

From: [Enquiries](#)
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: FW: Vattenfall, Norfolk
Date: 25 April 2019 14:42:38
Attachments: [Representation made to Open Forum meeting on 24th April.docx](#)

Think this might be for you.

Thanks
Mark

From: Simon Fowler [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 April 2019 13:38
To: Enquiries <Enquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Vattenfall, Norfolk

Ian,

As discussed I have pleasure in attaching the written version of the submission I made yesterday to the Open Floor Forum in East Dereham, Norfolk. Thank you for agreeing to forward this to the appropriate parties.

Simon Fowler

Representation made to Open Forum meeting on 24th April, 2019 concerning Vattenfall

My name is Simon Fowler and I chair Little Dunham Parish Council. We have some experience of large infrastructure applications such as this, having opposed Warwick Energy for some two and a half years and through two planning appeals in connection with their original application to have the current substation located immediately adjacent to Little Dunham on some of the highest land in Norfolk. That application was eventually withdrawn. The reason I mention this is that the first appeal by Warwick Energy against the local planning authority's refusal failed on landscaping grounds. Warwick Energy were then allowed to alter their application so that the substation would be for alternating current only and this removed the requirement for the large convertor buildings shown in this application. Madam, if you were to decide that no amount of landscape mitigation is going to be adequate then I would suggest that you could follow this example.

Madam, I have been requested by Little Dunham Parish Council to address you only on the question of landscape mitigation. You will appreciate that the applicant's landscaping proposals are not detailed and I would submit that the information supplied shows them to be inadequate. I am aware of the directions issued to applicants as the result of the Rochdale cases. However I would suggest that this should not be used as an excuse by applicants to fail to provide anything other than rudimentary indications of what we consider to be wholly insubstantial landscape mitigation measures. I would like to refer to Mr Justice Sullivan's judgement when he referred to the abuse of the need for flexibility "this does not give developers an excuse to provide inadequate descriptions of their projects. It will be for the authority responsible for issuing the development consent to decide whether it is satisfied, given the nature of the project in question, that it has 'full knowledge' of its likely significant effects on the environment. If it considers that an unnecessary degree of flexibility, and hence uncertainty as to the likely environmental effects, has been incorporated into the description of the development, then it can require more detail, or refuse consent" (para.95).

Such information as we have been able to find indicates that two metre high bunds will be built on which trees will be planted. Firstly it is generally accepted that trees in Norfolk are only in leaf for five months of the year and secondly the applicants themselves on page 117 of Chapter 29 of your papers indicate that after twenty years the trees will be between 6.75 m and 9.05 m high and after thirty years they will be between 9.25 m and 12.55 m high. If you take an average of these figures then the applicant is admitting that the trees will come up to only half the nineteen metres height of the substantial convertor buildings. This should be unacceptable.

Madam, our request to you is that you require the applicant to provide detailed plans and proposals at this stage for effective landscaping particularly from the viewpoints along the A47, ie. viewpoints 5 and 6 before you grant the Development Order and we would like an opportunity to consider such proposals. The applicant concedes on page 121 of Chapter 29 paragraph 163 table 29.15 that there is the potential for significant cumulative effect from the views from the A47 and surely this should be minimised.

Madam, you will be familiar with the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy E.N.1. You will be aware that paragraphs 5.9.18, 5.9.19 and 5.9.20 deal with the visual impact of a development and paragraphs 5.9.21, 5.9.22 and 5.9.23 deal with mitigation. I would respectfully suggest that these paragraphs put an obligation on you to consider full proposals to minimise the adverse landscape and visual effects both on site and off site. We would suggest that this made difficult for you from the scanty information that has been provided by the applicants relating to landscape mitigation.

Madam, you will also be familiar with Appendix A to the National Grid Guidelines for the siting of substations. These require applicants to set out mitigation measures where significant adverse effects are identified and refer specifically to design, colour, landscaping and tree planting. Madam, we are fortunate to have on our Parish Council a man with both practical experience and academic qualifications in landscaping and we would be prepared to help with and comment on the measures referred to in Appendix A but we are unable to assist without more detailed plans and proposals being available.

Madam, it is within your powers I think to request that the applicant provides more specific details of landscape mitigation at this stage and I would hope that you press for this and allow time for further discussion.