

Georgie Hannigan

From: Suzanne Bolwell-Davies [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 March 2026 21:37
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Deadline 2 - Response to Applicants answers to questions submitted in Deadline 1 OFH 2 – Suzanne Bolwell-Davies – Reference [REDACTED]
Attachments: Bird collision matrix.xlsx; Notts Live - Bird Strike causes power cut.docx; Appendix K Floods _ Drainage Strategy Review.docx
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Ma'am, Sirs

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to the Applicants answers to the Questions that I raised during the Open Hearing 2.

I really thought I was clear with the questions I asked, they were on a separate page called "Questions for PINS to ask National Grid" and grouped under the headings :

1. Farmland Birds
2. Bird Strikes
3. Red List Protected birds
4. Vintage Trees and Hedgerows
5. Oil Pipelines
6. Holford Rules
7. National, Royal, Military and Commemorative Fly-past over proposed Norwich 2 Tilbury
8. Flooding

By contrast "the Applicant" instead of directly answering my questions grouped them by themes and to be honest I am struggling to match some of them up ! It is also requiring hours of reading and going round in circles. Their rationale was to avoid repetition, on the contrary that would have been easier for everyone concerned to search for answers by their name and would have been so easy to find and respond too. Therefore I can only assume that the "Applicant" did not want this to be the case. The "Applicant" states under Human Health and Wellbeing page 35 – highlighted in blue - "The Applicant has also sought to reduce concern or uncertainty about the proposals through inclusive and transparent engagement with residents, communities and stakeholders throughout the development of the project". This process is a very clear example to the Inspectors that the "Applicant" has not been inclusive and the engagement limited and has certainly not been transparent, I'm frankly exhausted looking for the answers to my questions.

Human Health and Wellbeing

Health – general

The Applicant recognises people may have concerns about the health effects of living close to an overhead line. **6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]** includes a specific assessment of the impacts of the Project on mental health and wellbeing during both construction and operation. The Applicant recognises that uncertainty whilst the proposals are developed may cause anxiety. The Applicant has sought to reduce potential effects on communities and residents through routeing and design. **The Applicant has also sought to reduce concern or uncertainty about the proposals through inclusive and transparent engagement with residents, communities and stakeholders throughout the development of the Project.** The Project team will continue to engage with people potentially affected during progress of the Project, through regular communication including letters, phone calls and meetings. This would enable concerns to be raised and discussed at an early opportunity and provide a regular point of contact to respond to queries and concerns. The Applicant urges anyone with concerns to get in touch through the Norwich to Tilbury Freephone number, address or email throughout the progress of the Project: Community Helpline: 0800 915 2497 (Lines are open Monday to Friday 9:00am – 5:30pm) Email: contact@n-t.nationalgrid.com Write to us: FREEPOST N TO T (No stamp or further address details are required).

Apparently my themes are A4 :

1. Application of the NPS, Holford Rules and NPPF
2. Security and Resilience of Infrastructure
3. Consultation on Alternatives
4. Engagement with landowners and communities
5. Impacts of haul road

Then there is another page A5:

1. Soils and Best and Most Versatile land
2. Agricultural Businesses including severance
3. Biodiversity (inc tree loss)
4. Birds including Bird Strikes
5. Historic Environment General
6. Listed Buildings and Conservation areas
7. Landscape and visual

1. Farmland Birds – unanswered questions

Can I ask NG why they have not included Farmland birds in any of their 400 documents?

What mitigation are they going to put in place for Farmland birds?

Are National Grid aware that at this very moment 6th – 22nd February there is a National Survey by the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust called the Big Farmland Bird Count?

2. Bird Strikes –

The “Applicant” states that Farmland birds (mentioned now as Farmland Passerines) are not likely to be impacted by bird strikes on OHL. This is not true. For example, If you disturb a ground nesting Skylark they draw you away from their nests squawking flying at height and in real danger of being electrocuted from overhead power lines.

Only this week there was a power cut in Nottinghamshire following a bird strike.

