the numerical guidelines and precautionary policies</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Electrical hyper sensitivity (EHS): This is, again, something that the National Grid do not recognise as an illness, but the WHO recognise it and list it as the symptoms of having headaches, nausea and migraines. It makes ordinary people depressed. It makes depressed people very depressed, and it makes very depressed people suicidal – and 10% to 20% of the population suffer from EHS.</p>	<p>Government require, which take full account of the evidence on corona ions, is included in the <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>.</p> <p>National Grid look to independent authoritative review bodies such as the UKHSA and WHO to review science on all potential health effects and for Government to advise on appropriate protective measures based on the outcomes of these reviews. Those protective measures take full account of the scientific evidence, including the evidence on EHS. National Grid are committed to ensuring all its assets, including those which form part of this project comply with those measures. <b>Document 7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b> provides evidence of compliance with the EMF requirements detailed in EN-5. The WHO provides information and conclusions concerning EHS on their website. The conclusions state:</p> <p><i>'Conclusions</i></p> <p><i>EHS is characterized by a variety of non-specific symptoms that differ from individual to individual. The symptoms are certainly real and can vary widely in their severity. Whatever its cause, EHS can be a disabling problem for the affected individual. EHS has no clear diagnostic criteria and there is no scientific basis to link EHS symptoms to EMF exposure. Further, EHS is not a medical diagnosis, nor is it clear that it represents a single medical problem.</i></p> <p><i>Physicians: Treatment of affected individuals should focus on the health symptoms and the clinical picture, and not on the person's perceived need for reducing or eliminating EMF in the workplace or home. '</i></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>Whilst the WHO recognise the symptoms of EHS, they also conclude that there is no scientific basis to link EHS symptoms to EMF exposure.</p>
		<p>I asked, 'Find me another place in the country which is surrounded on three sides by pylons'. The Applicant has come back with Maltby in West Yorkshire, where the arms of the three sides are much longer and it is further away from residential homes.</p>	<p>There are similar examples to what the Applicant has proposed close to Roydon, such as in Maltby in Yorkshire, but each project and faces unique challenges as a result of the local environment.</p> <p>The Project including the alignment near Roydon has been designed in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy and the relevant NPS.</p>
		<p>The IP provided a fuller version of the text with their submitted oral summary.</p>	<p>As noted, some European countries have also introduced precautionary measures in addition to exposure limits. It is for each country to introduce the policies they consider appropriate. The UK has undertaken its own review of what precautionary measures should be applied to electricity infrastructure. In 2009, the outcomes of the Department of Health's established Stakeholder Advisory Group to Government on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and magnetic fields (SAGE) were published. The aim of the process was to bring together the range of stakeholders to identify and explore the implications for a precautionary approach to Extremely Low Frequency EMF (electric and magnetic fields) and make practical recommendations for precautionary measures. SAGE looked at a range of precautionary measures and made recommendations to Government on those which should be adopted.</p> <p>The Government adopted several of the recommendations SAGE had made for precautionary measures. Those measures specific to high voltage power lines include 'optimal phasing' of power lines and providing more advice on EMFs. Other precautionary measures, specifically the introduction of corridors around new and existing overhead lines, were</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>considered but were judged to be disproportionate in light of the evidence and were not adopted.</p> <p>Based on the science and recommendations by SAGE, the UK has a carefully thought-out set of policies for protecting against EMFs, which includes both numerical exposure guidelines to protect against established, acute effects of EMFs, and precautionary policies to provide appropriate protection against the possibility of chronic effects of EMFs at lower levels, including, specifically, the possibility of a risk for childhood leukaemia. We believe it is right that the decision on what is acceptable or not is made independently of National Grid, rather than our own assessment of the science. The evidence concerning compliance with these policies, including the numerical guidelines and precautionary policies is included in the <b>7.8 Electric and magnetic fields compliance report [APP-330]</b>.</p>
N. Moore	<b>[REP1-427]</b> (incorrectly labelled as Written Representation)	<p>General comments on general ecological effects.</p> <p>The Project will be taking out a massive part of our main farming field, which will make it impossible to work the rest of the area, taking access through our Grade II listed home driveway and straight through my husband's farm and engineering business. We are going to be financially ruined, with no regard for us to move forward or diversify our small farm.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that whilst there will be an impact on the arable fields during construction of a pylon on the IP's land, this will amount to approximately one third of the field for temporary construction rights. On completion permanent infrastructure will exist of approximately 400 square metres. Compensation is available for proven losses under the Applicant's Land Rights Strategy and the approach has been both provided in writing and discussed with their agent at a HoT meeting on 23 January 2026. Further discussions with the IP and their land agent around mitigation will seek to limit the impact to the business and to reach agreement on the optimum approach.</p> <p>Access along the driveway is only required for the UKPN mitigation works and not for the whole of the construction</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>period. There will be further engagement with the IP to discuss the arrangements and timescales once details are provided by UKPN.</p> <p>The permanent access route sought via a field gate will only be required on an infrequent basis for access in a 4x4/van vehicle for site inspections to the overhead line, and tower on the IP's land and tower RG053 on the neighbour's land. The permanent right is not anticipated to disrupt business operations.</p>
		<p>We have engaged with the Applicant meetings to try and point out the mistakes in their approach and to mitigate the damage to ourselves.</p>	<p>The Applicant has met with the IP in 2024 on site, and with their agents on 7 July 2025 to discuss the design and it's impacts. It was explained at that meeting why the IP's proposal to move the alignment would introduce both a curve in a currently straight line and also bring impacts closer to other residential properties. These are therefore not considered to be 'mistakes'.</p>
		<p>I have also raised the matter of access they say is needed for seven years through our home driveway and straight through my farm and business yard.</p>	<p>It appears there is a misunderstanding around the seven-years time frame, which relates to length of the proposed Option Agreement. The Applicant does not require nor seek to prohibit the IP from maintaining their business activities during the Option period. Ongoing discussions around the HoT document would seek to mitigate the impact to the IP's businesses where appropriate, having full regard to daily operations before any construction impacts commenced.</p>
		<p>The land that is going to be desecrated will never fully recover, and the land drains beneath will be ruined. However, there are no answers given to us how this will be rectified and repaired.</p>	<p>The Applicant's commitment to understanding existing drainage systems and the potential impact is acknowledged and evidenced in the HoT document, which contains a specific clause relating to drainage. Ongoing negotiations will log these details to ensure that the detailed construction design has due regard to the systems in place.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		The Applicant have not addressed any safety issues regarding Tibenham Airfield and Priory Farm airfields.	The Applicant has responded to the points regarding safety of the local airfields in its response to Norfolk Gliding Club in the <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b> .
