

ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 1 – 7TH May 2026 – BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KINGS LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK – DEADLINE 1

Topic and agenda item	BCKLWN Response	References
Need, site selection and alternatives		
3.1	No specific comments on behalf of BCKLWN	
Grid connection		
3.2 ExA's comments, in response to lack of grid connection offer, requesting justification of why the substation is within the Order limits.	Agree (with NCC and other comments) - this issue is fundamental. No guarantee a TCPA app or similar would be supported or granted. Significant conversations took place and amendments were made at the pre-Application stage. Ultimately, the Application will be considered as submitted and additional impacts/comments discussed later on in the Agenda and examination.	
Cumulative effects		
3.3 a) do LPAs agree with assessment of cumulative effects, schemes scoped in etc? b) comments on proposed content on interrelationships with other NSIPs?	a) agreement to list of schemes scoped in and topics covered in each chapter b) no particular concerns at this stage.	
Aviation		
3.4 In regard to MOD/DIOs comments in regard to precision radar and bird strike.	Any solution is not just a matter of satisfying the DIO/MOD – potentially significant knock on impacts on landscape or heritage with any required physical mitigatory works.	
Landscape and visual		

ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 1 – 7TH May 2026 – BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KINGS LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK – DEADLINE 1

<p>3.5 Discussion on landscape and LVIA suitability - Applicant's position is LVIA submission are appropriate and proportionate</p>	<p>We are working with Breckland District Council and provided additional viewpoints for consideration by the ExA as part of Deadline A.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the applicant has worked with us to mitigate harm which the LVIA acknowledges cannot be fully mitigated.</p> <p>Relocation of substation has listened to KLWN concerns and mitigated harm however there are some outstanding concerns regarding treatment of mitigation of actual droves.</p> <p>Mitigation measures will result in framed views of substations for users of the landscape The mitigation measures themselves could therefore result in a negative impact.</p> <p>Requested additional visualisations of Petticoat Drove, Palgrave Manor etc, those viewpoints put forward to Deadline A.</p> <p>Mitigation - careful with this landscape historic character - 17/18/19th century. Breckland's character assessment does thoroughly assess from heritage perspective. Introduction of new landscaping itself could cause harm. Framing views, other pieces of landscape could be harmed in the longer term.</p> <p>Whilst the Council acknowledge our in-depth discussions on the impact of panels and substations, the impact of lighting/fencing/other related infrastructure also needs to be considered. This is a very special landscape. The lighting turning on/off when needed does not remove harm.</p> <p>Fencing along A1065 and surrounding fields will result in additional visual impact from this paraphernalia. Every piece of additional infrastructure has an additional impact over and above that which is already identified as having a degree of harm. Noted to be 'locally appropriate' but lots of this would be entirely new/alien feature given the intensely rural and undeveloped landscape area.</p>	<p>APP-055 PDA-003</p>
<p>Cultural heritage</p>		
<p>3.6 ExA comments in relation to Castle Acre. Assessment of castle</p>	<p>The main matter of concern is the fundamental understanding of why these buildings are <i>where</i> they are and <i>are</i> what they are. Castles were built to dominate their surrounding landscape and</p>	<p>APP-055 APP-057</p>

<p>and priory underplayed. Significance of CA undervalued. Further consideration needed. No explicit reference to level of harm, required for weighting of harm versus benefits.</p> <p>1) adequacy of assessment of setting of assets 2) explain how significance of CA has been considered 3) explain assessment of level of harm</p>	<p>Castle Acre does this particularly well. The valley setting is also rare for Norfolk, visible from a distance - e.g A1065, as is the land's relationship with the church and priory. The scheme impacts upon a Scheduled Monument and Grade 1 buildings of the highest significance.</p> <p>Ultimately the purpose of a castle is that it is visible to/from wider areas and provides views towards wide distance. The view back towards the castle and landscape is just as important as the view from the castle grounds outwards.</p> <p>It is hard to link heritage considerations discussed in the heritage submission with the content of the LVIA,. Given the considerations at hand these documents ought to be better linked. The castle was always intended to be visible and is supposed to have views. Its dominance in the landscape is key and the Council would argue its setting is intrinsic to significance as the Castle was constructed there for a reason.</p> <p>In terms of the Conservation Area, this is a collection of highly grade assets and non-designated assets (see Castle Acre Conservation Area Appraisal). The Conservation Area is visible and recognisable from the A1065 as a grouping of buildings and built to be visible from distances away. The pantile roofs for example are highly visible on approach. The solar panels and associated paraphernalia would all be highly visible in this same viewpoint.</p> <p>Whilst the Council agree with less than substantial to Castle Acre Castle, it is not a low level of less substantial. The level of harm should be considered as at least moderate as a result of the intrinsic significance. The significance is not just aesthetic and the Council agree with Historic England in this regard.</p> <p>The clearly perceptible change in character from one of agriculture to semi industrialised would be harmful to appreciation of the castle's command over the landscape as a whole. As you breach the ridge adjacent to Barts Hill, appreciation of Castle Acre as a village - conservation area impact is moderate, castle setting is moderate. Built to command over the landscape views. Stick to moderate.</p>	<p>AS-060</p>
<p>Flood risk and water resources</p>		

ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 1 – 7TH May 2026 – BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KINGS LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK – DEADLINE 1

3.7	No specific comments from KLWN.	
-----	---------------------------------	--