

I am writing in response to Examination Library doc ref REP6-203.

RVAA - I note that the Applicant acknowledged that my comments regarding incorrect separation distances were valid in a number of cases. However, I remain deeply concerned that these errors were only identified because I happened to discover them at a very late stage of the Examination. This inevitably raises the question of what other inaccuracies may remain within the extensive application documentation and whether interested parties, the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State can have full confidence in the evidence base. EN-1 makes clear that decisions should be based on robust, proportionate and reliable evidence, and that the environmental information submitted must be sufficient to enable a proper assessment of the project's impacts. Where factual errors are present in assessments affecting individual receptors, confidence in the wider assessment is inevitably diminished.

On a personal level, I fundamentally disagree with the Applicant's assessment of the impacts on my property. I also believe that many other homeowners along the route would reach similar conclusions if they were aware of the relevant assessments. These assessments were not individually brought to the attention of affected residents; I am not a technical expert and only discovered the relevant document by chance within the vast volume of examination material. Put simply, many members of the public are unlikely to be aware of the Applicant's conclusions about the impacts on their own homes or have had a realistic opportunity to scrutinise them.

More fundamentally, the assessments represent the Applicant's own professional judgement rather than the lived experience of those who will be directly affected. EN-5 requires landscape and visual assessments to identify and properly assess significant effects on receptors, including residential visual amenity. In my view, this objective is not fully achieved where the conclusions rely solely on the Applicant's interpretation without independent verification or direct evidence from affected properties. A more robust and transparent approach would have included independent surveys or structured engagement with homeowners to validate the Applicant's conclusions and provide the Examining Authority with a balanced evidence base.

Dust/Noise - I welcome the confirmation by the Applicant that I will not be affected by dust or noise, however, I remain very skeptical of this, even with mitigation. Over the past week, the field in question has been harvested and ploughed, and the dust/noise carries at least 400-500m - I appreciate that there isn't mitigation in place, but I believe helps emphasise what I have been saying, that the prevailing wind is a significant factor too.

EMF - The Applicant mentions that EMF experts were available throughout the consultation phase. I agree that this was the case, but not that they could answer my questions and provide reassurance. As I have mentioned before, I directly asked if the expert would choose to live as close to a pylon as we would be forced to, to which they said they wouldn't want to live that close. That's the very opposite of giving reassurance and surely begs the question as to why the pylons should be so close to any property. As mentioned elsewhere, the curtilage of my property is much closer to the pylons than the property - can we not safely use the garden any more?

Flooding - I note that the Applicant will capture rainwater falling onto impermeable surfaces. However, there will be significant additional concrete used for the project, which will permanently alter the flow and drainage of water. I remain unconvinced that these works would not adversely affect my property in the years to come.

Mental Health - I agree that I was (finally) contacted in March 2026. However, a single phone call and email that didn't answer all my questions cannot be considered to be satisfactory. As stated, I will suffer a significant loss on the value of my property if the project goes ahead, pushing me into negative equity. As you can imagine, this in itself is a cause of huge stress, even before any of the previously mentioned factors are also added in. A few hundred pounds off my electric bill is quite frankly an insult.

My overall summary is that from Day 1, there has been a huge predetermination by the Applicant in favour of pylons, with no serious consideration of modern alternatives, ie DC undergrounding/offshore grid. The applicant will mention the costs being higher, but are they really when you take into account the lifetime costs and reduced opposition to the alternatives - a fully measured and balanced costing has not taken place with these factors considered. The project should not be allowed to proceed in its' current format.