G. Moore	[REP1-365]	<p>The Project will ruin the viability of my small arable farm, and it will be slicing through my main growing field. Permanent access is being sought across my field to access another farm's pylon, not the one proposed for my field, and shouldn't be needed for the project. It was admitted that this is a mistake in their plans and it would be sorted out. However, I attended a meeting a couple of weeks back, and somebody new tells me that this has not been dealt with and they may not be able to do anything about it, after themselves stating it was a mistake in their plans, but they said they had to rush to get the plans in on time.</p> <p>I have also raised the matter of access they say is needed for seven years through our home driveway, straight through my farm and business.</p> <p>The Applicant has said that UKPN is not replying to its request to speak about such matters.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this point in the response to N. Moore above.</p> <p>There is no mistake in the proposed permanent access route plan, however a review of options for the permanent access route to the IP neighbour's pylon (RG053) are the subject of ongoing discussions between the Applicant and the IP and their land agent, at the IP's request.</p> <p>It appears there is a misunderstanding around the seven-years time frame, which relates to length of the proposed Option Agreement. The Applicant does not require nor seek to prohibit the IP from maintaining their business activities during the Option period. Ongoing discussions around the HoT document would seek to mitigate the impact to the IP's businesses where possible, having full regard to daily operations before any construction impacts commenced.</p> <p>In respect of the UKPN comment, whilst there were no details relating to UKPN's approach regarding the mitigations for the undergrounding, for the meeting held with the IP during July</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			2025, UKPN has now appointed their own land agents who will be picking up the interactions on their behalf in due course.
G. Palmer	[REP1-358]	<p>General comments on consultation and general environmental effects.</p> <p>Bunwell Low Common is ancient and unspoiled. In modern times, there has been no industrial or residential development allowed. To introduce huge industrial structures into this setting will cause incalculable damage to the landscape and the enjoyment and well-being of those who inhabit it. It must not be permitted, especially as alternatives exist.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has complied with EN-1 and EN-5 policies including 2.9.23-2.9.25 and has applied the mitigation hierarchy. The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project near Bunwell Hill and Low Common.</p> <p>Transmission infrastructure (including overhead lines) is found throughout rural landscapes across England. This includes existing overhead lines which fall within the LVIA study area, as illustrated on <b>6.13.F4 Environmental Statement Figure 13.4 - Settlements and Infrastructure [APP-240]</b>.</p> <p>Whilst the rural landscape will remain in place beneath and around the proposed overhead line, it is nevertheless recognised by the Applicant that significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity will occur. These effects are reported in the LVIA in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>Significant adverse effects are identified within approximately 1.5 km of the Project as set out in paragraphs 13.4.60 to 13.4.71 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b> for visual receptors and paragraphs 13.3.111 to 13.3.125 in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b> for landscape receptors.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant's submission quotes the South Norfolk's landscape assessment, but conveniently they omit any reference to the inappropriateness of pylons. the Applicant's own admission, the effects on this landscape are significant and irreversible. They are a large scale of change. Within 0.5km, the impacts are major and significant. Within 1.5km, they remain significant.</p>	<p>The effects on the Tas Valley tributary farmland are set out under Landscape Character Area (LCA) B1 Tas Tributary Farmland, in paragraphs 13.3.111 to 13.3.125 in <b>6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 - Landscape Baseline and Assessment [APP-228]</b>. Significant adverse effects are identified within approximately 1.5 km of the Project. The 'Location and Key Characteristics' section of this assessment (paragraph 13.3.111) includes reference to the open, gently sloping topography. This has been directly quoted from the 'Key Characteristics' section of LCA B1 within the 2001 South Norfolk and Broadland Landscape Character Assessment. This is in line with the landscape methodology set out in paragraphs 13.4.14 to 13.4.43 in <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology [APP-227]</b>. The Applicant acknowledges that a sensitivity to intrusion by tall and large elements, including pylons, is stated within section 8.13 Sensitivities and Vulnerabilities for LCA B1 within the 2001 South Norfolk and Broadland Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
		<p>All residents of Bunwell Hill and Low Common are to suffer this significant impact. The proposed pylons intersect our little hamlet. They are less than 200m from four dwellings. They are within 350m of three important listed buildings. The Applicant has specifically dismissed the harms to both visual amenity and heritage for these properties. The effects are clearly not inconsequential, they are life-changing. If you wish to look at visualisations of the pylons as they pass through our community, you will be disappointed, as there are none. The visualisations for Bunwell are from entirely</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project near Bunwell Hill and Low Common.</p> <p>Low Common is located within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) A6 Forncett St Peter and Bunwell Hill is located within VRA A5 Tacolneston. Significant effects are identified on visual receptors within approximately 1.5 km of the Project at both construction and operation, which includes Low Common and Bunwell Hill, as set out in paragraphs 13.4.49 to 13.4.71 in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		different parts of the village and are both inaccurate and incomplete.	<p>The Applicant acknowledges there are no representative viewpoints located at Low Common on Bunwell Hill. The approach to selecting viewpoints is set out in paragraphs 13.2.39 to 13.2.41 of <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4 [APP-229]</b>. The LVIA viewpoints are a representative selection of publicly accessible locations along the Project, capturing a range of receptors and a variety of distances and viewing directions. The locations of all viewpoints are shown on <b>6.13.F7 Environmental Statement Figure 13.7 – Visual Receptors and Viewpoints [APP-243]</b>. The number of viewpoints assessed in the LVIA (206 viewpoints) is considered to be proportionate and appropriate in relation to the scale of the Project. Visualisations are presented in <b>7.12 Visualisations [APP-343 - APP-349]</b>. In addition, there are a further 47 viewpoints and accompanying visualisations that support the historic environment assessment. These are presented in <b>7.12 Visualisations [APP-350 - APP-351]</b>. It is important to note that the LVIA is based on first hand observations during site visits and not on viewpoints and visualisations alone.</p> <p>An assessment of effects on residential visual amenity for properties within 200 m of the Project centreline is provided in <b>6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-233 &amp; APP-234]</b>. We are unable to comment on residential visual amenity in detail for the specific properties mentioned but can provide a further response if the locations are provided.</p>
