



Planning Inspectorate

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for an order granting development consent for the Norwich to Tilbury Project

Issue Specific Hearing 2

Dates: 28 and 29 April and 1 May 2026

Venue: Colchester United Football Club and Ipswich Town Football Club and MS Teams

Action points:

The action points listed below are all directed to **the applicant only** unless otherwise stated in **bold**.

All responses should be provided by **deadline 4 (Tuesday 12 May)** unless otherwise stated.

Reference to '**all local authorities**' includes the following: Norfolk County Council (CC), Suffolk CC, Essex CC, South Norfolk District Council (DC), Mid Suffolk DC, Babergh DC, Tendring DC, Colchester City Council, Braintree DC, Chelmsford City Council, Brentwood Borough Council (BC), Basildon BC and Thurrock Council.

Day 1

Tuesday 28 April

Agenda item 4: Noise and Vibration

2	<p>Use of term 'where practicable'</p> <p>All local authorities: Provide a response to the applicant's answer to first written question (ExQ1) NV1.6 and follow up to hearing discussion regarding use of the term 'where practicable' and whether commitment NV23 in the outline code of construction practice (CoCP) would be adequate.</p> <p>SNDC Response</p> <p>SNDC reiterate our position that percussive piles should only be used as a last resort and their use must only be permitted with the consent of the appropriate local authority.</p>
---	---

Day 1

Tuesday 28 April

Agenda item 6: Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)

10	<p>Discharge period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide a full response in writing to the local authorities' request to further extend the period for discharge to 40 working days/ 56 calendar days.• Local authorities to provide additional justification for their request, including reasons for continuing to request additional days for discharge (with reference to experiences relating to Sea Link and Bramford to Twinstead).• Provide a response to the suggestion of a validation checklist being secured in the DCO. <p>SNDC Response SNDC have no further comments to make and refer to our Relevant Representation, Local Impact Report, and responses to ExQ1.</p>
11	<p>ExQ1 DCO 1.A7 and 'maintain'</p> <p>Local authorities to comment on the applicant's position in its response to the question.</p> <p>SNDC Response SNDC have no further comments to make and refer to our response in ExQ1.</p>
16	<p>Schedule 3 - Requirements 1 (Interpretations)</p> <p>Local authorities to comment on the applicants response to ExQ1 DCO 1.S5 regarding the discharging authority and the revised wording, including in relation to local government reform as set out in the Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2025.</p> <p>Both the applicant and local authorities to provide further comments on the definition of 'stage'.</p> <p>SNDC Response SNDC query the terminology 'relevant county planning authority' but refer to our comments made in our Relevant Representation, Local Impact Report, and ExQ1 Response.</p>
17	<p>Schedule 3 – Requirement 5 (Archaeology)</p> <p>Local authorities to provide comments on the applicant's answer to ExQ1 DCO 1.S8 and the document now provided [AS-090].</p> <p>SNDC Response SNDC raise that presently, under the other DCO's in Norfolk, SNDC as the local planning authority have been required to consult with the Historic Environment Service who fall under Norfolk County Council for archaeological responsibilities, not Historic England. SNDC also query the</p>

	terminology 'relevant county planning authority' and would suggest that the three county's' archaeological services are listed in the Terms of Reference as this in relation to archaeology.
--	--

DAY 2	
Wednesday 29 April	
Agenda item 6: Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	
19	<p>Schedule 4 Discharge of requirements</p> <p>The applicant and local authorities are both to provide a response to the ExA questions and comments including an update by deadline 5 (Wednesday 10 June) regarding post-discharge functions and the involvement of the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), following the related submissions at the final deadline of the Sea Link examination.</p> <p>Enquiries are to be made whether DESNZ has been consulted or provided comments regarding the draft wording of the relevant schedule in the Sea Link draft DCO.</p> <p>SNDC Response</p> <p>SNDC have no further comments to make and refer to our response in ExQ1.</p>
20	<p>Article 60 and Schedule 19</p> <p>Local authorities to respond to the points made at the hearing.</p> <p>SNDC Response</p> <p>SNDC have no comments to make on this matter.</p>
22	<p>ExQ1 GEN 1.21 and Appendix E</p> <p>The local authorities, highway authorities, police forces and statutory undertakers named in the Appendix E of [REP3-074] are to provide further response to ExQ1 GEN 1.21 and Appendix E, having regard to the criteria set out in s122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.</p> <p>Rosie Pearson for Pylons East Anglia and Charles Micklem to provide in writing their comments regarding clauses in agreements relating to objections to planning applications and projects.</p>

