Via email

Sirs,

You have invited comment on accelerating onshore electricity transmission development. The main thread of your consultation seems to be regarding the need for competitive tender for works once the transmission routes have been established. I sincerely hope that you are not intending to reduce the public consultation periods or try to reduce the rights of those affected by such projects (although recourse for those affected is pretty much non-existent).

I am deeply affected by the proposed East Anglia Green project which is set to destroy beautiful countryside and habitats through East Anglia and together with the numerous other projects on the table for East Anglia is going to destroy many stunning, fragile and valuable habitats and have a huge negative impact on wildlife and many individuals and communities. The public consultation process is pitiful, a box ticking exercise and there is no real concern for those affected. National Grids recent consultations in our area were insulting and callous. It is a project which is not wanted and is not necessary, there is an offshore alternative which will save money in the longer term. Investment in offshore infrastructure around East Anglia is virtually non-existent – although it seems viable in other parts of the country. Instead a very destructive peace-meal approach is being adopted with offshore windfarms all being asked to connect to onshore locations. Multiple underground connections are therefore being made, adding to the onshore transmission burden when a well thought out offshore grid would reduce the need for multiple onshore connections and the need for destructive lines of pylons to transmit the power to London. A well thought out process and contracts would have asked the windfarm investors/operators to jointly fund the offshore grid connections with landfall to brownfield sites and closer to where the power is ultimately needed.

Ofgem should change the legislative process , the emphasis should be on providing the least invasive and disruptive network with offshore options utilised wherever possible.  Stop destroying what little open countryside we have left and so many individual lives. If the process was more sympathetic there would be fewer objections and delays with substantially less disruption to onshore economies (which is not taken into account at all but has a huge monetary impact). Furthermore the cost of residential and business property values should be taken into account (and proper compensation costed and ultimately given where onshore schemes have to go ahead), it is totally unjust that significant loss is borne by ordinary individuals which reduces quality of life and life choices, often to a really devastating level. If these costs together with broader environmental impacts were properly brought into account, the cost of offshore alternatives wherever possible would not be projected as so out of line in cost.

Your framework allows National Grid to make excuses and act as bullies. Overseas investors profit hugely, they have no interest in preserving our stunning British countryside, just profit first. This will continue into the future and the regulatory framework has facilitated this. It is not protecting the consumer or the environment. The framework is not fit for purpose and needs to be rethought and refocused.

Propper planning with the highest regard to the environment is the best way to accelerate electricity transmission, not seeking out the easiest/fastest/cheapest (because it is not fully costed) route.

Yours faithfully,