		15 years after installation, the landscape impacts are projected to be unchanged, not surprising when there is no landscape mitigation whatsoever proposed. If our	The Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on landscape and visual receptors, through routeing and siting. However, the Applicant acknowledges the

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>landscape and visual amenity are to be destroyed, an extensive programme of planting for some level of screening should be mandatory.</p>	<p>concerns raised regarding the potential effects of the Project near Bunwell Hill.</p> <p>Bunwell Hill is located within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) A5 Tacolneston and is within 0.5 km of the Project. Effects on visual receptors within approximately 0.5 km would be major and significant (adverse). Effects between approximately 0.5 km and 1.5 km and around Bunwell would be moderate and significant (adverse). Low Common is located within VRA A6 Forngett St Peter, between 0.5 km and 1.5 km. Effects between approximately 0.5 km and 1.5 km would be moderate and significant (adverse). Further detail is provided in <b>6.13.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 - Visual Baseline and Assessment - Part 1 of 4</b>.</p> <p>The points relating to landscape mitigation and compensation are addressed in Chapter 3 of the <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (document 8.8.2)</b>.</p>
P. Palmer	<b>[REP1-446]</b>	<p>The damage to the historical and natural environments in my community is unacceptable. An ancient hamlet, Low Common, has 11 listed buildings, all to be within 1km of a pylon. The pylon line is to intersect three of them: Banyard's Hall, Persehall Manor and the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Quaker Farm. These three buildings are to be within 350m and in full view of the pylon run.</p> <p>For their 2024 consultation, the Applicant produced a heritage evaluation defining the impact on the settings of Banyard's Hall and Quaker Farm as 'significant negative'. However, in the 2026 submission, the impacts are now 'low adverse', as they are now for almost all listed properties along the</p>	<p>Banyard's Hall (1373609) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a minor adverse, not significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded lower less than substantial harm during construction operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288-APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>length of Norwich to Tilbury. This change requires scrutiny.</p> <p>Pylons will be in full view on all approaches to the Grade II Quaker Farm, undeniably huge detrimental to its setting.</p>	<p><b>Environment [APP-208].</b> The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the assessment of the Persehall Manor (1049610) in light of the respondent's comments. The Applicant acknowledges that the line of pylons in the distance may potentially be seen from the asset. However, the Applicant disagrees with the assumption that intervisibility alone means the setting of the asset extends to the Order Limits. The setting of a heritage asset is not defined solely by whether it is visible from, or can see, a development. In line with established heritage guidance, the Applicant has considered all relevant factors and has concluded that the setting does not extend to the Order Limits despite some visibility. Therefore, the Applicant is satisfied with the assessment undertaken within <b>6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-209].</b></p> <p>Quakers Farmhouse' (1373606) has been assessed in relation to potential impacts resulting from change within its setting that affect its value and this concluded a moderate adverse, significant, significance of effect during construction and a minor adverse, not significant, effect during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.2 - Historic Environment Assessment Tables [AS-070]</b>). The assessment has also been undertaken in terms of harm to designated heritage assets and this concluded mid less than substantial harm during construction and lower less than substantial harm during operation (and maintenance) (<b>6.11.A7 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.7 - Assessment of Harm to Designated Heritage Assets [APP-215]</b>). All</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>heritage assets were assessed in accordance with <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288–APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment [APP-208]</b>. The Applicant is confident that the assessment is robust and proportionate, and that the methodology has given appropriate weight to the potential impacts of the Project on this designated asset, including changes to its setting.</p> <p>Embedded and standard mitigation proposals for listed buildings are set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> and <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>. Mitigation follows the mitigation hierarchy and measures include the avoidance of heritage assets where possible, sensitive siting and design, retention and reinstatement of landscape features (including hedgerows, earthworks, and boundaries), and archaeological investigation and recording.</p> <p>Regarding embedded mitigation, <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> provides an explanation of the main changes requested and those changes raised by a larger number of respondents, but which may not have led to a change of Project design. In all cases, factors relevant to the change have been considered (which can be multiple and potentially conflicting) and a balanced decision made taking into account environmental (including the historic environment) and socio-economic effects, engineering feasibility and risks, cost and programme amongst other factors. Given the assessment concludes at worst, less than substantial harm, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed, NPS EN-1 (2024) does not require the Applicant to take any further measures.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>My property is to have two pylons 300m away. They will tower over my single-storey barn, and at least one pylon will be visible from all windows on both north and west aspects. Pylon RG45 will dominate the skyline from every aspect of my garden and curtilage. I have seen computer-generated images from the Applicant which show this to be the case, although these have not made these publicly available.