

E S Cole & Sons Limited are one of the most heavily burdened landowners on the entire route with currently 9 pylons planned on their holding stretching from the most northerly point of their farm at Winfarthing to near enough the most southerly.

This accounts for nearly 10% of Pylons along the route in Norfolk alone, yet their requests to move pylons to the east (not even off their ownership) have been disregarded without any real justification other than concerns over impacting neighbouring residential property (which appears extremely limited). This argument seems quite perverse in that (very few) homeowners who are not having the burden of pylons sited on their own land are considered more important than a landowner that is required to take 10% of the counties planned pylons.

E S Cole anticipate that the relocation of pylons (RG061-RG069) would save NG costs in compensation due which can only be considered a positive when cost appears to be the primary driver for overhead lines in the first instance, in contrast to underground or offshore alternatives.

We cannot see any economic or engineering reason why these proposals should not be accepted and the suggested locations move the pylons behind existing woodland and hedge lines and in the corner of arable fields, reducing landscape, agronomic and environmental impacts.

E S Cole were astonished to note the weight that has been given to economic and social benefits of aerodromes which we understand to be the driver for an entire shift of the pylon locations further south along the route moving pylons east towards the village of Palgrave (and a large number of residential dwellings). From our research it is a local airstrip that appears to be a privately owned, infrequently used personal aerodrome that from what we can tell offers no community or social benefit. We find it very difficult to understand that NG have relocated pylons a significant way from this airstrip to allow continued use which appears to benefit nobody other than the owners of the airstrip. This approach is clearly to the detriment of numerous neighbouring residential properties and appears a direct contradiction as to why the Coles requests to move the pylons marginally east on their holding could not be accepted by NG.

E S Cole's farm is enjoyed by the residents of Winfarthing offering walks and footpaths throughout the holding. It delivers far greater social/ community benefit than a private airstrip, notwithstanding the landowners are to be burdened by up to 9 pylons. Our enquiries suggest that Brook Airfield were originally to have no pylons, it was just an issue of clearance between the runway and the overhead lines that resulted in the route realignment. We would be interested to know why NG have tolerated such a significant route adjustment in some instances but will not accept a marginal repositioning of pylons to the east of ES Cole's farm to utilise natural screening and reduce the agronomic impact by siting them in field boundaries and corners.

My clients have offered to meet with NG on site to better highlight the impact and why the repositioning has been requested but this offer has not been accepted. In light of the above comments we sincerely hope the ES Cole route amendments (which have been submitted in detail to Fisher German on numerous occasions) can be reconsidered to save NG money and significantly reduce the impact of the scheme on the farmland, the local community of Winfarthing and the ongoing future of the farming business.

As previously raised, my client has concerns over the validity of the non intrusive ecology surveys carried out. Specifically in regard to the bat surveys, we are aware that cameras were installed at the most southerly point of my clients holding. This is bizarre as the obvious location would be nearer to the farm buildings in the centre of the holding where bats are known to roost. When my client asked the ecologist why they had picked such a location they confirmed that NG told them where to put them. Clearly the ecologist should not be dictated to by NG as to where to install monitoring equipment on the route and it should be down to their expertise and judgement. This makes us wonder if the surveys are valid and we would like a formal response to this concern which has yet to be received on this issue or the route amendment requests in general.

Despite ES Cole being a landowner heavily impacted by the scheme, they do not receive any prior notification of route amendments or adjustments or whether their requests have been considered and the results of such requests. Instead they are only notified when the information becomes available in a public forum.

Given the scale of the scheme falling on this landowner, we expect improved dialogue on landowner specific matters.

