

From: [Jenny Smedley](#)
To: [PINS](#)
Subject: Footprint 2
Date: 06 March 2019 11:13:05

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I have just read and finally deciphered this document:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010079/EN010079-001531-Appendix%2004.09%20Onshore%20Project%20Substation%20Site%20Selection.pdf>

The whole document really shows that NONE of the footprints were totally suitable.

Footprint 2 has 3 red bars – ie major risk to the environment. One of them is noise and vibration, about which they say, “Noise reduction technology and design approach can be considered through the detailed design process to mitigate noise impacts.” Don’t mention vibration though.

The second is LVIA (Land and Visual Impact Assessment) – so also major risk

5.10.2 Option 2 The landform within footprint option 2 is gently undulating with a gentle fall from north-east to south-west for Norfolk Boreas and east to west for Norfolk Vanguard. The sites are located on the edge of the Plateau Farmland LCT and Settled Tributary Farmland LCT. **Both sites have little benefit from vegetative enclosure**, with hedgerows and tree cover providing limited enclosure to the south and west but not on the other aspects. The sites would bring development marginally closer to visual receptors at Ivy Todd, although tucked to the east out of the main channel of views along the river valley to the north. The Norfolk Vanguard site would potentially be more visible where views occur through tree cover along Ivy Todd road and Ivy Todd hamlet.

Viewpoint 1: Ivy Todd Road. Both HVDC and HVAC options of **Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas would be readily visible owing to their location on an elevated plateau**. The HVDC option would form a more notable feature owing to its larger scale halls. Norfolk Vanguard would appear more prominent owing to its location to the fore, such that it would largely screen Norfolk Boreas. Norfolk Boreas would be mostly screened by tree cover, especially the HVAC option. Norfolk Vanguard would be mostly exposed.

Viewpoint 2: Lodge Lane South. In the HVAC options, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas would be concealed apart from occasional components visible through trees. In the HVDC option, the halls of **Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas would be visible along the ridge**, although partially screened by tree cover and benefitting from favourable scale comparison with trees.

Viewpoint 3: Lodge Lane North. Visual assessment not completed at this stage. The final visualisations will be compiled as part of the environmental impact assessment process and presented as part of the final Environmental Statement. 27 July 2017 PB4476 PB4476 20

Viewpoint 4: A47 Necton substation. Both HVDC and HVAC options for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas would be screened by intervening landform and Necton substation.

Viewpoint 5: A47 Spicer's Corner. **Norfolk Vanguard HVDC and HVAC options would**

be exposed and prominent on ridge of plateau - HVDC especially evident owing to the scale of the halls. HVAC option would be possible to mitigate through planting in the medium term, while HVDC option would take the longer term to mitigate. Norfolk Boreas would be screened by Norfolk Vanguard, thus reducing cumulative effect.

Viewpoint 6: A47 Top Farm. Norfolk Boreas HVDC and HVAC options would be largely screened by tree cover. Left extent of Norfolk Vanguard HVDC and HVAC options would be screened by tree cover with remainder exposed albeit not as prominent as in VP 5.

HVDC would be especially evident owing to the scale of the halls. HVAC option would be possible to mitigate through planting in the medium term, while HVDC option would take the longer term to mitigate.

Viewpoint 7: Ivy Todd Road East. Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas HVAC options largely screened by intervening landform and tree cover with very limited visibility. Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas HVDC options largely screened by landform and tree cover, with partial visibility of halls through trees.

Viewpoint 8: Chapel Road, Necton. Both HVDC and HVAC options for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas would be screened by intervening landform, apart from **tips of the lightning protection mast of Norfolk Vanguard HVDC** which would be seen as minor feature along the ridge.

Viewpoint 9: Crown Lane. Both HVDC and HVAC options for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas are screened by intervening vegetation and landform. While the close proximity of the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas sites would create a well consolidated appearance, their arrangement with long sides both facing south would maximise the horizontal extent that would be experienced from this direction. While this may add to the cumulative effect, existing mature tree cover around Lodge Farm would act to moderate this effect. The Norfolk Vanguard site makes best use of the hedgerows to the west and south but movement north of both sites would make better use of screening effect of Necton Wood. **The elevated location of these sites on the edge of the Plateau Farmland** LCT would mean mitigation through planting would require a longer term period, especially in respect of the HVDC option. Substantial planting would be needed, especially along the southern boundary closest to the visual receptors. The closer proximity of the proposed development to the receptors at Ivy Todd could give rise to potential effects. Option 2 is assigned amber with regards to development considerations for landscape and visual impacts.

It would appear that none of the footprints should have been chosen. I also note that they have missed Ivy Todd Farm out of the residences impacted by visual damage. Why do they keep leaving this farm out? It maybe because in their early documents they missed it out on maps – appearing to be under the impression that it was part of Necton Farms, which it is not.

Please publish this if at all possible.

Jenny Smedley (IP)