

Assessment of Likely Change to Visual Amenity – [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
through the Introduction of Pylons RG21 and RG22

In writing this observation, I have used the same analogy as the Applicant in an effort to draw distinct comparisons where the applicant has chosen to underplay the impact of the proposals. Due to the increasing high volume of paperwork pushed out by the Applicant, it is not always possible to pick up on given points in a timely manner. An example of this can be seen in the assessment of lightly change to visual amenity, which concludes that there is a significant problem with Nos [REDACTED]. This is absolutely true but the applicant fails to note that the problem is as bad, or even worse for [REDACTED] as well as the house “High Hopes” and the bungalow, “Gable End”, all on Flordon Road and within a short distance of pylons RG 21 and RG 22. All these properties are clearly marked on the maps produced by the applicant, so there can be no excuse for ignoring them. The likely change to visual amenity experienced by receptors at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] High Hopes and Gable End have been assessed with specific reference to the introduction of proposed pylons RG21 and RG22 and their associated overhead line infrastructure. These residential receptors, to use the Applicants own terms, are considered to be of high sensitivity due to the private residential nature of the views and the importance of outlook to residential amenity. Existing views from these properties are presently characterised by an open rural landscape containing agricultural fields, mature hedgerows, tree belts, ponds, woods and wide open skies. There are no other industrial elements visible, save that of the distant pylon line running past Flordon Village. At most you can see [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Existing vegetation along field boundaries and around residential curtilages provides little filtering of views, although open views are obtainable from upper storeys, garden areas and access routes, particularly during winter months when deciduous vegetation is not in leaf.

The introduction of pylons RG21 and RG22 would result in the

addition of prominent vertical structures within the local landscape context. Due to their scale, height and engineered appearance, the pylons would dominate the view from these properties. There would be no escape from the harsh industrial scale, particularly from the impact of RG22. To coin a phrase; it would be in your face from all primary windows at High Hopes. The view of the pylon would be totally uninterrupted save for a four foot high garden fence; there are no trees or vegetation to mitigate the brutal satanic view. The associated conductors would also introduce horizontal visual elements extending across the skyline and short to middle-distance views, increasing the perception of infrastructure within the landscape. The degree of visual change would vary between properties depending on orientation, intervening vegetation and proximity to the proposed alignment. At High Hopes, [REDACTED], where views toward the alignment are open, the pylons will be clearly perceptible and would become defining features within portions of the outlook. The change would be most appreciable from external amenity areas and windows with direct or partially direct views toward the infrastructure corridor. The greatest impact will be on High Hopes where the pylon base will only be at best, about 200m away across an open field. At Gables End vegetation and built form provide a greater degree of filtering and obliquity, reducing the prominence of the structures in comparison with the more exposed receptors. The introduction of RG21 and RG22 would alter the existing composition of views by increasing the presence of large-scale man-made infrastructure within an agricultural landscape. The pylons would contrast with the finer grain and organic qualities of the surrounding vegetation and field pattern, particularly during the initial years following construction before any mitigation planting has matured. Temporary construction activity associated with erection of the pylons will also give rise to visual disturbance, including movement of machinery, construction compounds and soil disturbance. It is understood that there will be a working compound within a few meters of High Hopes.

The magnitude of visual change for receptors at [REDACTED] and High Hopes is therefore considered likely to be major adverse during the initial operational phase, owing to the

prominence and proximity of pylon RG22 within the outlook. Over time, as mitigation planting and existing vegetation mature, effects may reduce slightly but are likely to remain major adverse due to the permanent and substantial nature of the structures. For receptors at Gables End, where views are more filtered and indirect, effects are anticipated to range from minor to moderate adverse.

Overall, the introduction of pylons RG21 and RG22 would result in a clear and perceptible alteration to the visual amenity currently experienced by these residential receptors. The proposal would wholly dominate views and render them unattractive and would introduce visually prominent infrastructure elements into a currently rural outlook, resulting in locally significant changes to residential visual amenity for the nearest and most open receptors. Why has the Applicant not included these properties in its assessment in table A13.4.4 Assessment of Likely Changes to Visual Amenity (Step 4). Is it incompetence or a deliberate attempt to mislead? A simple solution would be to move the pylon route by some 500 m North West, away from the properties, yet still on our land. It would minimise the visual impact and reduce the physical and mental harm to the residence of [REDACTED] as well as High Hopes and Gable End.