

CA Hearing Ipswich 11 Feb 26

Intro: Nick Cheeseman Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

I would like to take this opportunity to invite the planning inspectorate to visit our farm and see for them self the permanent damage the pylons will cause to a Nationally Important building and landscape:

My name is Nicholas Cheeseman and as well as being an AP I am representing my Father In Law, Mr Rex Webster and the family farming company G Webster and Son Ltd. We live and [REDACTED], 6 mile due south of Norwich.

I understand that this hearing is nonspecific in terms of Compulsory Acquisition and is looking holistically at the whole project and not individual concerns. Many parts of this project are difficult to understand for several structural reasons and not just the very poor communication. The consultation documents are written defensively and they avoid clear, plain statements.

For non-lawyers, the documentation is extremely technical and fragmented; whilst that legality may be required for the purposes of planning, when it comes to your land being taken from you, it should be in plain English. After all, you wouldn't be expected go into court without an interpreter if you could not speak the language. Understanding the acquisition of your land and how, requires cross-referencing multiple documents over quite literally, thousands of pages. For something that is so significant to so many people it seems unjust for it not to be fully understandable.

There are thousands of pages of information in tabulated form, detailing what land will be required under compulsory acquisition.

There is a detailed legend that explains what the numbers mean when apportioned to each piece of land and there is a clear description of a colour coding scheme that is intended to show on a map how each parcel of land will be attributed to the type of acquisition required. However, the tabulated document and the map are not linked, which means the maps don't clearly identify each parcelled of land that will fall under CA.

On the surface there is the appearance of total transparency, yet in truth, the areas that are considered by the applicant to be problematic appear hidden away within the documents, effectively in plain sight.

Because of the haste that this project intends to be pushed through, we are effectively being asked to put our trust in the applicant in the hope that they are doing the right thing for all. Unfortunately, from what we have seen so far, there is very little trust to be shared about.

And on a closing note, in relation to the applicants KCs comments reference Agenda item 3 at 3.6 regarding a compelling case for the pursuance of the project. Why on earth would anyone agree a contract with such penalties that necessitates the project to go ahead and therefore forcing a compelling case! Is the tail not wagging the dog and if so, why should those living on the route be forced to pay the price.

Thank you for your time, I hope that made a semblance of sense.

Open Floor Hearing 3 Norwich 12 Feb 26 1100 hrs.

Intro: Nick Cheeseman Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

I would like to take this opportunity to invite the planning inspectorate to visit our farm and see the permanent damage the pylons will cause to a Nationally Important building and landscape: This cannot be fully appreciated without coming onto our land as the area to be covered is not all visible from public roads.

I'm sure that the ExA are aware of how emotive this project is but to concentrate on that point for a moment, I farmed our land with my brother-in-law. [REDACTED] Whilst the [REDACTED] killed him in reality, he lost the will to live mainly because the intention is to place a pylon in front of his kitchen window in the house that he and my wife were borne in, on land that he had farmed all his life. As a result, my father-in-law [REDACTED] and he has farmed this land all his life, as had his father etc. So, I object to the proposed installation of 6 X 50-metre- high pylons (RG19 – 24) through the middle of our farm land at Flordon Hall.

Flordon Hall is a Grade II* listed building of national importance, and the site includes two Grade II listed barns, one of which is recognised as a Norfolk Long House and the other, wrongly named by the applicant as a piggery, is in fact a three-story dower house, forming a rare coherent historic farmstead. The proposed pylons, by reason of their scale, height, and industrial appearance, would introduce dominant vertical structures into a historic landscape. They would intrude into key views of the listed buildings and permanently alter the historic skyline. This would result in clear harm to the setting of designated heritage assets, which the National Planning Policy Framework confirms must be given great weight.

We asked the applicant if the route could be changed by moving some of the pylons 500 meters NW. They would still be on our land but far less intrusive. When they did eventually reply they said it couldn't be done for all sorts of spurious reasons. One of the contractors informed us that the main reason the line would not move was because of the convenience for the work compounds and lay down areas on that part of our land. To support this claim, the applicant has just offered one of our neighbours £60,000 for a small parcel of land at the top of our drive. I have serious concerns due to a lack of consultation as I now see they intend to close **the only route** into and out of the farm and to our tenanted cottages. This could potentially cause serious harm to life as it restricts all traffic inc, Fire and Medical services but also all farm deliveries post and refuses collection and the movement of farm vehicles effectively stopping us from working.

Notwithstanding the heritage harm, the proposal presents a serious environmental risk. Our land is crossed by a natural chalk stream that feeds the River Tas, itself a rare and protected chalk stream river. Chalk streams are explicitly recognised in national policy as irreplaceable habitats, and that precautionary principle must apply. Once disrupted, such systems cannot simply be reinstated through mitigation. The Applicant has acknowledged the chalk stream but failed to demonstrate how they will protect the stream and given where they intend to put pylon RG 24, it is extremely likely that they won't be able to.

The farm fields, grade 2, produce award winning barley, they are surrounded by woodland, 10 ponds, pyramidal hedgerows, water margins and grassland all contribute to the wider ecological network in the area. Lower part of the farm forms part of the Norfolk Valley Fens Special Area of Conservation which leads onto Flordon common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This area is home to a number of rare Key Rare Species including: **Narrow-mouthed whorl snail**– very rare in UK and central to the site’s conservation importance. The low meadow and chalk stream also house Bank vole, field vole, and water voles. Wood and door mouse. Water shrew. The farm is home to many bird species including rare birds such as Whitethroat, willow warbler, reed bunting, lapwings, skylarks, snipe and woodcock. As well as Reptiles & Amphibians inc: Great Crested newt and Smooth newt, Common lizard, Grass snake, slow-worm.

An ecological bat survey carried out in one small area of the farm on behalf of the applicant, found 8 species of bats (with over 10,000 movements recorded in one week), including a **population of barbastelle bats which are legally protected** under UK and European wildlife law because of their rarity and conservation concern. The survey team were good enough to share their findings with us. I haven’t seen the results shown up on any of the applicant’s ecological documents, but that could perhaps be because of the thousands and thousands of pages we have to wade through to find anything.

This proposal would cause long-term harm to the viability of the farm. In addition to the multitude of CA, Pylons and easements would restrict machinery movement, disrupt established drainage patterns, sterilise productive land, and impose permanent constraints on farming practice. These are enduring effects that undermine the viability of an active agricultural enterprise.

In summary this project will:

Result in unjustified harm to designated heritage assets, irreversible damage to a sensitive chalk stream environment, decimate rare wild life and would materially affect the operation of a viable agricultural holding.

I believe the Proposal Fails to demonstrate that these harms are necessary or unavoidable.

Thank you