

## ***Landscape Briefing Note 4***

*Project:* 1080 East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two  
*Date:* 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020  
*Purpose:* Notes responding to SPR's Deadline 2 submissions  
*Reference:* 1080 BN04 Deadline 3.docx

### ***Sequential Developments***

1. On 17<sup>th</sup> November SPR issued a Project Update Note (EN010077-002970-ExA.AS-4.D2.V1 EA1N&EA2) which includes a commitment '*should both the East Anglia ONE North project and the East Anglia TWO project be consented and then built sequentially, when the first project goes into construction, the ducting for the second project will be installed along the whole of the onshore cable route in parallel with the installation of the onshore cables for the first project.*'<sup>1</sup> The reason for making this commitment is to avoid '*a scenario whereby both Projects are constructed completely independent of each other along the onshore cable route.*'<sup>2</sup>
2. No similar commitment has been made with regard to the two substations and the scenario whereby both Projects are constructed completely independent of each other still remains. As a consequence, the uncertainty over both the length of the construction period and the date on which the vast majority of the mitigation planting can be implemented also remains. As previously noted the construction period for the substations should they be built sequentially could be six years or even longer if there was a delay between the implementation of the two projects.
3. SPR have provided no information on how the mitigation planting would be phased should the substations be built consecutively. This implies that the mitigation planting cannot be commenced until both substations have been completed, which will be several years after the Yr 1 operational date for the first substation if they are built sequentially. This increases the period when there would be unmitigated major landscape harm and unmitigated major harm to the visual amenity of residents of Friston and other users of the PRow network to the north of Friston. It also extends the date by which the Yr 15 mitigation shown in SPR's visualisations, which is already highly optimistic with regards to tree growth rates, would be achieved.

---

<sup>1</sup> EN010077-002970-ExA.AS-4.D2.V1 EA1N&EA2 Project Update Note Paragraph 5

<sup>2</sup> EN010077-002970-ExA.AS-4.D2.V1 EA1N&EA2 Project Update Note Paragraph 7

- 
4. The Project Update Note also includes information on a reduced footprint for the SPR onshore substations of 10%. This reduction would be beneficial as it would allow the retention of a small copse in the north eastern corner of the substations. The fact that this reduction has only taken place now is considered to be symptomatic of the failure to date to properly consider existing features within the landscape with regard to micro siting and design. Paragraph 5.9.8 of EN1 requires promoters *‘Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.’* (emphasis added).
  5. Importantly there has been no reduction in the size of the NG substation, where the decision on whether to build a GIS or AIS system has yet to be made. One of the principles in paragraph 9 of the Outline National Grid Substation Design Principles Statement (Doc Ref: ExA.AS-6.D1.V1 - EA1 and EA2) states that *“Appropriate building design and materials will be sought as part of the procurement process. The visual impact of the National Grid substation will be sought to be minimised as far as possible by the use of design, building materials, shape, layout, coloration and finishes, as appropriate.”* Although supported, it is considered, that the outline design principles do not include a sufficiently clear commitment to reducing the overall size of the substation (as well as height of the buildings and equipment) during the design refinement process. It is not clear, for example that minimising harm to the landscape is a consideration in the decision regarding the use of a GIS or AIS system.
  6. Whilst the reduced footprint of the SPR substations will allow the retention of the existing copse, and this is welcomed, the reduction will not be significant enough to reduce the magnitude of change for either landscape or visual effects which will remain as **major adverse** during construction and through Year 1 (potentially a six-year period or longer) only reducing to **moderate/major** at year 15 based on highly optimistic assumptions with regard to tree growth rates.