

Comments on NG's responses on PEA Appendix I – Heritage Bounds Farm [REP3-137]

“Too close” – the Applicant says it is all the fault of the listed property!

The Applicant feels that as the substation is so close to Bounds Farm there is no way that they can mitigate the impact of the project on the listed building's setting.

The Applicant says that the operational noise from the proposed substation is what it is, and the proximity of the listed building is such that no mitigation is possible. The undergrounding of the substation is apparently too costly - an option to consider whereas it apparently can be justified at Orsett. Have they attempted to value the effect on the historic property's setting and experience of noise?

Laughably the Applicant states that the impact on the historic environment is only temporary during construction, and it is only a permanent impact once the substation is finished.

The Applicant acknowledges that through routeing and siting the proposed substation there is a permanent impact on the listed building. So why did they site the sub-station where they did in the first place?

Through routeing and siting the Applicant has ensured the proposed substation has the maximum impact on the historic environment of Bounds Farm. A “permanent moderate adverse effect” is acknowledged by the Applicant, but this is a blatant misrepresentation and downplaying of the true situation.

“Wirescape”

The Applicant acknowledges there is a potential ‘wirescape’ with the proposed substation and the North Falls and Five Estuaries substations. A breach of the Planning Rules.

Alternatives

Why has compulsory purchase or discretionary purchase not been considered?

The owners, as the Affected Party, were not made aware by National Grid that the property was now classified as Category 2, whatever that is.

Abuse of land ownership

The Applicant has already taken liberties in trespassing on the Bounds Farm site to obtain access to a neighbouring property.