

Deadline 8 Submission

Interested Party References [REDACTED] (Joanne Elliott)

and [REDACTED] (Richard Davies) of the same address.

We note the Applicants Response to our previous submissions in items 5.2 and 5.4 of document 8.4.17: Applicant's comments on Post-Hearing Submissions and Interested Party Action Points.

In respect of the Independent Landscape Assessments of the Colne Valley, impact on the Dedham Vale and the impact assessment on our own property, [REDACTED], National Grid continue their stance of refusing to acknowledge or genuinely consider any opinion or assessment other than their own.

We did not state that [REDACTED] had not been included in in the Historic Environment Report – we stated that we disagreed with the description and impact assessment and continue to do so. The fact that National Grid can assess the impact of the project on [REDACTED] as “minor adverse residual effect” given their own images and visualisations is beyond belief.

The project will render part of our garden completely unusable as the wires will more-or-less oversail it – how can this be a minimal residual effect.

National Grid state that the residential visual amenity of [REDACTED] has been considered in Document 6.13.A4 but as the area is located beyond 200m of a proposed pylon, effects on it are not considered likely to affect “living conditions”. This is the document which we stated our property had not been included in (alongside others) as there was no evidence in the document that it had been considered. There is no cross referencing to the Historic Environment Report where [REDACTED] and the other properties mentioned have been considered. The criteria for inclusion in these two reports are different and as a consequence, listed properties where there has been an assessment of high impact from the project are not included in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment, so we still maintain that this document understates the number of properties highly impacted by the project.

We still believe that [REDACTED] should have been included in this report. As stated above, the nearest pylon/overhead wire is within 50m of our summerhouse and part of our garden. It is attractively landscaped and in regular use as it offers a sheltered seating and dining area whereas the immediate surroundings of the house (which is on a hill) are usually affected by winds which can be strong and make sitting outside uncomfortable. The nearest pylon will also be within 200m of the end of our driveway and the entrance to the property will be dominated by the pylon opposite and pylons will dominate the approach to the property from both directions. There is no other access to the property. I disagree that this will not affect “living conditions”, it most certainly will and furthermore, my husband's medical condition, referred to below, will mean that this is an area of our garden which we will not be comfortable using at all. This has been pointed out to National Grid and their agents repeatedly.

Regarding the wider landscape, National Grid refuse to acknowledge the qualities of the Colne Valley and its amenities and continue to refuse to consider alternatives to Overhead Lines when this would clearly be appropriate and in fact required under the planning legislation and best practice.

We wholeheartedly disagree with the Applicants conclusions in their responses under these two paragraphs.

There are a number of other points which we have repeatedly raised with the Applicant which have not been addressed;

- Our concerns around flood risk and in particular the road immediately outside our property and access to our property over a fording stream have been ignored. National Grid have directed us to general Flood Risk documentation with no assessment of our site.
- We have pointed out the topography of our location and the way noise is channelled and amplified and our concern about buzzing of cables and wind noise. This has not been addressed. It could severely impact the living conditions at [REDACTED] and its surrounds.
- We have repeatedly raised our concerns about EMFs, a particular concern given my husband's [REDACTED] and that he has an [REDACTED] and proximity of the house and, in particular the garden, to the overhead lines.

The Applicant's documentation states that "There are also 'indirect' effects that can occur as a result of exposure to EMFs, and which are not explicitly covered by the exposure guidelines. Examples of indirect effects are interference with active implantable medical devices (AIMDs), and microshocks" (1.3.6 in REP3-034), and, "2.10.5 The Project would be capable of producing EMFs which, while still compliant with the public exposure limits, are in excess of the reference levels for public exposure. Therefore, in theory, some interference of EMFs with AIMDs could possibly occur." (2.10.5 in REP3-034). The Applicant has told us that they are not aware of any instances where a patient with a modern, correctly fitted device has experienced interference from the electricity transmission system.

This does not give a high degree of comfort. We have contacted the manufacturer of my husband's [REDACTED] and they cannot guarantee that there will not be an impact. There may not have been any reported instances of malfunction because individuals with an implant would not choose to live close to a high voltage overhead line. It is the continual exposure which is of concern and the fact that there may be no indication that the device is being interfered with until it is needed (as has happened on one occasion – which certainly saved my husband's life) and failure would result in death. I certainly would not buy a property anywhere near a HV pylon line for this reason, yet this is being imposed on us.

The Equality Act 2010 rules that those with Protected Characteristics be identified. Those with pacemakers and [REDACTED] have been neglected throughout the process and

remain deeply concerned given the stated **possibility** by the Applicant that the high voltage network may interfere with these devices.

- Environmental Surveys of our land identified trees where bats might be nesting. We know we have bats around the house, over the pond and in the woodland. The Applicant has stated that there are no nesting bats along the route. We know this is not true.
- We have repeatedly pointed out the siting of the overhead line is in the path of migrating geese and would impact with a wide variety of hunting raptors and ground nesting birds. I have recorded around 100 species of birds around our property, some of them rare or endangered species. The Applicant has made no attempt to properly assess this. We were told by ecologists in the initial surveys that our land was ecologically rich and further surveys would be needed which have not been carried out.

We note that the Crabtree Lane Sealing End Compound is sited on top of a Roman Villa site. This typifies the Applicant's disregard for the natural beauty, wildlife and archaeology of this much-valued countryside.

The route through the Colne Valley area is currently unfettered with electricity infrastructure, none is visible from the footpaths around and through Hillhouse Wood, the part of The Essex Way through this valley and the Fordham Hall Estate, providing a tranquil setting and qualities that are not even found in the neighbouring National Landscape. This is valuable and should be preserved.

National Grid have chosen a route through the countryside and are determined to disregard any evidence that more care should be taken to preserve valuable landscapes, the setting of individual properties or communities. Their approach has been combative and arrogant with no compassion or regard for lives and livelihoods being severely negatively impacted.

This project causes severe harm to the Dedham Vale National Landscape and should be rejected on that basis alone. It also causes irreparable damage to nearby valued landscapes. Permanent and irreversible damage.

National Grid have asked communities to tell them what matters and how a community fund of £30m should be utilised. We have repeatedly told National Grid what matters, preserving our landscapes, wildlife and communities. These funds should be used to minimise the damage to landscapes and communities wherever possible or to provide proper compensation to those affected. This project has already been severely damaging to the health and wellbeing of a large number of people and it will have a severe and lasting detrimental impact for generations.

We are shocked that despite the fact that the scale and impact of this project is unprecedented, the Examiners have not been given any more time to review the application than a much smaller project. The volume of documentation is unbelievable.

Impossible for individuals to assess. The examiners been impressive and have asked searching questions of The Applicant but generally these have not been adequately answered as National Grid always hold out with their original stance with an obvious strategy of waiting for time to run out.

The solution to transporting energy from the Offshore wind Farms does not have to be this destructive to the countryside, wildlife and communities. Consent should not be given to this project in its current form. The consequences will be devastating if it goes ahead as set out.