

CSNP Consultation Survey: Whole System Network Planning

This consultation survey will be used to gather the views from stakeholders regarding the whole system network planning elements of CSNP methodology. This feedback will be considered and used to develop the final methodology released in September 2025.

Please complete this consultation survey by 1 August at 5pm. Following this date the consultation will be closed and you will no longer be able to submit a response through this form.

Do you agree that NESO is intending to engage with the right stakeholder categories to successfully deliver the CSNP? (Page 18). We aim to ensure all relevant stakeholders are adequately represented.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments on the stakeholder categories we are planning to engage with for the CSNP? Your feedback will help shape how we engage in the future

Historic England notes the Stakeholder definitions detailed in Appendix A and welcomes our inclusion in the Environment grouping as a Type one Statutory stakeholder. This is important given our statutory role and engagement with the SEA and EIA processes. We therefore anticipate our engagement to be primarily through this group. However, as the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England and our role to champion and protect England's historic places, including those in the marine environment, we note that our engagement could overlap into other such as the Government and regulatory, and Land and marine groups.

Do you agree with our current position that the SEA/HRA assessment should not be extended to cover gas and hydrogen? (Page 28). Your feedback will help us balance environmental considerations across different planning domains.

Yes

No

Maybe

Don't know

If you do not agree, can you provide a reason why? (Page 28). Your detailed feedback will help us understand whether there's further action that's required.

Historic England is supportive of the government's drive to speed up the delivery of energy infrastructure of all types in order to achieve net zero. We are keen to explore ways to make this happen whilst ensuring proper and robust consideration of the impacts on the historic environment and the avoidance of unnecessary harms wherever possible. We are therefore concerned about proposals not to extend SEA/HRA to gas and hydrogen.

Development of all networks, including gas and hydrogen, has the potential to impact on a wide range heritage assets. Identification of such assets which, due to their irreplaceable nature, cannot be compensated for in the same way as the natural environment is an important aspect of the SEA process. Early identification can enable solutions to be identified early in the process, save time, costs and ultimately assist in delivering energy infrastructure more quickly.

We also note that page 28 refers only to “..consultations with the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SCNBs)”. Historic England seeks clarification that we will also be consulted the environmental assessments.

Do you agree that the methodology steps (drive, identify, develop, appraise, deliver & plan publications) outlined in the whole system CSNP overview are appropriate for developing a whole system CSNP? (Page 29). Your feedback will help us validate or improve the methodology steps.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments on the specific assessment steps shared within the whole system CSNP overview? (Page 30). Please share any suggestions or concerns regarding these steps.

The five assessment criteria -economic, environment, community, deliverability and operability- detailed under the appraise step seem to be appropriate.

As detailed in our response to the previous question we have concerns over the potential omission of the SEA/HRA process for gas and hydrogen.

Do you agree that the whole system approach for the centralised strategic network planning has been clearly set out in the CSNP draft methodology? (Page 30). Your opinion will help us refine the methodology for better clarity and effectiveness.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Do you agree that the outlined governance structure proposed in the methodology is appropriate to support the delivery of the whole system CSNP? (Page 34). Your input will help us ensure the governance structure is robust and effective.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Do you agree that the membership, roles, and responsibilities set out for the governance process will support the delivery of a whole system CSNP? (Page 34).

We want to ensure the governance roles are well-defined and effective.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments on the whole system approach we're taking for the CSNP? (Page 35). We are interested to get your views on this new approach

No comment

Do you have any other comments on the overview of the whole system CSNP draft methodology that you would like to share? Your feedback will help support the wider development of the methodology

Overall, the approach has been set out in a clear way. However, there appears to be an absence of monitoring or review mechanism needed to assess the effectiveness of the methodology itself (rather than the CSNP). It may be that this is addressed through the three yearly cycle of updates to the CSNP however this is not clear in the current document. Clarification on this point in the next version of the draft would be welcomed.

The outlined governance structure proposed appears to be similar to that operating for the SSEP and Historic England supports the inclusion of an Environment Working Group (EWG). However, the success/impact of the EWG for the SSEP is unknown given its early stages, and so it may be premature to be assured that this structure is also appropriate for the CSNP.

We welcome the engagement principles detailed on pages 18 and 19. As a statutory stakeholder Historic England is committed to providing constructive input whilst meeting all relevant deadlines. We appreciate that NESO is also working to tight deadlines on multiple plans. Of necessity these plans are complex and technical in nature and include very large quantities of material to digest. This can make it challenging, for non-industry stakeholders in particular, to fully absorb and understand the consultation documentation in the timeframes available. We are concerned this may limit our ability to engage effectively. Responding to the uplift of consultations continues to challenge the resources available at Historic England. With no opportunity for cost recovery for the work undertaken we rely fully on our grant in aid based resources to cover this work. We nonetheless remain committed to supporting and advising NESO in the development of the CSNP and associated plans and would therefore welcome a conversation about other ways we can do this e.g. through bespoke and issue targeted meetings, as we have done with the SSEP.