

Submission ID: S2C113142

This is a submission in respect of items covered by the Issue Specific Hearings in the week commencing 27th April AND in response to the Applicants response to the First Written Questions. It is made by myself and on behalf of my husband, interested party ref [REDACTED]

Dear Sir,

This is a further submission made by Interested Party References [REDACTED] in response to the Applicant's response to the First Written Questions and to the proceedings on Day 2 of Issue Specific Hearing 2.

Applicants Response to First written Questions HE 1.34 (Page 319) **Highfields Farm and Coney Byes, West Bergholt.**

I apologise for the detail, but it is necessary to illustrate how inadequate National Grid's assessment has been, as owners of Highfield Farmhouse for over 21 years, we have a very detailed knowledge of the asset and its setting. These comments specifically relate to the references to Highfield Farmhouse but the impact on the neighbouring listed assets, Coney Byes and Kings Hall (referred to as Kings Farmhouse) are similarly understated.

The Applicant states that "The operation (and maintenance) phase of the Project would result in pylons TB39 and TB40 entering the setting of the asset on the opposing eastern bank of a shallow north/south aligned valley that separates the asset and the project." A moderate proportion of the pylons would be visible for the asset, "Pylon TB40 would be visible from the southern access driveway when departing the asset and the pylons would also likely be visible in the background of the view of the asset from the northern access driveway."

ALL pylons from the Sealing End Compound (TB 35 & TB 36) to TB43 & possibly TB44 are visible from the asset and garden, not just the driveway. Pylons would be the dominating feature of the view from every single room. At one of the consultation events, we were shown visualisations from Highfield Farm and it is clear that all the pylons mentioned above would be visible. The images which follow are screen shots so are not particularly clear, the pylons are even more imposing on a clear computer screen.

This image shows TB 34/35 (sealing end compound) and TB37 and TB38. **It does not include the two pylons closest to the house, TB 39 and TB40.**



The views from the South elevation are far reaching across the very attractive valley, there is no screening at all and every pylon across the valley to Fordham will be visible. Pylons TB40 all the way to TB44, and possibly further, will be clearly visible.

The image below shows TB41 onwards – these are considered by the Applicant to have no impact but they clearly do have a very adverse impact.

TB 41

TB42

TB43

TB44



The Applicants own Document 6.13.F14 Environmental Statement Figure 13.14 – ZTV of Great Horkesley (Tilbury side) CSE Compound shows the full structure of the Sealing End Compound gantries will be visible from Highfield Farm (and the neighbouring listed properties). The gantries are significantly smaller than the subsequent pylons. Pylon TB40 sits on a hill and as an angled pylon is likely to be even larger and more imposing than the neighbouring pylons, we would like the Applicant to set out the dimensions of this pylon and assess where it will be visible from as it is in a very prominent position.

National Grid also states that “[Mature tree cover in the intervening landscape would provide some partial screening, however a moderate proportion of the pylons \[TB 39 & TB40\] would be visible.....](#)”

Clearly, more pylons than these two would be visible. As they are positioned on land higher than the trees, any screening would be less than “moderate”, the trees are deciduous so the pylons would be fully visible from bottom to top in winter. Furthermore, some of the trees mentioned are bat willows which are due to be harvested (with saplings replanted) within the next five years and National Grid have also stated that they intend to remove a significant number of the other “screening” trees in order to bury an existing small overhead electricity line on our land.

National Grid also state “[The project would not, however, impinge on the view of the asset from the unnamed road \(*it is Fordham Road*\) to the south west, nor would it interrupt street-level views from the same road to the south-east due to the screening by mature tree cover in the intervening landscape.](#)”

The comments above about the trees also apply here.

In Document 7.12 – Visualisations – Part 5 (copied below) show how the pylons will materially and adversely change the setting of Highfield Farmhouse and how they will dominate the setting. Highfield Farmhouse and its outbuildings are circled in red.



Baseline Photograph



View flat at a comfortable arm's length.

nationalgrid OS reference: 594132E 228219N Horizontal field of view: 90° (cylindrical projection) Camera: NIKON D750
 ACD: 47.61 m Principal distance: 52.2 mm Lens: 50mm Fixed Focal Length
 Direction of view: 45° Paper size: 641 x 297 mm (half A1) Camera height: 1.5 m
 Nearest pylons: 0.31km Correct printed image size: 250 x 260 mm
 Photography Date: 04/15/2023
 Photography Time: 14:19
 Notes: The image shows the baseline photography - the Project is not shown.