<https://www.nottinghampost.com/news/local-news/big-blue-explosion-spotted-skies-10855156> (See attached) National Grid has since confirmed this was caused by a bird strike involving an 11kV overhead line in Alfreton Road. This caused the conductor to fail, leading to the flashing. Homes were without power and also traffic lights were not working with potential danger or harm to human life.

Bird Strikes are not rare, birds get harmed by power lines, in large numbers and therefore this raises a number of new questions :

1. Why has the Applicant continued to build pylon Infrastructure on known migratory flightpaths, near reservoirs and across farmland which attracts Swans, Buzzards, Kites, Geese and other farmland birds instead of burying the cables ?
2. How much does it cost the Applicant to repair Overhead powerlines following a bird strike ?
3. What is the impact and danger to their customers due to blackouts and power cuts, following bird strikes ?
4. How can Bird strikes which are frequent be avoided ? Underground, Undersea ?

So the Applicants answer - NG is only worried about coastal areas or water bodies such as Abberton Reservoir, where high numbers of large birds live. NG says that in the farmland areas through which N2T passes there are only passerines and that these are not at risk. Both of these Statements are untrue. The Applicant should be required to complete full surveys Essex Suffolk Norfolk Pylon Group has already sent evidence to the Inspectorate (as well as all your photos of geese/swans etc. and the iNaturalist records which include your sitings). Which I have been involved in compiling. And now the ESN pylon Group pro bono environmental adviser has put together this table. It shows the birds that NG has actually established live along the route and the risks to those species in previous bird collision studies. See document attached Bird Collision Matrix. So you see that even without ESN Pylons Group evidence of what actually lives here, and without full surveys, it is clear that there is an unacceptable risk to birds of all sizes from overhead lines. Alternatives such as

undergrounding or subsea cables would avoid the very high risk to birds of all types in farmland areas from collisions with power lines.

3. Red List Protected birds

Please see above – Bird strikes as Red List Protected birds are at Risk of Powerline Collisions, that's if their habitats haven't been destroyed by haul roads and destruction of the Draft Order limits.

4. Vintage Trees and Hedgerows

The Applicant refers to 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, but I cannot see how those whips will replace mature trees that store 22-50Kg of Carbon annually and provide homes to 1,000 's of species.

5. Oil Pipelines

Unable to find the documentation referring to Oil Pipelines.

6. Holford Rules

The Applicant states that in some areas they have been unable to follow the Holford Rules and they think that apparently is ok. Consideration of rules is not the same as applying them, which they have not and those rules are in place for a reason.

7. National, Royal, Military and Commemorative Fly-past over proposed Norwich 2 Tilbury – unanswered questions - Page 34 references Airfields but no mention of Fly-pasts!

Have National Grid informed the Ministry of Defence the location of the Norwich to Tilbury Pylon line and that the National, Royal, Military Fly-past fly low over the pylon route?

How is National Grid going to mitigate the Fly-past?

8. Flooding

I refer to the ESN Pylon Group expert who has written a report which is attached.

9. Alternatives

Yes I did briefly mention Alternatives to N2T. After the unprofessional and poor presentation that the Applicant subjected us to at the Alternatives meeting at Orsett Hall, I am pleased that the Inspectors have allocated a whole day to review all the Alternatives and to look at new technologies that can be implemented more efficiently, speedily and effectively.

Thank you again for listening and I hope that the information included in this submission is helpful.

Yours Sincerely,

Suzanne

Suzanne Bolwell-Davies

Don't miss our experts' picks for the best Amazon **Spring Deals** [Find out more](#)

N > News > Local News > Nottinghamshire

'Big blue flash' spotted in skies above Nottinghamshire-Derbyshire border leaving residents baffled

A bird had hit an overhead line in Alfreton Road, Sutton-in-Ashfield



Comments 2

NEWS By **Louis Corbett** Trainee Reporter

12:42, 09 Mar 2026 | Updated 12:45, 09 Mar 2026



Residents were left baffled after spotting a dramatic "blue flash" in the sky over the Nottinghamshire-Derbyshire border.

