



31.07.26

Dear Inspectorate

As a lay person, this has been the most stressful thing I have ever had to deal with. The volume of material to trawl through, the jargon, the abusive Nimby rhetoric. But I must try for the sake of us all.

I still have grave concerns about the Norwich to Tilbury project. Many are about the consultation, transparency and motivation of National Grid but I know that these are project wide so I will leave those to others.

In my particular backyard, [REDACTED], the National Policy Statement EN-5 2.11.2 have NOT been followed. The route horseshoes around us. I did suggest to National Grid that it would be more in line with these rules to move pylon RG117 to the East of the railway line so that it could then follow a straight line to RG120.

In addition to taking the route further away from the heavily populated village of [REDACTED], it's Grade I Listed Church and the Grade 2 Listed [REDACTED] which National Grid's own documentation says will be significant negatively effected, it would straighten up the route and additionally a section of haul road could be dispensed with (the section that would only serves to reach Pylon RG119) as there is already a haul road on the East side of the railway.

National Grid acknowledge that this proposal would save one pylon from being necessary and reduce the heritage effects and potential residential amenity effects, though they failed to note that this would dispense with the need for a haul road to serve RG119 and therefore the destruction of trees and hedges that go along with it. They said that the change would transfer to other receptors. They clearly had not been on a site visit and they concluded that more trees would need to be taken down with the new proposal, when in actual fact, the trees on the new proposed alignment, do not, in any way compare to the importance of the trees which would be removed to facilitate the current proposed route with its haul road. Additionally, had they been to site they would be aware that the number of properties in [REDACTED], particularly in [REDACTED] is huge compared to less than a handful on the other side of the track, none of which, I believe to be listed. Whilst the new proposal does transfer to other receptors, it does not effect anywhere near as many properties and, on balance, I believe that National Grid did NOT give sufficient consideration to the many gains, and that their desk based conclusion is flawed and detrimental to so many and so much.

I remain convinced that there is a better way to transfer the power to London rather than using pylons which, for whatever reason National Grid do not want to consider.

Yours faithfully

