

Once again, I must emphasise that consultation by National Grid has been legally deficient since 2022. No alternatives have been presented, and the public has not been listened to in any way by National Grid. Indeed, the public has simply been presented with a single overhead line concept, rather than testing viable alternatives such as undergrounding, an alternative re-route, an integrated offshore route or use of existing corridors. This is not consulting, but dictating.

Failure to engage

One of the points mentioned in my submissions to the Inspectorate is that our Grade 2 Listed Heritage Asset, which has been our family for nearly forty years, has a boundary just ten metres away from NG's boundary for their substation site in Ardleigh. NG have, themselves, described our home as "**the worst affected receptor**" of their project in their 'Norwich to Tilbury, Volume 6: Environmental Statement' paper.

We have tried to engage with NG about the disastrous position they have been 100% responsible for creating for our home. We had a meeting with a representative from NG () and a representative from Fisher German () on 19th June 2024, together with our neighbour who also owns a Grade 2 Listed Heritage Asset. Here is a brief summary of the points they agreed to action:

1. **Heritage assessment inclusion** - NG will ask their heritage people about a) including our properties in their planned heritage assessments or b) reimbursing us for assessments we commission ourselves.
2. **Sound impact information** - NG will ask for a sound file or similar so we can understand what the sound impact will be for us. They are welcome to visit us to take background sound readings or invite us to a similar substation so we can hear for ourselves.
3. **Correction of impact assessments** - NG will find out who made the impact assessments that said the impact of the substation on Bounds Farm (our home) was "not capable of mitigation" yet the impact on Hungerdowns (our neighbour's home) was "not significant", and correct any erroneous statements.
4. **Exploration of alternative substation layouts** - NG will explore moving the substation slightly to the east and away from Bounds Farm. They will also report back on alternative substation solutions, including enclosed buildings which result in no audible impact (even if the visual impact is still there) and other solutions for reducing visual impact through undergrounding, bunds and bio-diversity net gain.
5. **Offshore connection feasibility** - NG will report back on progress with North Falls etc about connecting to Sealink offshore, and thus not requiring a substation in Ardleigh. They will also report back on the technical feasibility of undergrounding an HVDC link for Norwich to Tilbury.
6. **Compensation discussions** - NG will consult internally with the team that looks at special situations where blight is much higher and arrange a further discussion on compensation (recognising that those of us within 500m of the substations are in a unique position of disruption with the combined blight of the pylons/undergrounding/substation, and that, while there may not be a statutory right to compensation, a special case can be made due to the degree of harm to the limited number of people directly affected).
7. **Whole-life carbon assessment** - NG will revert with information about if and when a full whole-life carbon assessment of the current project vs a) a discreet offshore project, b) the relevant portion of a national integrated offshore grid and c) HVDC undergrounding option. It would also be useful to know if any attempt is being made to cost the project to include all externalities (ie not just CO2) vs alternatives.

We were told that they would come back to us within a couple of weeks. To this date, over two years later, we have had no response to these points. So much for consultation and engagement with local communities!

Ignoring significant medical needs

My husband is [REDACTED]. There is a very strong and urgent need to move from the current family home to a much smaller and appropriate property for these reasons. However, we are unable to do so (see section below). NG's current proposals will eventually make him a prisoner in his own home. Our predicament has been caused totally and utterly, 100% by National Grid's plans, and they need to take responsibility for the harm they are creating.

We have previously requested, through our agent, an urgent meeting with NG and/or Fisher German to ask them for a solution to this problem that NG is totally and utterly, 100% responsible for. An email was sent on 17th July 2026 to [REDACTED] of Fisher German requesting a meeting. A further email was sent one week later, on 24th July 2026. A third request was made verbally during the week commencing 27th July 2026. Each time our agent has been told that Fisher German are awaiting instructions from NG. Again, NG appears to have no desire to engage. [REDACTED].

All of the above points directly contradict the Applicant's Comments on PEA Appendix I – Heritage Bounds Farm [REP3-137], where it states that it "has had an ongoing consultation and engagement process with affected landowners for over two years." Based on our experience, this statement is misleading and simply untrue.

Trivialising dire realities

Our Grade 2 Heritage Asset was put on the market on 1st June 2025, and during the following ten months one person viewed it. It was taken off the market temporarily in order to carry out a re-marketing assessment, and has been on the market again since 1st June 2026. Again, one person has viewed it. It would seem that no-one wants to live in a home very close to NG's substation, close to North Falls substation, close to Five Estuaries substation, close to the proposed Tarchon Interconnector and with five 50m high pylons (TB1, TB2, TB3, TB4 and TB5) looming over the property! Incidentally NG claims in its Applicant's Comments on PEA Appendix I – Heritage Bounds Farm [REP3-137] that "The Applicant concluded that the Project would impact views away from the asset to the farmland to the east and the tops of pylons TB1 to TB4 may be visible over the top of mature tree cover to the south." For NG to suggest that pylons that are 50m high may be visible above the height of 30/40ft high trees to the south is clearly misleading and simply not the truth – they will **very definitely** be **extremely** visible.

As for NG's off-hand remark in the same Applicant's Comments, "Concerns are more likely to arise when a property is in very close proximity to pylons or a substation. The main concern would likely be the visual impact that affects the amenity of a property. However, individual preferences vary hugely among different buyers and opinions on certain properties are entirely subjective. Some potential buyers could be deterred while others are entirely unbothered." This is simply NG trying to trivialise the impact that their project will have.

Again, I would stress that we are not Nimbys, Naysayers or Blockers. Nobody along the whole of the proposed Norwich to Tilbury route would deny that there is a need for more electricity to take the

country forward. But 20th century pylon technology will only take it backwards, and in the process will destroy farmland, businesses, natural habitats, trees, hedgerows, people's homes and people's lives. It has already created severe mental health issues, and these will only increase. All these things must be taken into account above the greed of NG and its shareholders. There is a much better method of transporting the electricity and helping to achieve Net Zero within a reasonable period, and National Grid is well aware of that.

Planning Inspectorate, please ensure that NG is made to investigate fully the alternatives. Please ensure that it is made to present the public with a proper consultation process instead of the ill-planned, disjointed, disconnected, arrogant and rudimentary attempt they have tried to present so far. They do have a chance to get it right, and they must be made to do so.