</p>	<p>The Applicant has complied with EN-1 and EN-5 policies including 2.9.23-2.9.25 and has applied the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>At statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a 3D model showing the route of the Project at that stage. This did not form part of the overall suite of materials and was designed as a visual tool. However, the Applicant did take requests for screen shots should people wish to receive one.</p> <p>At each stage of consultation, the Applicant has laid out our consideration of the alternative route options and technologies. The Applicant's consideration of alternatives is set out in <b>7.19 2023 - Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b>. The Applicant's job is to carefully consider the most feasible options and present proposals for public consultation and cannot present plans for consultation that would not meet the requirements placed on us by the government and our regulator Ofgem.</p> <p>The outcomes and reasons for either making or not making changes are set out in various documents with individual responses set out in <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b> with more overarching changes in the various <b>Design Development Reports</b> (the most recent being <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> with earlier requests covered in <b>APP-358 to APP-360</b>).</p>
		<p>My wife and I have asked at every consultation opportunity for alternatives and mitigation. None of these requests have been heeded or even acknowledged. We asked for individual consultation, and this was refused.</p>	<p>The Applicant has no record of meeting requests from this IP. If further details can be provided the Applicant will follow up on this request.</p>
		<p>Much of the layout of Bunwell Hill and Low Common has been unchanged since</p>	<p>Low Common and Tabernacle Lane are subject to temporary closure for activities including the proposed installation of the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>medieval times. There are steeply banked, sunken roads with sharp bends and unbridged fords. All the roads are single-track. During construction, the Applicant proposes using these ancient lanes as alternative routes when other local roads are closed. This risks damaging historic roads and also poses serious danger to recreational users, dog walkers, horse riders and cyclists. The safety aspects of road closure proposals need scrutiny, including for the access of emergency services when the unbridged fords are flooded, as today.</p>	<p>crossover bellmouth and netting activities to enable overhead line stringing. These temporary closures are proposed for short term duration of less than four weeks. Where diversions are necessary (due to temporary closure of roads), they will adopt the principle that they will use the same standard of road, or higher where practicable and available. The diversions for the temporary closure of Low Common and Tabernacle Road are shown on Section A, Plan C of the <b>2.5 Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation plans [APP-033]</b>. The diversions will be agreed by the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing to use the Permit Schemes in place and operated by the relevant Local Highway Authority to coordinate the street works (such as temporary closures) required for the Project.</p> <p>As detailed in 5.10 of <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>, the police, fire and ambulance services (referred to as 'blue light services') will be given written notice of planned temporary lane or road closures.</p> <p>Construction vehicles using the crossover points are to be managed via traffic management detailed in <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b>. Section 5.5.10 details the proposed construction vehicle measures and how construction vehicles will give way to the public.</p> <p>Construction vehicles will not be able to join/leave the public highway from the crossover points unless detailed in the CTMP. <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-309]</b> also states that construction route signage is to be erected to provide drivers with information relation to potential pedestrian conflict areas. Additional traffic management measures may be required to manage or control vehicular speeds for the safety of road users</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>Where the pylons are to cross the River Tas at Bunwell Hill, land only accessible by a centuries-old footpath and track, what is proposed here is an ecological disaster. The various protections on the area of land between RG49 and 50, and pleas for its ecological significance to be recognised, have been ignored. The Applicant has been determined to cross the river at this point, despite widescale damage to mature and veteran trees, to wildlife and the historic setting.</p>	<p>Through routeing, siting and detailed design, the Applicant has sought to reduce, as far as practicable, potential impacts on key ecological features such as designated sites, irreplaceable habitats, protected species, ecological connectivity/wildlife corridors and habitats/species of principal importance. The design process has taken account of existing biodiversity, the natural environment and, where practicable, has sought to reduce impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity, through avoidance or mitigation. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> assesses the effects on important ecological receptors. As part of the EIA process for the Project, a suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken over the 2022-2025 period. The findings of which informed the design and approach to mitigation. In this location the route has avoided two country wildlife site (CWS) designations (Carlton Road Fen CWS and Brick Kiln Lane, Bunwell Hill CWS) and has crossed the River Tas at the least wooded section in order to minimise impacts.</p> <p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b> contain a list of relevant good practice and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts on valuable habitats and species.</p>
Piercy	<b>[REP1-364]</b>	<p>We own a private nature reserve at the bottom of Brick Kiln Lane, which has just been approved as a county wildlife site by Norfolk Wildlife Trust. The nature reserve consists of two meadows, one with a potential burial mound, and two woodlands, one of them probably ancient. Next to our reserve is a three-acre overgrown, probably ancient wood pasture, a grazing meadow,</p>	<p>There has been considerable engagement by the Applicant with the IP over the past few years, and multiple visits to site including engagement and survey visits. The design proposed by the IP in April 2025 was reviewed and responded to in a phone call on 24 June 2025 to advise that no design change was proposed, following a further holistic review of feedback from other parties. A HoT meeting to discuss site specifics in more detail was offered in a letter dated 9 February 2026 but has not yet been taken up.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>and finally another county wildlife site with a spring-fed lake.