

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Deadline 6
Date: 29 February 2020 11:36:41

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I would like to comment on the following:

ExA Q. 2.9.1.2 The Applicant Public and private views: 1. Further to the comments arising from the ASI [REP4-055] and [REP-4-045], set out how the LVIA methodology you have adopted has taken account of views, picking up the points made regarding public and private. It is requested that this be in a way that a lay person can appreciate, rather than referring back to the LVIA methodology statement in the ES. 2. Explain in this public/private context how Necton is a principal receptor for visual impact. Also, seemingly contrary to the impression gained by IPs on the ASI (above) explain how residential visual amenity has been included, which appears to have been assessed [APP-242, Table 29.13, Viewpoints VP8, VP9, VP10, VP12]. 3. Included in this explain how the viewpoints were selected and agreed with whom. 4. Is there a viewpoint assessed which would represent the views from the camp site referred to by NSAG [REP4-050]? 5. Confirm whether visualisations of what would be seen from peoples' homes were used at consultation events.

The Applicant's response to this question.

A. 1. ***The Applicant has never stated that the proposed development would not be visible from Necton or Ivy Todd....***

This is not true. As a community we are getting really infuriated by the applicant's inaccurate and manipulative responses, like this one, made when denying issues that will affect the rest of our lives in Necton.

To prove that this comment is not true I would respectfully draw your attention to the Recording of Issue Specific Hearing on Onshore effects including the draft Development Consent Order -

Part 3 - 21 January 2020 (link below) from 01.21.07 to 01.21.15, where Jo Phillips (for the applicant) says, **"We actually don't see the substation from the settlement of Necton"**

Comments very similar to this were also made repeatedly by Applicant's representatives at the Accompanied Site Inspection to various people who attended it.

We will see it from ground level in our property's garden, and possibly from our windows (hard to tell) which while on the outskirts of the village in St Andrews Lane, is still within the boundary of the settlement.

https://www.breckland.gov.uk/media/1232/Necton/pdf/Necton_Adopted_Jan_2012.pdf?m=635935511102030000

Ivy Todd being closer to the development is obviously going to see even more than the main area of Necton.

Indeed both Vanguard and Boreas will be seen from as far away as Ashill Common, (5km away) as the Planning Inspectorate will see if they take up the suggestion from NSAG of visiting the Common, and as the photographic evidence sent in already shows.

A 2. St Andrews Lane. Here, the rear facades of residents are orientated towards the proposed development. In the assessment, consideration was given to how their views would be affected by the proposed development, taking into account the potentially fuller extents of visibility from upper floors.

As stated, our property sits on St Andrew's Lane, along with many other residents' properties. The Applicant has never visited any of these residences, and cannot possibly say what will be seen, and any 'consideration' by the Application is yet to be experienced. They speak of "potentially fuller extents of visibility from upper floors" There is nothing potential about it as they would know with certainty had they ever visited the residences.

It should also be noted that the Applicant conveniently doesn't include the National Grid Infrastructure connected to their development in their comments, which can be seen from far and wide in both Necton and from miles away.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010087/EN010087-001569-Issue%20Specific%20Hearing%203%20Part%203.mp2>

Jenny Smedley