Topic Matter	Local Planning Authority - LIR paragraph	Mechanism of Agreement	Purpose of Agreement	Applicant's Response	Application to any other Local Planning Authorities?
Energy Infrastructure Plan	South Norfolk Council – 8.5.1	Not specified	Energy Infrastructure Plan to deliver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a share understanding of the connection capacity • a coordination of construction periods • coordinated access tracks and construction compounds • locally shared ecological mitigation sites • local cumulative compensation and community mitigation fund 	As stated in 8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030] page 158, the Applicant does not consider it appropriate to have a commitment in its draft Development Consent Order that binds the Project with Five Estuaries, North Falls and Tarchon Interconnector on construction timetables, maintenance and mitigation strategies. These are separate schemes at different stages. However, the Applicant has committed to joining and engaging in the Developer's Forum proposed by Essex County Council to help facilitate coordination on highways matters. 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision B] further notes that the Main Works Contractor will liaise with the relevant highway authorities, National Highways and other major infrastructure developers to ensure a coordinated approach to construction traffic management. This is to be secured and made enforceable under Requirement 4 of 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [Revision C] .	No
<p>National Grid April 2026 Norwich to Tilbury 26</p> <p>SNDC Response The applicants' response in Appendix E does not specifically refer to any of the other energy infrastructure proposals and consented schemes in the South Norfolk District which is what this suggestion was more aimed at, focussing on locally cumulative schemes.</p>					

Day 2

Wednesday 29 April

Agenda item 8: Landscape and visual effects

25

Limits of Deviation 1

Local authorities to identify the most sensitive locations and specific viewpoints that they would like to see additional visuals of pylons within the limits of deviation (so as to further illustrate the worst case scenario). The list of viewpoints is to be agreed as soon as possible with the applicant, and submitted by the applicant at **deadline 4 (Tuesday 12 May)**. The applicant is to submit the agreed visuals by **deadline 5 (Wednesday 10 June)**.

SNDC Response

SNDC have contacted the applicant to reach agreement on additional visualisations listed below.

	<p>1.01- From Roman town Venta Icenorum, to illustrate worst case from this scheduled monument</p> <p>1.04- To illustrate worse case of the introduction of pylons and overheads in vicinity of Flordon Hall</p> <p>1.15- Showing the descent of the pylons into the Waveney Valley, in the vicinity of Church of St Remigius, Roydon</p> <p>1.22- Pylons within the valley, with St Remigius on skyline behind them</p> <p>HE2a- Church of St Remigius – Angles Way</p> <p>HE2b- Church of St Remigius</p> <p>HE21- Elm Farmhouse – SNDC still have concerns that the viewpoint is not in the best position to assess impact of the proposal on the setting of LB No 1373558</p>
28	<p>Waveney Valley</p> <p>Provide more information on the technical reasons for other pylon types being discounted.</p> <p>Local authorities to provide further comments in writing in response to the discussion regarding the setting of St Remigius Church.</p> <p>SNDC Response</p> <p>National Grid, in their consultations and discussions with SNDC never raised the T-Pylons, these discussions centred around undergrounding and lattice pylons. In the absence of appropriate visualisations, SNDC are unable to comment or assess the impact that alternative pylons may have on the setting of St Remigius Church.</p> <p>It is accepted that the setting to the north of Grade I St Remigius church has been altered by the 20th century urban development of Roydon, however to the south the rural pastoral landscape setting of the church has been largely preserved. The church is experienced as a landmark historic building of architectural importance within this preserved setting from the Angles Way footpath, which crosses the landscape to the south with views of the church to the north, although the appreciation and understanding of the asset within its valley landscape setting is not wholly dependent on public access. As a centuries old medieval structure and an asset that has a historic social connection to the wider area that contributes to the church’s historic significance, the church is an accepted part of the valley landscape that contributes positively to it.</p> <p>The proposal will result in a very visible modern and alien intrusion of industrial infrastructure into the Waveney Valley that will significantly alter the character of the landscape and will detract from the setting of the church within this landscape and the way in which it contributes to it. It is considered that a shorter version of the lattice pylon or alternatively a contemporary T- pylon design will result in a similar modern and alien intrusion. The T- pylon, being an attention-grabbing design within the local context, would detract</p>

<p>and draw attention away from the church as the most prominent local landmark. SNDC's Senior Design and Heritage Officer does not consider that a change in design would therefore mitigate the level of harm that we maintain to be moderate rather than low, and has the potential to increase it. The council's position remains that undergrounding would, with regard to impact on the significance of the grade I heritage asset and how the setting currently contributes to its significance, be the only effective way of mitigating the resulting level of harm.</p>
--