</p> <p>There is an ancient right-of-way called Cow Lane, and there are many veteran trees, pollards and ancient hedgerows. It is a particularly unspoilt rural area, inaccessible by public road. The River Tas, a rare chalk-bed stream, weaves its way through the medieval small field system to the south.</p> <p>At the 2023 non-statutory consultation, we made the Applicant aware of the ecological importance of our small woodland. They changed the route for 2024, saying it was to move the pylons further away from the woodland and private nature reserve at Brick Kiln Lane. The route changed again in 2025, and no longer avoided our special little woodland. South Norfolk Council visited and placed a blanket TPO on the area in March 2025. I asked Norfolk Wildlife Trust if they could help persuade the Applicant to change the proposed route to avoid our smallest, possibly ancient woodland. They did speak to the Applicant and strongly recommended they find a different route.</p> <p><b>The IP has attached details about the site to their oral summary.</b></p>	<p>The area of land indicated as being a candidate County Wildlife Site (CWS) between RG48 and RG49 in the Tas Valley, due to its woodland habitat, has been captured in the environmental assessment under the woodland ecological receptor category in 6.8 Environmental Statement <b>Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>. While not considered as a CWS in the assessment, this area of woodland has been included under the priority habitat receptor and as such has been given significant weighting in routeing design decisions. Mitigation proposals for the candidate CWS would relate to the impact on woodland habitat and this is already clearly set out within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered the routeing and does not consider it necessary or appropriate to modify the route in the manner proposed. The rationale for this change is set out in the <b>Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> at paragraphs 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 but identifies that this does not just transfer effects to other landowners, uses the pylon positions and heights to reduce effects on veteran trees and avoids the introduction of further angle changes.</p> <p>The potential burial mound is not located in an area in which there would be any new physical impacts as it is close to the location of an existing 11 kV wood pole overhead line that would be removed (<b>6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-209]</b>).</p>
		<p>April 2025, I asked the Applicant to consider placing pylons RG48 and RG49 in a north-to-south alignment using deviation pylons to minimise the ecological damage and associated habitat loss. A reply on 9 May</p>	<p>There has been considerable engagement by the Applicant with the IP over the past few years, and multiple visits to site including engagement and survey visits. The design proposed by the IP in April 2025 was reviewed and responded to in a phone call on 24 June 2025 to advise that no design change</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>2025, said, 'This is being reviewed by the Applicant, and a fuller response will be with you shortly'. I'm still waiting.</p>	<p>was proposed, following a further holistic review of feedback from other parties. A HoT meeting to discuss site specifics in more detail was offered in a letter dated 9 February 2026 but has not yet been taken up.</p> <p>The area of land indicated as being a candidate County Wildlife Site (CWS) between RG48 and RG49 in the Tas Valley, due to its woodland habitat, has been captured in the environmental assessment under the woodland ecological receptor category in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>. While not considered as a CWS in the assessment, this area of woodland has been included under the priority habitat receptor and as such has been given significant weighting in routeing design decisions. Mitigation proposals for the candidate CWS would relate to the impact on woodland habitat and this is already clearly set out within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered the routeing and does not consider it necessary or appropriate to modify the route in the manner proposed. The rationale for this change is set out in the <b>Design Development Report APP-122</b> at paragraphs 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 but identifies that this does not just transfer effects to other landowners, uses the pylon positions and heights to reduce effects on veteran trees and avoids the introduction of further angle changes.</p>
		<p>We're concerned about the harms to nature and wildlife. The loss of mature hedgerows and trees, especially the old dying ones, result in a huge loss of habitat for many species. Planting whips to replace trees cannot compensate for the ecological loss. This land needs avoiding altogether.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on habitats and protected species through careful routeing, siting and detailed design. The design has been informed by an understanding of the existing biodiversity and ecological constraints, with avoidance prioritised wherever practicable and mitigation applied where impacts cannot be fully avoided. This iterative</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>We have always thought that the 1 acre woodland is a remnant of Ancient Woodland due to the structure of the woodland and the large number of Ancient Woodland Indicator species that are present. We are applying to Natural England to see if the land can be</p>	<p>approach has helped reduce potential effects on ecological receptors.</p> <p><b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b> sets out the assessment of ecological effects, supported by extensive surveys undertaken between 2022 and 2025. Arboricultural impacts based on the current alignment are reported within <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236]</b>. Updates to the Arboricultural Impact Plans (Annex D) of <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA Figure A13.6.1 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-065]</b> were issued as errata at Deadline 1. Mitigation and good practice measures, including details on replacement planting, are secured through <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>.</p> <p>Although the mandatory requirement for 10 % BNG under the Environment Act 2021 is not yet in force for development consent schemes, the Applicant has voluntarily committed to delivering 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits for this Project in line with its corporate sustainability commitments.</p>
