

Example of letter sent by Ardleigh resident to secretary of state. local MP and other elected representatives

To: <secretary.state@beis.gov.uk>, <handsg@parliament.uk>

Cc: JENKIN, Bernard <bernard.jenkin.mp@parliament.uk>, Cllr Neil Stock <cldr.nstock@tendringdc.gov.uk>, <cldr.Carlo.Guglielmi@essex.gov.uk>, <cldr.gscott@tendringdc.gov.uk>, <cldr.awiggins@tendringdc.gov.uk>

We were appalled to read that National Grid is proposing 180km of 'lattice framework' pylons between Norwich and Tilbury. These are the old-fashioned, 50m high (the size of 10 double decker buses), exceptionally ugly pylons, first seen 100 years ago! In the Dedham AONB, the cables will be buried but will still impact the land.

We are also highly alarmed about the proposal to site a **massive** National Grid sub-station (45 ha) within the Parish of Ardleigh and adjacent parishes, on valuable agricultural land (grade 1), in peaceful countryside that is only accessed by tiny single carriage rural roads. In addition, two further substations for two separate offshore wind farms are proposed in close proximity, as well as a battery storage facility! There seems to be no co-ordinated approach here between the three organisations: North Falls, Five Estuaries and National Grid. The loss of potentially more than 75 ha of prime agricultural land and the impact on the environment is shocking and seems to have been 'passed over' in the consultation documentation.

The route of the pylons would surround the village of Ardleigh on three sides, potentially as close as 250 metres to the village centre. The route crosses the existing Ardleigh Reservoir and the newly constructed reservoir, through some of the most attractive landscape in the Parish, close to priority habitats, ancient woodland and many listed buildings. This is clearly unacceptable: impacting on habitation, loss of agricultural land and the health of residents, known to be associated with high voltage pylons. The emerging Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan has identified a number of Green Spaces the community wishes to protect which will be affected, should the route be allowed.

The consultation does not allow any other options to be considered. It simply presents a pre-selected route which is a short-term solution, ignoring the need for a **long-term strategic approach** to energy distribution. The obvious answer would appear to be an under-sea cable which could connect to off-shore wind farms and coastal power stations.

We believe that National Grid should first have presented a series of options, with costings set out, for the following:

1. Land-based with lattice pylons as presented
2. Under the sea cables: to prevent the blight of what must be thousands of acres of countryside and the loss of millions of trees and wildlife habitats. Why is it possible to put a line under the sea from Sizewell to the Kent coast but this has not been considered as an alternative?
3. Buried cables on other stretches. It's not just the AONB that is beautiful!
4. T-pylons, as adopted in Somerset for a 38 km stretch of pylons. These are far less obtrusive
5. Following the existing line of pylons.

The socio-economic value of the loss of beautiful countryside and all that live here, loss of agricultural land needed for food security, reduction in value of properties, not to mention health implications, must be recognised and compared against the cost of this proposal. We **MUST** put a true value on these things and recognise that the health and wellbeing of

citizens should outweigh any economic advantage in pylons and unco-ordinated substation developments. Whilst we fully support the need for green energy and energy security, the means to achieve this must be co-ordinated and with every consideration given to those affected by their development.

Gunning principles, which are recognised in law, require a consultation to be held when a proposal is still at a formative stage. This one is clearly not. It is well advanced and the options above are not even presented for consideration. In fact, they are not even set out on the consultation website.

We hope you will support our desire for an undersea cable alternative to the proposal. We will be joining in with the campaign to ensure this is the outcome.