

**From:** [Helen Bowler](#)  
**To:** [Triton Knoll Electrical System](#)  
**Subject:** For the attention of Mr Kelvin MacDonald  
**Date:** 21 September 2015 15:48:16

---

Dear Sir,

- 1. Triton Knoll Electrical System ENO20019**
- 2. Viking Link Electrical System**
- 3. Ecotricity Turbines & Electrical System**
- 4. Sleaford PV Panels Wiring – Solar Array**

This is Residents Written Representations:- Deadline 1

It is not possible to assess the huge cumulative effect on Bicker Parish without full simultaneous consideration of all four schemes above, which are likely to be constructed either at the same time or partially overlapping. All have serious consequences for Bicker and in respect of 1. there has been inadequate consultation, and in respect of 2. 3. & 4 there has been no consultation whatsoever with Bicker Parish Council or residents.

Residents grounds for objection are in summary:-

1. Cumulative effect (especially Bicker Parish)
2. Gross visual intrusion
3. Vast environmental damage
4. Loss of large areas of prime agricultural land
5. Effects of the proposed total volume of electrical wiring in Bicker Parish on the health of residents through electromagnetic radiation.
6. Unacceptable traffic volumes, disturbance and distress to residents.
7. Suitable connections and capacity for 1. & 2. available elsewhere
8. Increased flood risk confirmed by Environment Agency

Residents would wish to expand on the items above:-

1. The cumulative effect of the four schemes proposed would have a devastating effect on Bicker Parish, turning an agricultural area into a large industrial zone. This is against Government Policy as set out by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. Bicker Parish already has numerous 400kv towers, 132kv and 11kv poles, two sub-stations (National Grid and Western Power Distribution) thirteen wind turbines. Added would be two further sub-stations and associated wiring, 28 Heckington Turbines by Ecotricity very close, and associated wiring and Sleaford PV Solar Farm wiring which is unfair and unacceptable.

2. Residents and other areas within a ten mile plus radius suffer visual intrusion from the 13 existing and proposed 28 additional wind turbines.

In Bicker there are all the items set out in (1) above and the two new sub-stations will add to the visual intrusion of the Parish turning a prime agricultural area into an industrial zone, which is unfair and unacceptable.

3. & 4. There will be an unacceptable loss of agricultural land across Lincolnshire, especially Bicker Parish. One resident will lose just to RWE 12 ½ acres out of 90, and lose more again to Viking Link, Ecotricity and Sleaford Solar farm. The total loss will be a severe handicap to his agricultural business, and this will be repeated across Lincolnshire. A large part of this environmental damage could be avoided by the use of existing connections and capacity near Grimsby. The only criteria appears to be cost,

which is unacceptable, and should be the last consideration.

5. Residents cannot find a full comprehensive report on the electrical wiring overall in Bicker Parish, if all four additional schemes are given permission. With four sub-stations and very substantial volumes of overhead and underground wiring, what is the effect on residents health of all the electromagnetic radiation? A full comprehensive report is required before any of the four new schemes is approved. On a personal note, I have both 11kv overhead wiring, and wiring joining the existing 13 wind turbines to the grid within a few feet of my house and already suffer serious ill health.

6. Whilst RWE says that construction traffic will use the new roads to be constructed off the A17, residents are concerned at the loose wording of the undertaking and details of how it will be enforced. During construction of the existing sub stations and wind turbines, Bicker suffered some 355000 recorded vehicle movements past my property (measured by Lincolnshire County Council) with 155000 of these vehicles speeding. There was also substantial construction traffic that used other routes, to avoid the Lincs C.C. camera, when they knew that they were breaking planning conditions eg, starting at 4am when conditions dictated light traffic at 8am and heavy traffic 9am and no weekend working. The volume of traffic was a large multiple of that set out in the planning applications. So any figures set out by RWE, NG, and Ecotricity and Sleaford PV Panels will need very careful checking and proof of accuracy. During the existing constructions, this area suffered 57 losses of water supply because by using Cowbridge Road large vehicles are unable to pass without running over either the wiring to the wind turbines or residents supplies of water and telephone / broadband. The road is very narrow, in poor condition and totally unsuitable for large volumes of traffic. This has been confirmed by Bicker Parish Council, Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council. Local residents needed to call the police 210 times during the construction of the existing sub stations and wind turbines, for problems ranging from dangerous driving to threats of violence from sub contractors because residents had lodged complaints. The traffic control was very poor, with residents having to telephone an N.G. office in Loughborough, many miles away , who would then telephone the site. With N.G. visiting the site only at irregular intervals the contractors were given a free hand, and there were many violations of planning conditions. In addition, promises made during planning applications such as the provision of wheel washes and regular sweeping of mud off the roads, were not done. This caused a shocking level of distress and inconvenience to local residents who had to contend with many hours daily of noise, clouds of diesel fumes, dirt, dust, and when wet seas of mud. There are no footpaths in this area, and the road has to be used for walking by residents. The local roads are already well used by agricultural traffic and local businesses, and are totally unsuitable for heavy volumes of industrial construction traffic in addition. Obviously the volume of agricultural traffic varies significantly on the time of year because of ploughing, seeding, spraying, harvesting etc. The local roads are dangerous with numbers of accidents, but no deaths so far.