			<p>This area of woodland is not listed as an ancient woodland on the latest Natural England 'Ancient Woodland Inventory Counties Revised' update (November 2025).</p> <p>Detailed ecological surveys were undertaken at this area, including detailed woodland habitat surveys and a habitat condition assessment by experienced botanists over appropriate seasons in 2024 and 2025. In addition, a comprehensive arboricultural survey of the trees within the</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>designated as Ancient Wood Pasture on the Ancient Woodland Inventory.</p> <p>This small piece of probably ancient woodland / wood pasture, is an important part of my Woodland and Countryside Conservation business. The plan was to use this woodland, and the rest of the nature reserve, to teach / demonstrate conservation and restoration techniques to other woodland owners, community groups and professional bodies. Destroying this ancient habitat will have an adverse effect on my business. I have made the Applicant aware of this.</p>	<p>woodland was also undertaken, with particular emphasis on identification of any mature and / or veteran trees in the area.</p> <p>From the results of our surveys, and as presented within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>, we acknowledge the woodland in this area is of high ecological value and also classifies as Section 41 priority woodland habitat as listed under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. However, based on our survey results the woodland as a whole does not meet the criteria to be considered ancient woodland. While there are older / veteran trees present within the woodland, these are focused on the field boundary features and likely remnant of an historic field structure – the location of the veteran trees identified during field surveys are presented within Annex D: Arboricultural Impacts Plan of <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236]</b>. Therefore, the routeing decisions for this area do not trigger the ancient woodland specific considerations in EN-1 (2024).</p> <p>It would be necessary to undertake some tree removal within the woodland to provide clearance for the overhead line, but this would be limited to only the amount of tree cover necessary to meet safe electrical clearance requirements. Typically, tree removal is potentially required close to the alignment (20 m to either side of the centreline) with canopy management (rather than tree removal) for a further 8 m beyond the 20 m.</p> <p>In addition to <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b>, <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> and <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>, further information can be found on Sheet 8 of 13 in <b>2.16 Trees and Hedgerows to be</b></p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>If the Applicant was to change the orientation of pylons RG48 and RG49 (currently north-east to south-west) to locally run north to south, there are two, better, less ecologically damaging routes available.</p>	<p><b>Removed and or Managed Plans - Section A [APP-048] and 5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066].</b></p> <p>The impact on the woodland would be mitigated through replacement tree planting within the Order Limits, where practicable. In addition, the woodland impact would be captured within the BNG metric to ensure a sufficient multiplier is applied for woodlands and any deficit would be delivered off-site following the approach set out within <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299]</b>. Impacts on specific veteran trees within the woodland would be subject to compensation, following measures outlined within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Appendix B - Ancient Woodland and Veteran Tree Strategy [APP-323]</b>. The Applicant will engage with the landowner and Norfolk Wildlife Trust as detailed design progresses.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>I have also attached a copy of the TPO notice that was placed on our nature reserve</p>	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered the routeing and does not consider it necessary or appropriate to modify the route in the manner proposed. The rationale for this change is set out in paragraphs 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 of the <b>Design Development Report [APP-122]</b> but identifies that this does not just transfer effects to other landowners, uses the pylon positions and heights to reduce effects on veteran trees and avoids the introduction of further angle changes.</p> <p>The Applicant has completed several detailed ecological and arboricultural surveys of the site and adjacent areas and been in dialogue with the landowners on multiple occasions and in several meetings onsite.</p>
			<p>The Applicant has reviewed the survey report submitted by Mr Piercy.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>and the three acre overstood wood pasture to the east of it. Also, a photographic record of the area, showing the ancient character of the Lane and surrounding land. And our Brick Kiln Lane species list. The IP has attached a document called National Grid's threat to Brick Kiln Lane NR16 1SA and surroundings.</p>	<p>This area of woodland is not listed as an ancient woodland on the latest Natural England 'Ancient Woodland Inventory Counties Revised' update (November 2025).</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that under Article 51 (2) of Schedule 14 within <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Revision B)</b> the Applicant may undertake works to TPO trees.</p> <p>Detailed ecological surveys were undertaken at this area, including detailed woodland habitat surveys and a habitat condition assessment by experienced botanists over appropriate seasons in 2024 and 2025. In addition, a comprehensive arboricultural survey of the trees within the woodland was also undertaken, with particular emphasis on identification of any mature and / or veteran trees in the area.</p> <p>From the results of our surveys, and as presented within the <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity [AS-026]</b>, we acknowledge the woodland in this area is of high ecological value and also classifies as Section 41 priority woodland habitat as listed under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. However, based on our survey results the woodland as a whole does not meet the criteria to be considered ancient woodland. While there are older / veteran trees present within the woodland, these are focused on the field boundary features and likely remnant of an historic field structure – the location of the veteran trees identified during field surveys are presented within Annex D: Arboricultural Impacts Plan of <b>6.13.A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236]</b>. Therefore, the routing decisions for this area do not trigger the ancient woodland specific considerations in EN-1 (2024).</p> <p>It would be necessary to undertake some tree removal within the woodland to provide clearance for the overhead line, but this would be limited to only the amount of tree cover</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<p>necessary to meet safe electrical clearance requirements. Typically, tree removal is potentially required close to the alignment (20 m to either side of the centreline) with canopy management (rather than tree removal) for a further 8 m beyond the 20 m.</p> <p>In addition to <b>7.20 2023 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-358]</b>, <b>7.21 2024 - Design Development Report for the Project [APP-359]</b> and <b>5.15 Design Development Report [APP-122]</b>, further information can be found on Sheet 8 of 13 in <b>2.16 Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed and or Managed Plans - Section A [APP-048]</b> and <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-066]</b>.</p> <p>The impact on the woodland would be mitigated through replacement tree planting within the Order Limits, where practicable. In addition, the woodland impact would be captured within the BNG metric to ensure a sufficient multiplier is applied for woodlands and any deficit would be delivered off-site following the approach set out within <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299]</b>. Impacts on specific veteran trees within the woodland would be subject to compensation, following measures outlined within <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Appendix B - Ancient Woodland and Veteran Tree Strategy [APP-323]</b>.</p>
