

Georgie Hannigan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 April 2026 18:24
To: NI Enquiries; ni.mail.distribution@notifications.service.gov.uk; Norwich to Tilbury
Cc: Cllr Mike Steel - Member CC
Subject: Interested Party Reference [REDACTED] RE: EN020027 – Norwich to Tilbury

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the update in regard of request to make changes to the application.

Can I please seek clarification in regard of my comments made as Submission ID: S262205A7 and also presented at the February Open Hearings – a copy pasted below. I urged for consideration of the NGET request in AENC-ARC-ENV-REP-0031 Page 36 that they be granted flexibility to revert to standard lattice pylons following further technical details being refined – this may also include removing the need for one of the three pylons and a change to the location.

I am surprised that this request, popular with many local residents, did not feature in the NGET requested design changes.

However, it may be the case that if such flexibility is already requested by NGET then a design change is not needed. I also note that **AENC-ARC-ENV-REP-0030 August 2025 page 99** states *“Adopted in part – Assessment under Regulation 14(2)(d) and consultation feedback evaluation led to hybrid approach. Historic England expressed preference for low height pylons in post consultation meetings, particularly north of River Chelmer. Targeted consultation feedback indicated preference for reduced extent of low height pylons to minimize visual effects for nearest residential properties. Final design adopts low height lattice pylons north of River Chelmer where heritage benefits are greatest, with standard lattice pylons south of river proposed to be positioned further back from Chelmsford Road to reduce visual effects for local receptors”*

This statement is a little confusing as the River Chelmer appears in several places, but it implies a change back to the standard height pylons just south of Chelmsford Road (TB141) is proposed. As I said at the hearing, this would be a win-win for residents and NGET.

Is there any way of letting me know if this option is still on the cards?

Submission ID: S262205A7 Interested Party Reference number: I am the Essex County Cllr for the division of Broomfield and Writtle, the Chelmsford City Cllr for the ward of Broomfield and the Walthams and a Parish Cllr for Great Waltham. I made 3 separate representations, but was contacted by Planning Inspectorate and asked if they could be combined under one, which I agreed – Interested Party Reference number: My County Council role covers 11 parishes of which 10 are affected by the overhead lines. As such I have been consistent in opposing the overhead line run to the West of Chelmsford, in previously unspoilt countryside and have supported alternative routes, or undergrounding the cables. I have participated in all the consultations in all my 3 roles, and as an individual. I do live in the village of Great Waltham, 0.5km from the nearest proposed pylon, so I am not personally directly affected. But I do represent around 16,000 people who will feel some impact. I am a Chartered Electrical Engineer, so I am not unaware of the difficulties and costs of alternative options! Noting that the objective of these hearings are to consider how the application will be examined, I will not repeat all my objections, but I do wish to promote a proposal made by NGET in AENC-ARC-ENV-REP-0031 Norwich to Tilbury Volume 6: Environmental Statement Document: 6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description Final Issue A August 2025 Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and

Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(a) – Page 36. This pertains to a change that was made before the submission to lower pylon heights in the region of The Walthams (the gap between Great Waltham and Little Waltham, which is in the conservation area. The design submission changed TB136 to TB142 to lower lattice height pylons up to 40 metres in height (but widening by 10m) instead of the 50m standard pylons, The negative impact of this was to add an extra pylon, but more importantly, position a lower height pylon TB141 right next to Chelmsford Road. This road is the main highway/footway between Great and little Waltham, and would be significantly affected by the presence of such an overbearing feature right next to the road. From my involvement with the local community, I have experienced much concern over this position of TB141. Whilst lower height pylons may reduce the extent of visibility from Grade I listed Langley's house and its immediate gardens, the wider stance and heavier frame of the lower height pylons would have a greater visual presence in the context of the southern part of Great Waltham Conservation Area and the designated and non-designated heritage assets in this area. AENC-ARC-ENV-REP-0031 Page 36 (see attached file) requests consideration of flexibility to revert to standard lattice pylons following further technical details being refined – this may also include removing the need for one of the three pylons and a change to the location I urge for this to be considered as part of the examination, and if possible, be mandated as a change to the design such that change of just 2 (not all) to full height pylons will facilitate the move of TB141 further away from the edge of Great Waltham Conservation Area, the main road and the non-designated heritage asset Windmill House. The introduction of full height pylons and the omission of one pylon could potentially reduce the level of heritage harm by positioning the pylon more towards the centre of the adjacent field, further away from the road, and significantly reducing the overbearing aspect of the pylon. I request that the matter is explored further

Mike

Mike Steel | Essex County Councillor (Broomfield and Writtle), Chelmsford City Councillor (Broomfield and Walthams), Great Waltham Parish Council, Chair Walthams Scout Group [REDACTED] | E:Mail [REDACTED]@chelmsford.gov.uk