

12/3/26

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

RID [REDACTED]

Comment on written representations, including applicant's Response to Relevant Representations and Errata List EN0027

The applicant's errata list Document 8.1 Final Issue A February 2026 Ref EN020027, along with other Errata documents, fail to correct errors and omissions detailed in my 'Relevant Representation' (26 November 2025) and included in the Examination Library.

These relate to residents directly south of the A1071 who would be impacted by the project to a considerable degree. Many properties are within 200m of the proposed overhead line. The applicant's assessment is contained in *Document 6.13.A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 – Residential Virtual Amenity Assessment – Part 1* and relevant extracts start at page 52.

The applicant carried out a more detailed 'Step 4 Assessment' for some of these. ZTV map 6.13.F10 Environmental Statement Figure 13.10 - *ZTV of Bramford Substation Extension (Final Issue A)* demonstrates the substantive cumulative visual amenity impact across the area.

Errors include:

A property known as 'The Bungalow', opposite The Palms, is omitted, despite the significant impact accepted for nearby properties including The Palms.

Rose Cottage is recorded as a detached property. In reality it is semi detached and adjoins West Cottage which is thus omitted. Land associated with West Cottage is within the order limits and compulsory purchase notices apply. It is thus a relevant property.

Finjaro is included but is a guest house and there would thus be a socio-economic impact which should be appropriately referenced.

The residual visual amenity assessment for the immediate area is therefore incorrect and the conclusions are flawed.

As the ExA has noted, the applicant's thematic responses fail to address many detailed issues raised by statutory consultees and local communities.

These include issues raised in my representation relating to:

- Problems of access for the construction of tower 16
- The mitigation afforded by micropositioning
- Lack of mitigation proposals where the applicant has accepted there are significant residual visual impacts

If the applicant continues to leave these matters unanswered or fails to provide valid reasons, I respectfully request the opportunity to speak at relevant future hearings.

Yours sincerely

John Foster