Smith	[REP1-405]	<p>My interest relates to the impact the Project will have on flying at Tibenham and Priory Farm airfields. The hazards to aircraft include loss of land available for safe forced landings and increased risk of collisions with obstacles.</p> <p>The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has confirmed that the safeguarded radius around both airfields should be 5km.</p>	<p>As per the Applicant's response to Matter 6.5 within <b>8.3.37 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tibenham Aerodrome [REP1-105]</b>, the Applicant has duly considered the aerodrome's defined safeguarding zone, albeit recognising its primary purpose is to ensure prospective developer awareness of the aerodrome and to prompt operator consultation (see paragraph 5.5.13 of EN-1, 2024).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the complexity of the site and its operations may limit the value of including multiple Obstacle</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The NPPF makes it clear that local authorities should avoid any development close to an airfield which is incompatible with existing or potential aviation operations. EN-1 states that, <i>'It is essential that new energy infrastructure is developed collaboratively alongside aerodromes... so that safety operations and capabilities are not adversely affected by new energy infrastructure'</i>.</p>	<p>Limitation Surfaces (OLS) within a single, broadly defined safeguarding zone. The Applicant agrees this is a matter for the aerodrome operator. Whilst neither safeguarding zone nor OLS infringement preclude development, there is a distinction between the purposes of a safeguarding zone and the Applicant's undertaking of aviation impact assessments focused on obstacle clearance and consideration of the significance of OLS infringement amongst other factors. The Applicant's approach to the latter is described within para. 15.3.27 of <b>6.15.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.2 - Review of Aviation Impact [APP-267]</b>, which recognises OLS consideration to be a best practice, standardised and objective measure for obstacle assessment, as defined under the CAA CAP 168 regulations for licensed aerodromes<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p>For both Tibenham and Priory Farm airfields, the Applicant's assessment of the effect of the overhead line's presence on aviation operations shows that the line can either be accommodated within existing procedures or else with normal mitigations that are common in General Aviation.</p>
		<p>The Applicant seeks to justify its intransigence by relying on an impact assessment whose methodology the CAA has described as 'flawed' and 'unsafe'. Although it has acknowledged that aviation safety issues at Tibenham and Priory Farm still need to be resolved, it has failed to engage in any meaningful way, in particular, to provide documents.</p>	<p>References to the 'CAA' in this context refers to the now-defunct Airfield Advisory Team and should not be confused with the policy-making and regulatory oversight departments of the Authority itself. The Applicant has engaged on several occasions with CAA's AAT and has no record of methodology being referred to as either 'unsafe' or 'flawed' by it.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussion with both airfields and will continue to engage with them on how to address safety issues. See <b>8.3.37 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tibenham Aerodrome [REP1-105]</b> and <b>8.3.36 Draft Statement of</b></p>

<sup>7</sup> Civil Aviation Authority (2025) CAP168: Licensed Aerodromes

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
			<b>Common Ground - Priory Farm Airfield [REP1-104]</b> for the latest positions.
Stevens	[REP1-432]	<p>General comments on consultation and alternatives and the impacts on ecology and the landscape.</p> <p>The proposed Norwich to Tilbury route and pylons RG36 to 40 would pass close by my property, with RG38 only about 150m from my home. Our property was included in their RVAA, but were scoped out. Quoting their words, '<i>The property would be affected by a moderate change of visual amenity</i>', but my pictures (<b>provided with the oral summary</b>) highlight the enormous change and the awful prospect that the future holds for us.</p> <p>The project would create a high risk of pollution for the chalk-stream River Tas and its tributaries. Construction where the route crosses the river, and surface run-off into the river from building the haul road and pylons on higher ground through Fornsett are a serious concern, especially as there is a colony white-clawed crayfish confirmed to be present in the River Tas. Construction and maintenance of Norwich to Tilbury would pose a serious threat of extinction for this colony of crayfish.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that views from two of the four elevations of Northfield House would be affected by the Project, as stated in <b>6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP-233 and APP-234]</b>. When making a judgement as to the magnitude of visual effect likely to be experienced, the assessment considers how residential visual amenity at a property is likely to be affected 'in the round'. The methodology outlines that for a 'Moderate' magnitude to be experienced, the property would '<i>be affected by a moderate change to views/visual amenity in the round. For example, the Project will be clearly discernible from at least one aspect of the house and/or garden but will not be the key defining feature of views experienced from the property</i>'</p> <p>The River Tas and its tributaries would be protected from pollution during construction of the Project by the range of control and management measures that are secured through inclusion of commitments within the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision B)</b>. Measures include those to control runoff from worksites that may contain elevated concentrations of silt, as well as controls on potentially polluting activities such as refuelling and working with concrete, including protocols for unplanned events/spillages. In addition, due to the known presence of white-clawed crayfish within the River Tas (although there are no records within the tributary located within the Order Limits), specific biosecurity</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>The farmland in the Forncett area is high grade. Between pylons RG 33 and RG 40 a huge acreage would be lost under the proposed haul road.</p>	<p>measures have been included within the <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> to ensure no spread of crayfish plague.