More than 600 homes in the Sutton-in-Ashfield area were left without power on Sunday, March 8 after a bird hit an overhead power line.

Residents living nearby took to social media to question what the "big blue explosion" or "blue flash" they saw was, just after 7pm.

National Grid has since confirmed this was caused by a bird strike involving an 11kV overhead line in Alfreton Road.

This caused the conductor to fail, leading to the flashing.

The electricity distribution company then dispatched staff to isolate the fault and make it safe again.

Subsequently, 651 homes lost power for several hours before it was restored later that night.

A National Grid spokesperson said: "A fault on a high voltage power line on Alfreton Road caused a power cut affecting 651 properties yesterday evening.

"Power was restored to 644 properties by 8.28pm, with all properties restored by 10.03pm.

"We'd like to thank customers for their patience and understanding as we worked to reconnect them."

Appendix K – Flood risk / Drainage Strategy Review, Deadline 2

Drainage Strategy Review — Summary of Findings

A review of the submitted Drainage Strategy has identified a number of deficiencies across both the methodology and the level of information provided.

The rainfall analysis relies on outdated methodologies. The use of the Flood Studies Report (FSR) rainfall method is no longer considered appropriate; current guidance from both Norfolk County Council and Essex Design Guide requires the use of FEH 2022 data, and this should be updated accordingly.

Similarly, Suffolk Design Guidance requires the submission of BRE 365 infiltration testing data, a Phase 1 Contamination Assessment, and associated exploratory logs at pre-application stage — none of which have been provided.

The topographic analysis underpinning the drainage design is based on OS Terrain 5, a coarse dataset that is not suitable for outfall and channel assessment. Ground truthing and/or a topographic survey should be used to confirm outfall locations and drainage flow paths, particularly in low-lying areas where gravity-fed drainage viability has not been demonstrated. Outfall levels must be established at this stage rather than deferred.

The SuDS drainage hierarchy has not been adequately addressed. There is no evidence of feasibility assessment for rainwater harvesting or reuse, infiltration viability has not been confirmed through testing in accordance with BRE 365, and the assumption that 50% of surfaces are permeable is not justified given the reported poor infiltration. Until infiltration testing is completed, all surfaces should be treated as impermeable. Additionally, pond side slopes are proposed at 1:3, contrary to Suffolk Design Guidance which requires a maximum of 1:4.

Further outstanding information includes pre- and post-development catchment area calculations (absent from Appendix A), half drain time analysis for infiltration features, maintenance schedules that address infiltration-specific requirements, freeboard provisions for all pond and basin features, and details of any balancing basins required to manage diverted field drain flows.

In summary, the submitted strategy contains multiple areas where the design falls short of current guidance and where essential supporting information has not been provided.

The above points are matters which could be raised as grounds for objection and/or as conditions requiring resolution prior to any drainage approval being granted.

Page	Item	Supporting Note
9 (Section 2.3.5)	(FSR Rainfall) - Generally outdated now. Should use FEH22 as stated in the Norfolk County Council's Drainage Design Standards Page	<p>https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/article/38639/Drainage-design-standards.</p> <p>This assessment should use up to date data i.e. FEH 2022 online rainfall / catchment characteristics.</p>
9 (Section 2.3.6)	FEH rainfall was used; however, Suffolk Design Guidance states that BRE 365 data, groundwater data, and the Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment Report should be provided at the pre-application stage. This information is outstanding.	<p>For pre-app requirements (in accordance with Suffolk Design Guidance (https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/asset-library/2023-sf3967-scc-suffolk-flood-risk-appendix-a2.pdf))</p> <p>- Preliminary Site Investigation Report</p> <p>* Trial pits across the site to BRE365 with minimum infiltration rate of 10mm/hr if infiltration is to be the sole method of drainage.</p> <p>* Associated exploratory logs (including depth to peak seasonal groundwater).</p> <p>*Phase 1 Contamination Assessment Report.</p>
9 (Section 2.3.7)	Essex (FSR) - Generally outdated now. Should use FEH22	<p>https://www.essexdesignguide.co.uk/suds</p>
15 (Section 3.1.2)	OS terrain 5 data used. Ground truthing should be considered	<p>OS Terrain 5 is a coarse dataset and should not be relied upon for outfall/channel assessment.</p>

