

Our ref: BRS.1526

Mr. Harrison Coles  
Case Officer  
Planning Inspectorate

e-mail: [NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

11<sup>th</sup> May 2026

**BY EMAIL ONLY**

Dear Mr Coles,

**Arqiva Limited**  
**Objection to Norwich to Tilbury Electricity Transmission Connection application for Development Consent Order**

Pegasus Group act on behalf of Arqiva Limited (“Arqiva”) in respect of Town Planning matters throughout the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. Arqiva are a leading communications and infrastructure provider serving multiple industries. They operate at the forefront of the UK broadcasting industry, enabling their customers to reach and engage audiences across technologies and platforms for watching TV and other content such as digital radio. Arqiva deliver a range of products and services for the management and distribution of content at-scale, both in the UK and internationally. Arqiva are also a UK critical national infrastructure operator, managing the digital terrestrial television (DTT) network and broadcast radio network that ensures the universal availability of a wide range of free-to-air TV and radio services. Their customers include UK public service broadcasters, as well as a wide range of commercial TV and radio providers, which deliver news, information, education and entertainment across the entire UK.

It is within this context that I write to you regarding the impact of the proposed Norwich to Tilbury National Electricity Transmission Connection.

Arqiva has conducted a Technical Assessment of the project following receipt of geolocal information provided to Arqiva in April 2026 by Fisher German, agents acting on behalf of the Applicant. As required by Arqiva in order to conduct their detailed technical network safeguarding assessment, this information included the precise locations of each of the proposed pylons. Arqiva’s assessment shows that several of the proposed pylons will have a detrimental impact on the functionality of their existing network because the locations of the pylons are either within, or very close to, existing super high frequency (SHF) and microwave link paths.

As the Examination will no doubt be aware, National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 121 provides specific protection for existing electronic communication services where the decision maker should ensure that they have considered the possibility of the construction of new buildings or other structure interfering with such services.

First Floor, South Wing, Equinox North, Great Park Road, Almondsbury, Bristol, BS32 4QL  
T 01454 625945 E [Bristol@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Bristol@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK and Ireland.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales  
Registered Office: Pegasus House, Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire GL7 1RT

**Expertly Done.**

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



In order for Arqiva's communications network to function effectively and efficiently it is essential that point to point SHF and microwave links are preserved. This requires line of sight between any given points on Arqiva's network to allow for digital communication. Where structures are situated within or close to existing link paths, there is the potential to damage and degrade the quality of existing links which disrupts the flow of information and prevents information exchange.

In this case, Arqiva has assessed that pylons RG48, RG132, JC33, TB61, TB62, TB66 and RG196 are situated either within or extremely close to link paths as summarised in the below table:

<b>Pylon</b>	<b>Arqiva Link Assessment</b>
RG48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located 30m from Tacolneston to Mendlesham link path</li><li>• Tacolneston: X – 613050, Y – 295721</li><li>• Mendlesham: X – 612280, Y – 264150</li></ul>
RG132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located almost directly underneath the path of link Mendlesham to Thetford</li><li>• Mendlesham: X – 612280, Y – 264150</li><li>• Thetford: X – 586540, Y – 284050</li></ul>
JC33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located almost directly underneath the path of link Sudbury to Warren Heath</li><li>• Sudbury: X – 591318, Y – 237650</li><li>• Warren Heath: X – 619635, Y – 242544</li></ul>
TB61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located 40m North of link path between Braintree Grid and Manningtree</li><li>• Braintree Grid: X – 577465, Y – 221782</li><li>• Manningtree: X – 612296, Y – 229546</li></ul>
TB62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located 30m South of link path between Braintree Grid and Manningtree</li><li>• Braintree Grid: X – 577465, Y – 221782</li><li>• Manningtree: X – 612296, Y – 229546</li></ul>
TB66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pylon located 15m East of link path between Great Braxted and Sudbury</li><li>• Great Braxted: X – 591318, Y – 237650</li><li>• Sudbury: X – 587017, Y – 214949</li></ul>
RG196	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approx 36m from Sudbury to Somersham – RBL</li><li>• Sudbury: X – 587017, Y – 214949</li><li>• Somersham: X – 608600, Y – 249230</li></ul>

Should the pylons be built in the locations proposed without change or mitigation, there is potential for significant negative interference with Arqiva's network which would degrade the quality of the communications network. It is on this basis that this objection is made.



Arqiva appreciates that the project is at examination stage and that this objection is made relatively late in the overall Development Consent Order process. However, the relevant information Arqiva needed to run their Technical Safeguarding Assessment was not provided to Arqiva until early April 2026, fully six months after the initial request for specific geolocational information regarding the locations of pylons was requested. This was despite several instances of chasing and follow-up where it was made clear to representatives of the project why the precise locations of pylons are important to Arqiva and the implications for not providing the requested information. I would be happy to provide a record of email exchanges to the appointed Inspector upon request.

Following the conclusion of their Technical Assessment Arqiva wrote to Fisher German on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026 explaining in detail their concerns, potential possible solutions and inviting further dialogue. Unfortunately, these discussions have not progressed and Arqiva must now lodge their objections with the Examination. Arqiva remain amenable to receiving a response from the Applicant, or agents working on their behalf, to the results of their technical assessment with a view to overcoming concerns raised with regards to the impact of the proposed locations of the pylons described in the above table.

You kindly confirmed to me in February this year that Arqiva Limited are listed in the project Book of Reference and that they could make written or oral submissions as part of the Examination process. I would be grateful if you could share this letter with the appointed Planning Inspector and would be glad to respond to any matter raised herein.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted]  
**Planning Director**

**e-mail:** [Redacted]@pegasusgroup.co.uk

**Telephone:** [Redacted]

(for and on behalf of Arqiva Limited)