</p> <p>Any works within 8 m of the River Tas channel would be governed by the parameters of a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency (as detailed in <b>5.5 Consents and Licences Required Under Other Legislation [APP-084]</b>).</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>In Forncett, Cheneys Lane and Northfield Road are single track lanes used daily by walkers and horse riders. There are no footpaths from Cheneys Lane with direct access to Northfield Road. Between Northfield Road and Long Stratton Road there is only one footpath, Forncett footpath 25. The Applicant's plans show that this footpath would be inaccessible with approx 1/3 of it covered by the Order Limits.</p>	<p>As set out in the <b>7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-329]</b>, a temporary diversion of approximately two months is required at this location due to a working area associated with overhead line stringing. The proposed diversion would route users via Northfield Road and Stickfer Lane. The Applicant has engaged with Norfolk County Council regarding the proposed diversion arrangements, and it has been agreed that this location will be subject to appropriate Road Safety Audits at the relevant stages of design and construction. For the remainder of the period during which Forncett Footpath 25 is affected by The Project, the PRoW will remain open on its existing alignment, with access managed in accordance with the <b>7.6 Outline PRoW Management Plan [APP-329]</b>.</p>
		<p><b>Additional points in the summary that were not made orally in the OFH:</b></p> <p>Forncett has two historic churches, St Peter's and St Mary's. The outlook from St Mary's</p>	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the assessment of St Peter's (1152619) and St Mary (1304627) in light of the respondent's comments.</p>

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>looking west would be marred by a skyline of pylons and HV cables. If the project goes ahead these two churches and the villages of Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary would be sandwiched between the existing pylon line and the new. Also, there are several listed residential properties close to the pylon route in Forncett particularly in the area of RG33 – RG40.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that views west from St Mary church will include wires and pylon tops. However, the Applicant is confident that the setting of both assets does not extend to the Project's Order Limits and therefore there is no potential for effects on these two heritage assets resulting from the Project. Furthermore, the rural landscape to the west of Forncett will largely remain in place beneath and around the proposed overhead line, preserving the wider character of the area.</p>

## 4. Further Submissions That Were Not Given Orally

### 4.1 Applicant's Response to Further Submissions That Were Not Given Orally

4.1.1 Table 4.1 sets out the Applicant's response to further submissions that were not given orally, for example if someone had planned to attend the OFH but had not been able to attend on the day. This includes some responses where it is not clear that the submission would have been an oral summary, but have been included based on the title allocated in the Document Library by the Planning Inspectorate.

Table 4.1 Applicant's Response to Issues Raised by Organisations in their Deadline 1 Submission (Identified as Oral Summaries)

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
Mead	[REP1-431]	General comments on alternatives.  In the Parish of Great Tey, there is a population of hazel dormice, that would be devastated by the wholesale destruction of hedgerows and trees planned by the project. I have seen no proposals for their protection as required by law.	These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b> .  A suite of dormouse surveys were undertaken across 2023-2024, at 25 different sites across Suffolk and Essex. The full results of the dormouse surveys are presented within <b>6.8.A12 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.12 – Hazel Dormouse Report [APP-174]</b> . Of these 25 survey sites, positive dormouse field signs were observed at eight sites. A draft dormouse licence has been prepared and submitted to Natural England, which sets out the anticipated impact and proposed mitigation to ensure the favourable conservation status of dormouse is maintained. The Applicant is working with Natural England towards obtaining a Letter of No Impediment for dormouse and expecting receipt during the examination phase as shown within the <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England [REP1-034]</b> . More general mitigation proposals for dormouse are presented within Section 6 of <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision C)</b> .

Surname	PINS ref	Third party comment	Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant has been underhand in removing from its website a positive report about an undersea cable alternative that previously appeared on its website.</p>	<p>The video in question was one of a number of resources provided by National Grid Ventures on its website promoting its projects. National Grid Ventures is a separate entity from the Applicant, National Grid Electricity Transmission. That particular video shows how interconnectors between Britain and mainland Europe are an important part of our energy mix. The Applicant understands that National Grid Ventures took the video down following feedback from stakeholders in order to include more context in the script of the video.</p>
		<p>The Applicant has omitted historic listed buildings and sites from plans submitted to the Inspectorate, as reported by two presenters at the second morning of the hearings on 11 February.</p>	<p>The Applicant is confident that all known designated heritage assets have been identified and assessed in <b>6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-209]</b> and supporting plans submitted to the Inspectorate. To enable a specific and prompt response, please confirm which listed building(s) or site(s) are alleged to have been omitted and provide any supporting detail (location, reference number or where this was referenced in the hearing). Once these details are provided, the Applicant will review the matter, verify the submitted documentation, and provide further information as necessary.</p>
Eves	[REP1-316]	<p>General comments on alternatives and general environmental effects.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.5.4 Applicant's Response to the Open Floor Hearings [REP1-140]</b>.</p>
		<p>The Applicant identifies the Landscape Character Types surrounding Offton as an area that will experience a significant negative impact of the Project. Only two locations have been identified at this level of severity. The other is Dedham Vale. However, the mitigation approach differs materially between the two areas. In Dedham Vale, undergrounding is proposed. In Offton, the proposal remains overhead pylons.</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the <b>8.8.1 Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (Revision A)</b>.</p>

National Grid plc  
National Grid House,  
Warwick Technology Park,  
Gallows Hill, Warwick.  
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)