<p>37 (Section 5.3.4)</p>	<p>SuDS drainage hierarchy.</p>	<p>No investigation / feasibility study undertaken with regards to rain water re-use / harvesting</p>
<p>39 (Section 5.4).13)</p>	<p>No freeboard for shallower ponds</p>	<p>Freeboard should be included for all pond / basin features</p>
<p>44 (Section 5.4.54)</p>	<p>Assuming 50% of footprint is permeable</p>	<p>Report indicates that infiltration is likely unviable. Finished platform levels mentioned to have "unbound free draining subbase and a minimum 75 mm top layer of stone chippings, allowing for storage of storm water during a storm event and drainage to existing ground."</p> <p>Surfaces should be 100% impermeable unless infiltration testing (in accordance with BRE 365) deems that infiltration is viable</p>
<p>45 (Section 5.4.58)</p>	<p>Outfall locations based on OS terrain 5 lidar</p>	<p>OS Terrain 5 is a coarse dataset and should not be relied upon for outfall/channel assessment.</p>
<p>45 (Section 5.5.3)</p>	<p>The permeable platform construction shall naturally retain runoff, where runoffs will be lost to the soils or the atmosphere.</p>	<p>Infiltration testing must confirm this viability.</p>

<p>47 (Section 5.6.5)</p>	<p>"In low-lying areas where the elevation is flat and there is proximity to a watercourse, currently available topographic levels may not allow for gravity-fed drainage to the outfall location. In these cases, the pond depth has been limited to 0.5 m, which also reduces the risk of groundwater ingress from the likely high water table. In the rest of the areas, a general pond depth of 1 m is proposed. More detailed, topographic data will be obtained from ground surveys at a later stage. "</p>	<p>Outfall levels should be determined at this stage and if a gravity fed system is viable, using LiDAR and / or topographical survey data</p>
<p>47 (Section 5.6.7)</p>	<p>"Attenuation ponds will be designed with a maximum gradient of 1:3"</p>	<p>Suffolk design guidance states that Sides slopes should not exceed 1 in 4 unless specific site/safety/maintenance arrangements allow for steeper slopes (C753 p.490 & 651)</p>
<p>50 (Section 5.7.11)</p>	<p>Diverted field drains should discharge to the closest watercourse or via balancing basins if required to mitigate flood risk at receiving watercourses. These balancing basins are not currently included in the drainage design and will need to be addressed at a future stage.</p>	<p>Further information is required regarding potential balancing basins. Retain natural flow pathways as much as possible.</p>
<p>63 (Table 9.1)</p>	<p>Maintenance Tables</p>	<p>Needs expanding. There is no mention of specific maintenance requirements for infiltration features, which is essential to prevent siltation and performance compromise.</p>
<p>Appendix A</p>	<p>No calculations / catchment areas provided. Must be included as part of final report</p>	<p>No pre and post development catchment areas or calculations have been provided.</p>

Other	Norfolk specific data	<p>Norfolk state the following should be submitted as a minimum to enable checks of the design:</p> <p>"Site investigation details including; topographic surveys, ground investigation surveys, infiltration testing, seasonally high groundwater levels, assessment of connection to wider watercourse networks and any CCTV survey of existing drainage networks</p> <p>Drainage design details including; discharge location, catchment area of the drainage system (pre and post development), officers may request long sections and cross sections as necessary, hydraulic calculations and modelling results, flow paths/extent/depth of expected water above ground, pipe schedule, maintenance plan and inspection access proposals with appropriate easements showing distance from adjacent dwellings, structures, utilities and carriageway</p> <p>Evidence of any consents including permits from Environment Agency, IDB, LLFA or Anglian Water. Agreements from adjacent landowners may also be requested."</p>
Other	Half Drain Times	<p>Any infiltration feature must show that half drain time can be achieved within 24 hours. No information regarding this has been provided.</p>