

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

[REDACTED] Farm is definitely a three-storey building. NG's ignorance in simply looking at the description by Historic England is not believable, especially as it then goes on to state that "this assessment has been informed by site visits and aerial and street-view imagery." If NG has done a site visit and looked at aerial and street-view imagery, then surely it can see that [REDACTED] Farm is three storeys high and not two. Failure by NG to do the job properly and deliberate down-playing of the true situation to suit NG's needs.

Once again, we would repeat that, although NG states that the Asset, [REDACTED] Farm, is "screened from view by a well-established hedge that lines the road," this is categorically not the case. The scrubby and badly maintained (by the current owner of the farmland opposite the Asset) hedge will clearly be grubbed out by NG. Any replacement hedge will not in any adequate way hide four 50m high pylons. The owners' long-established hedge is 1m tall rising to 1.7m tall. Again, entirely inadequate to shield against 50m pylons. There are four trees in the front garden, one of which needs to be removed as it is dead, and, once again, these trees are entirely inadequate in reducing the impact of the pylons.

The Applicant states that "the tops of pylons TB1, TB2, TB3 and TB4 may be visible over the top of mature tree cover to the south." Again, deliberate down-playing by the Applicant – it is obvious to anyone that the pylons will without doubt be visible over the top of mature cover. These pylons would be 50m tall, and to suggest that they may simply be visible is drastic understatement. In fact NG effectively goes on to admit this, as it then states that "additional screening planting was considered but found unlikely to reduce the effect meaningfully and could potentially alter the existing character of the setting." The Heritage Asset, [REDACTED] Farm, is, put quite simply, too close to NG's proposed substation or, put even more simply, NG should not be building their proposed substation so close to this Heritage Asset.

NG states that "adverse effects from operational noise are not expected at [REDACTED] Farm." However, in its Volume 6 Environmental Statement, 14.7 Operational Noise Assessment, 14.7.5, NG refers to the Heritage Asset [REDACTED] Farm as "the worst affected receptor R.10 [REDACTED] Farm." It goes on to state that "the context is a relatively low specific noise level in a rural area, above existing average levels of ambient noise during night-time periods (36dB LAeq, 16h)" and "the specific noise level marginally exceeds the SOAEL during daytime and night-time periods. Outcome – likely significant effect." Once again, deliberate downplaying and failure to represent the truth by NG about its disastrous impact on a Grade 2 Heritage Asset.

The Applicant goes on to state that "through routing and siting the Applicant has sought to reduce as far as practicable potential impacts on the historic environment including listed buildings." There is a simple answer to this – No, it has not. Not only will the Grade 2 Heritage Asset, [REDACTED] Farm, be severely impacted, but close by the Grade 2 Heritage Asset, Hungerdowns (no. 1112091) will also be impacted.

NG also states that "during construction and operation phases this Asset will experience a temporary, during construction and permanent during operation, moderate adverse significance of effect" and "a mid-less than substantial harm." Once again categorically not true, as explained above. This is deliberate down-playing, of which NG is well aware, simply to suits its plans.

NG states that "the Statutory Consultation route for the N2T pylons has carefully avoided homes." No it has not. In the case of this Grade 2 Heritage Asset, [REDACTED]'s Farm, which is also a family home and has been for nearly forty years, NG has very definitely not carefully avoided it. Very obvious

misrepresentation, untruths and deliberate downplaying by NG, once again to suit its own plans. It also states that “most of the residential property along the route that are marginally impacted can be protected from visual impact with screening.” Categorically not the case with ██████ Farm, which will have no less than five pylons, TB1, TB2, TB3, TB4 and TB5 looming over this Grade 2 Heritage Asset. Once again, very obvious misrepresentation, untruths and deliberate downplaying by NG

The Applicant states that “the pylon routes have followed several principles including the Holford Rules. However, the Holford Rules state under Rule 2 that “where possible choose routes which minimise the effects on the setting of areas of architectural, historic and archeological interest including Conservation Areas, **Listed Buildings**, Listed Parks and Gardens and Ancient Monuments.” It **is** possible to avoid impacting the Listed Building ██████ Farm, but NG has chosen to deliberately ignore this. Under Rule 3 the Holford Rules state that “Other things being equal, choose the most direct line, with no sharp changes of direction and thus with fewer angle towers.” Again NG has chosen to ignore this by deviating off the main N2T line with its diversion to Ardleigh/Little Bromley. NG intends to change top quality and very high grade farming land into a major industrial area with its connecting wind farm locations, solar farms and battery parks. It should be choosing one of the less expensive and better options, and not destroying East Anglia for its own selfish greed and for the inflated egos of a few politicians. Rule 6 of the Holford Rules states that “In country which is flat and sparsely planted, keep the high voltage lines as far as possible independent of smaller lines, converging routes, distribution poles and other masts, wires and cables, so as to avoid a concentration or ‘wirescape’.” There is currently a line of pylons running into the smaller substation in the Ardleigh/Little Bromley area, and this will **most definitely** create a wirescape. Failure by NG to make proper representation for their own gain and advantage, and again causing a huge detrimental impact on the Grade 2 Heritage Asset, ██████ Farm.

NG mentions the Beauly-Denny Report 2024 commissioned by Scottish Renewables. Clearly NG is trying to squirm its way out of any obligation with its pathetic claim from that Report that the “average house value remained consistent in the areas where the new pylons and infrastructure were constructed.” It has already been proved by the owners of the Grade 2 Heritage Asset, ██████ Farm, that this is not the case, as this property has been on the market for almost a year with only one viewing.

NG goes on to state “some potential buyers could be deterred while others are entirely unbothered.” NG, please show us buyers who are “entirely unbothered?” It should also be made clear that mortgage companies are unwilling to lend to proposed purchasers of properties near pylons or substations. These are facts that NG has chosen to deliberately and wilfully ignore.

The current owners of the Grade 2 Listed Heritage Asset, ██████ Farm, would reiterate that they have tried to communicate with NG regarding the position NG have forced on the owners. There has been **no** response to a meeting held on 19th June 2024 with a representative from NG and a representative from Fisher German, despite their assurances about a response within a couple of weeks of that meeting. There has been **no** communication from NG, either directly or through the owners’ agent in response to that meeting. Why not?

Apparently the Applicant is “surprised” to hear about this stated lack of communication. The Agent appointed by the owners has only had talks on Heads of Terms with Fisher German, and still nothing has materialised. NG claims to have engaged with communities throughout this proposed project, whereas the truth is that NG knows this an ill-conceived and rushed-through project, and is therefore avoiding engagement and contact with communities as much as it possibly can.