

Having attended or remotely viewed most of the Examination Hearings, and read many of the submitted documents, it is disturbing to have to say that my concerns relating to the proposed project have increased even further. For reference, my previous concerns are outlined in my Relevant Representation dated 26 November 2025.

The impact of this project would be without precedent, and that is just considering the project on its own. On top of this would be the unimaginable cumulative impact when other planned projects are also considered. This includes not only the Five Estuaries Offshore Windfarm, the North Falls Offshore Windfarm and the Tarchon Energy Interconnector projects, but also other large projects throughout the region such as the Lower Thames Crossing. The image that has emerged during the Examination is very bleak and I am not convinced that the full picture is clear even at this stage, where Examination is shortly to be concluded. A huge amount remains unresolved and that is concerning enough in itself.

Despite the functional interdependence, the Norwich to Tilbury project and the associated projects of the Five Estuaries Offshore Windfarm, the North Falls Offshore Windfarm and the Tarchon Energy Interconnector are being progressed as separate entities through the Examination process. This makes it impossible for interested parties to properly understand the proposals and to be able to assess the full impact. This is particularly important when the significant cumulative scale of the proposals, and consequently the severe impact, is considered.

Since the introduction of the Norwich to Tilbury proposals to communities in 2022 the outcome has been very predetermined, with poor community engagement. It is very clear that there are better alternatives which have not been properly considered. Onshore and offshore HVDC technology should feature highly. It is unacceptable that there is no offshore coordination in relation to the connection of the Five Estuaries Offshore Windfarm and the North Falls Offshore Windfarm. It is also not compliant with Section 3.3.71 in EN-1. This is all well-known and established technology that is currently being deployed elsewhere. As demonstrated in various NESO reports, offshore coordination can significantly reduce the impact of such projects. This is vital, for example, when nature is severely in decline and the importance of UK agriculture to food security is increasingly being recognised.

With the current proposals there is widespread non-conformance with the Holford and Horlock Rules. There are many examples of this along the route but an example covering both rules is provided in the Ardleigh area, as highlighted in submission [AS-065]. No amount of micro-siting will resolve these issues.

The Applicant has repeatedly understated harms, as confirmed, for example, by expert evidence such as that sourced by the campaign group Pylons East Anglia and the Applicant has been dismissive of responses during the Examination. Engagement is frequently rebuffed with standard phrases and repeated sections of text. This creates a very unbalanced and legalistic engagement. The Applicant has also refused to use the HM Treasury Green Book, which is needed to ensure that a balanced view of the costs is provided.

My experience is that most people are supportive of the drive to net zero and understand that the grid needs to be upgraded as a result but firmly believe there is a much better solution. There is one opportunity to get this right. Fundamentally, the current proposals will not achieve this.