

Planning Inspectorate Reference EN020027 – Norwich to Tilbury

Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]

Submission for Deadline 6 – 2359 hrs 7 July 2026

Response to National Grid's Document 8.4.12.2, Response to ISH2 Action Point 27 – Masterplans, Appendix A – Waveney Valley (including Snow Street, Roydon, Roydon Fen and Wortham Ling)

I am writing as a resident of Roydon. I manned the stalls we ran at Roydon Village Hall and on Darrow Lane for our own community survey on the Waveney Valley Alternative — full day shifts, talking to whoever came through. Nearly the whole village told us they use and value Darrow Lane, Roydon Fen and Wortham Ling, and the overwhelming majority wanted this section underground. National Grid's Appendix A doesn't reflect any of that.

****What's actually at stake****

This route changes direction as it crosses the village. [RESIDENT'S OWN KNOWLEDGE, NOT FROM A NATIONAL GRID DOCUMENT: it turns at RG81, RG82 and RG83 run behind Roydon parallel with Darrow Lane, RG84 sits at the edge of the village on the A1066, then it turns again to cut across the valley to RG92, with RG88 towering directly between Roydon Fen and Wortham Ling.] That's at least three direction changes through one small village, on ground National Grid's own plan admits has almost no cover.

Along that route sits St Remigius Church (Grade I listed), a cluster of Grade II buildings on Snow Street, and The Gables on Darrow Lane, a 17th-century timber-framed house. South of the village, Roydon Fen LNR and Wortham Ling SSSI sit either side of the Angles Way. None of this is background scenery — it's what this part of the village has instead of street lighting or pavements, walked every day. None of it appears as a cost anywhere in National Grid's response: not the loss to home and business values along the route, not the noise, dust and haul-road disruption of construction next to centuries-old buildings, for a village with no bypass and nowhere else to go while it's built.

****The Opportunities Plan is not mitigation****

National Grid's own document admits the draft opportunities plan, even delivered in full, "would not materially change the ES assessment of landscape and visual effects" (para 2.4.1), and that no landowner has even been approached about any of it (para 2.6.1). Tree planting and support for the WaLOR wetland project do nothing to hide a 50-metre pylon. This is a sketch of things that might happen on land National Grid doesn't own, not a plan.

****The Waveney Valley Alternative was dropped before it was properly tested****

National Grid withdrew its own 2 km undergrounding offer, citing ground conditions and cost. I don't accept ground conditions were ever the real barrier — National Grid is currently boring tunnels under central London and under the Thames itself at Tilbury, the very endpoint of this project. A company doing that has the technology for a Norfolk field. This was a cost decision.

But I don't think a number is the point. No cost should be allowed to outweigh the emotional and mental toll on the people who live with this permanently. This is a national project meant to benefit everyone; it shouldn't be built by loading its whole burden onto one small village because that was cheaper. And even setting cost aside, 2 km was never enough — it would only have moved the pylons to the edge of the village at RG84, still leaving RG82 and RG83 overhead behind Darrow Lane. Anything short of clearing the village fully isn't a solution.

****Flat ground, and the Holford Rules****

Before this Project, the church tower was the tallest thing on the skyline here. There's no woodland or landform anywhere along this stretch to break up a 50-metre structure — exactly the "open, agricultural, big sky landscape" the village's own Neighbourhood Plan describes at Key View 28. National Grid claims the route follows Holford Rules 2, 4 and 5. Looking at the ground, that doesn't stand up.

****What I'm asking the Examining Authority to do****

- Treat Action Point 27 as still unresolved for Roydon — National Grid's own document (para 2.8.4) admits no agreed position has been reached.
 - Stop accepting "ground conditions" as an excuse. Weigh the emotional and mental cost to this village against whatever this project costs to do properly — it never has been.
 - Keep undergrounding on the table, but only if it clears the whole village, not just to RG84.
 - Keep re-routing on the table — nothing is fixed until the Secretary of State decides, and this is already the third proposal for this stretch.
 - Do not accept what is currently on offer. It is not a fair trade for what this village has built and looked after for generations.
- Roydon, Norfolk