

My husband and I have written our submission together. The damaging Norwich to Tilbury pylon proposal must be rejected as the applicant has refused to properly appraise better method in the form of HVDC and an offshore grid.

As my husband noted in his submission, I wish to object as follows:

I strongly object to National Grid's Norwich to Tilbury proposal and respectfully ask the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State to refuse Development Consent.

My objection is based on the severe and disproportionate impact this proposal will have on my family, our home and our livelihood.

My family owns and operates [REDACTED] a long-established holiday cottage business. Our guests choose to stay here because of the peaceful rural setting, attractive countryside and tranquil environment. The proposed overhead transmission line, together with years of construction activity, heavy machinery and traffic, would fundamentally change the character of the area.

This project would seriously damage the attractiveness of our holiday accommodation and threatens the future viability of our business. The resulting loss of bookings and income would have a devastating effect on our family.

The proposal will also cause significant financial harm through the likely devaluation of both our home and our business.

Our property is not simply our family home; it is the asset upon which our business depends. Any reduction in its value represents a substantial financial loss that has not been properly addressed by the Applicant.

I am particularly concerned about the construction traffic proposed to use the narrow lane serving our property. This lane is wholly unsuitable for repeated use by heavy construction vehicles. Increased HGV movements will inevitably damage the road and create a real risk of vibration damage to the foundations of nearby properties, including our home and holiday cottages. Such damage would be costly, disruptive and potentially irreversible. I do not believe National Grid has demonstrated that the local highway network can safely accommodate construction traffic without causing harm to residents and businesses.

More fundamentally, I do not believe the Applicant has demonstrated compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-5. Being designated as Critical National Priority infrastructure does not remove the obligation to demonstrate compliance with national planning policy, apply the mitigation hierarchy, minimise adverse impacts and properly consider feasible alternatives. As highlighted in previous submissions, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that less harmful alternatives, including undergrounding where appropriate, have been adequately assessed.

EN-1 requires that the Secretary of State carefully weighs the project's adverse impacts, including impacts on communities, businesses and the local economy, against any claimed benefits. EN-5 similarly requires electricity transmission projects to minimise environmental and community impacts through careful routing, design and consideration of alternatives. In my view, National Grid has not met these requirements.

The harm to my family is neither minor nor temporary. This proposal threatens our livelihood, diminishes the value of our home and business, and places our property at risk from construction activity on an unsuitable rural lane. These are real and significant impacts that cannot simply be dismissed as the inevitable consequences of infrastructure development.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority gives substantial weight to these serious personal, financial and business impacts when making its recommendation and concludes that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that this proposal represents the least harmful solution or that it complies with the requirements of the National Policy Statements. Development Consent should therefore be refused.