

From: Donna Parrish

Sent: 03 August 2026 22:54

To: Norwich to Tilbury

Subject: Final Representation to the Examining Authority – [REDACTED]

Reference: [REDACTED]

Good evening

This is my final representation regarding the Norwich to Tilbury project.

After more than four years of consultation and six months of Examination, I remain profoundly disappointed that the concerns raised by my family have not been meaningfully addressed. We have engaged openly and constructively throughout this process, attended meetings, welcomed repeated site visits, provided information, answered questions and suggested practical solutions. Despite this, the scheme affecting [REDACTED] remains substantially unchanged.

The proposed siting of Pylon TB207 remains one of my greatest concerns.

During site meetings I proposed a simple, practical alternative: relocating TB207 further around the corner of our land. This would remain entirely within our ownership, would not require additional third-party land, would allow the project to proceed, and would significantly reduce the impact on our home, our approved residential development and our family business.

Crucially, despite repeatedly asking, neither National Grid nor its consultants have ever provided a clear technical, engineering, environmental or planning explanation as to why this alternative has been ignored and rejected. There has been no transparent assessment demonstrating that my proposal was properly evaluated or why it could not be accommodated. Without that evidence, I do not believe the Examining Authority can be satisfied that all reasonable alternatives to reduce harm have been genuinely considered.

That failure demonstrates a lack of meaningful engagement and undermines confidence that reasonable mitigation has been properly explored.

The cumulative impact of the National Grid proposals together with the UKPN underground cable works has also never been adequately assessed. My family is expected to endure the combined effects of two major infrastructure projects affecting the same land, yet these impacts continue to be considered in isolation rather than as one overall burden.

[REDACTED] has been our family home for over forty years. It is also the centre of our livelihood and our future. We have secured outline planning permission for seven new homes following considerable investment of time and money. That development represents our family's long-term future and has been placed at significant risk by the current proposals. This is not a speculative aspiration; it is an approved development which deserves substantial weight.

The project will also continue to damage our long-established equestrian and livery business through disruption, reduced usability of land, safety concerns for horses and riders, and the permanent industrialisation of what is currently a rural setting.

I remain concerned that I was never presented with genuine route alternatives. Instead, I was presented with a predetermined overhead line route and asked to comment on its impacts. The

Examination has not persuaded me that National Grid has properly demonstrated why alternatives such as upgrading the existing transmission network, greater offshore coordination or HVDC undergrounding could not reduce the need for this level of new overhead infrastructure.

The proposal also fails, in my opinion, to satisfy the fundamental objective of minimising effects on people, homes, businesses and the landscape. The principles reflected in the Holford Rules require infrastructure to avoid or minimise harm wherever reasonably practicable. At [REDACTED], I do not believe that objective has been achieved.

Perhaps most importantly, I ask the Examining Authority not to overlook the human cost.

This project has dominated our lives for years. It has created relentless uncertainty, placed enormous pressure on our family, affected our wellbeing, delayed important life decisions and put our future at risk. Those impacts are real and should be afforded significant weight alongside the engineering and policy considerations.

The planning system exists to ensure that nationally significant infrastructure is delivered in the least harmful way possible. In our case, I do not believe National Grid has demonstrated that the current proposal represents the least harmful solution, nor that it has properly justified rejecting a viable alternative location for TB207 that would materially reduce the impact on our home, our approved development and our business.

If National Grid cannot clearly explain why a less harmful, deliverable alternative on the same landholding has been rejected, I respectfully submit that it has not discharged its responsibility to demonstrate that the proposed alignment is the most appropriate, proportionate and least harmful option available.

I therefore respectfully ask the Examining Authority to give significant weight to the unresolved impacts on [REDACTED] and to conclude that National Grid has failed to demonstrate that the current siting of TB207, and the cumulative impacts on our property, represent the least harmful or most proportionate solution.

Thank you for considering my final representation.

Yours faithfully,

Donna Jae Parrish
[REDACTED]