Norwich to Tibury
 Figure: 7.12.F112 VP4.14b
 Viewpoint 4.14: Fordham Road, north-east of Fordham



Photomontage



View flat at a comfortable arm's length.

nationalgrid OS reference: 594132E 228219N Horizontal field of view: 90° (cylindrical projection) Camera: NIKON D750
 ACD: 47.61 m Principal distance: 52.2 mm Lens: 50mm Fixed Focal Length
 Direction of view: 45° Paper size: 641 x 297 mm (half A1) Camera height: 1.5 m
 Nearest pylons: 0.31km Correct printed image size: 250 x 260 mm
 Photography Date: 04/15/2023
 Photography Time: 14:19

Norwich to Tibury
 Figure: 7.12.F112 VP4.14c
 Viewpoint 4.14: Fordham Road, north-east of Fordham

National Grid also stated “[The project would have no impact on the relationship between the asset and its garden](#)”. This is also not true. The farmhouse sits at the top of a hill and is rarely without some wind. We have created a landscaped garden next to the pond at the bottom of the hill close to the entrance with a summerhouse and seating/dining area. It is frequently used in summer. TB39 sits just behind it and the wires will feel as if they are almost overhead. They will also interfere with the flightpath of the wildfowl and resident Heron on the pond. National Grid have repeatedly been told about this and their agents have visited.



We therefore wholeheartedly disagree with the conclusion set out by the applicant that “[The Project, therefore, amounts to a minor change to the wider rural setting of the asset only...](#)”

The Project is a material adverse change to the immediate setting of the asset. Furthermore, it is a major adverse change to the wider setting of the valley which runs along a tributary to the Colne Valley and to the Colne Valley itself.

Very specific questions about noise and flooding risk which will affect the property, its garden and access have also been. The response provided to the Flooding Risk appears to be generic rather than specific. The noise concerns given the unique topography of the setting have not been addressed at all.

Issue Specific Hearing 2 – The Colne Valley

As stated above, this project is a major adverse change to the Colne Valley and its tributaries.

The Applicant has acknowledged that the Colne Valley is of high sensitivity and that significant effects would occur up to 1.5km away. They have been asked what assessment they have made or special consideration given to the valley and have responded that no special consideration has been applied.

Although not within a National Landscape, the quality of the valley is similar to the best parts of the Dedham Vale and worthy of protection. When we purchased the property 21 years ago it was in a Conservation Area, such designations seem to have subsequently been changed but it indicates the quality and diversity of the area.

The valley has a variety of significant attributes in parallel with those of a National Landscape, it is a popular and valued walking/cycling and horseriding area with multiple heritage assets.

Colchester Castle and the Water Tower are visible from a number of points through the valley (at ground level!) so the pylons will be visible from these historic and notable sites.

The pylons will significantly adversely affect the setting of the part of the Essex Way which passes from West Bergholt and into the Colne Valley, the guide to the Essex Way states that the “The path is most scenic around the River Colne”. The Essex way is one of the foremost footpaths in the Country with high footfall and its setting should be protected. The pylons will dominate the section of the path as soon as it leaves West Bergholt Village and all along its route to and next to the River Colne.

National Grid have consistently understated the value of this valley and have failed to properly assess it and consider mitigation.

Issue Specific Hearing 2 – The Dedham Vale

The failures of National Grid to avoid harm to the Dedham Vale and to adhere to fundamental duties has been set out widely elsewhere. The Sealing End Compounds and multiple pylons will be visible widely across the Dedham Vale and we support the representations made by Villages Against Pylons.

The Western Sealing End Compound at little Horkesley and its neighbouring pylons would be widely visible across the Dedham Vale.

The Dedham Vale, Stour Valley and Colne Valley form a network of landscapes which are not only beautiful but provide a valuable wildlife corridor, they are diverse in habitats and rich with flora and fauna. Please protect them, not only for the residents and visitors who value and enjoy them now, but for future generations.

Once again, we would value the opportunity to show the Inspectors the area surrounding the Colne Valley and its tributaries.