7. There are no technical reasons why the sub stations should be built on Bicker Fen. There are many alternatives in Lincolnshire and the pain should be spread across the county. The cumulative effect on Bicker Parish is totally unreasonable and unacceptable. There are both connections and capacity available near Grimsby for 1 & 2 thus avoiding much of the environmental damage across Lincolnshire, and the cumulative effect on Bicker Parish. There appears to be one and only one consideration i.e. cost. There should be much more emphasis on damage to be caused, destruction of agricultural areas with inappropriate industrial development, and damage, distress and inconvenience to residents. Cost should be well down the list.

8. Following damage to three of the five pumps used to clear water from local fens,

including Bicker Fen, the remaining two are to be decommissioned as the Environment Agency has confirmed they have no money to repair or replace any of the pumps. The Agency has confirmed that the risk of flooding on local fens, including Bicker Fen, will increase. It is totally inappropriate for more and more industrial development on this known flood plain, as this will increase the risk both to the existing industrial infrastructure and local properties and businesses, especially the large agricultural businesses.

It is unreasonable and unacceptable for Bicker Parish to be trashed in this way, especially when completely contrary to Government policy.

### **Comments on Examining Authority's First Written Questions.**

**DC01.26** Applicant should not have deemed consent to fell or lop trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

**DC01.29** (plus 1.10) It is vital that all the works to be done by National Grid are recorded and monitored, especially for traffic, in view of N.G.'s record of causing severe problems in this area.

**DC01.41** It is vital that a new full flood risk assessment is undertaken because the level of risk in this area has increased (confirmed by the Environment Agency) because of the loss of pumping facilities for Bicker and other fens in the area.

**DC01.47** There can be no justification for 12 hour 6 day per week working, to the detriment of local residents. How will the hours be monitored? What systems are to be put in place to ensure that no RWE or NG traffic uses Bicker Village roads (including Ing Road, Ing Drove, and Cowbridge Road) and only uses the new access roads? What systems are to be set up for residents complaints to RWE and NG?

**DC01.70** It is absolutely vital that Boston B.C. Article 4 Direction is applied to this proposal, including NG. It is essential that Boston B.C. has some control as from past experience residents will suffer totally unacceptable levels of destruction of their lives by this proposed construction work, especially traffic.

Please remember that local residents have years of experience, often on a daily basis, of how people are treated by N.G. Unless you lived in this area you can have no concept of the level of inconvenience, distress and health problems caused by N.G. through their contractors and sub-contractors. I personally found N.G. to be arrogant, dismissive, unhelpful, disrespectful of residents problems and unwilling to listen to complaints. RWE and NG must be strongly controlled and closely monitored at all times, with fully detailed planning conditions put in place that are not ambiguous and stop residents being abused. Residents fully support Article 4 Direction.

**Alt 1.1** There is no technical reason for the use of Bicker Fen for Triton Knoll or Viking Link. Numerous other sites are available, which would spread the industrialisation and stop the totally unacceptable level of cumulative effect and loss of top grade agricultural land in Bicker Parish. Bicker Fen is chosen because it is the cheapest option, which should be very low on the list of considerations.

**Alt 1.8** Following the closure of two power stations, there is undoubtedly both connections and spare capacity for both Triton Knoll and Viking Link available at sub-stations near the east coast. The Environmental Statement must be updated noting that the vast environmental damage across Lincolnshire could be avoided.

**Alt 1.38 & 1.39** Residents were horrified at any suggestion of the use of green zone, which is far too close to residential properties in Bicker and Northorpe, and has no suitable traffic access. The environmental problems with Hammond Beck and the Brown Fen Waterway Trial would be unacceptable. The site lines from residential properties and

Bicker Village would be unacceptable. At a public meeting in Bicker on the night before RWE's presentation it was unanimously decided that all four proposed sites were to be rejected. Obviously RWE ignored this and just said they were using one of the four proposed sites, which is not consultation. Out of the four sites, green is out of the question, red is too exposed and difficult to screen, and yellow was not in Bicker Parish. Yellow would be much more acceptable from an environmental point of view as a railway with spare capacity runs next to the site and could have been used for bulk materials delivery reducing drastically the level of lorry traffic. Out of the three Bicker sites, the blue zone is furthest from the village and residential properties. There is no technical reason why any of the four sites set out should be used as there are numerous alternatives. The blue zone will cause the least damage to Bicker so long as all RWE and NG traffic is directed to use the new access roads and not roads through and out of Bicker village.

**CA 1.4** It seems unreasonable that private foreign companies have any powers of compulsory purchase in the United Kingdom, and this threat should not be used as it has been to try to force landowners to agree to give up their land.

**CA 1.13** The access roads to both the proposed new substations for RWE and NG (Viking Link) should be clearly delineated and must be used at all times avoiding Bicker Village and all roads leading out of the village.

**EON 1.1** It is essential that all four proposed projects set out in my heading are fully  
**& 1.2** assessed now because the level of cumulative effect and loss of Grade 1 / 2 land are clearly unacceptable on Government policy grounds. Food self sufficiency is a Government priority flowing the reduction from 75% to 60% self sufficiency in recent years. Industrial sites must be used for these projects and not greenfield sites, just because they are cheaper to develop. The NG Viking Link interconnector should not be allowed to hide what must be an almost finalised project to avoid the problem of cumulative effect and loss of agricultural land. Both schemes need simultaneous assessment for environmental damage on a huge scale across Lincolnshire. There has been no consultation of any description by NG with residents or Bicker Parish Council.

**Eon 1.15** Bicker Turbines (Wind Prospect Ltd now EDF Energy Renewables). The proximity of the turbines is another reason why the green zone should not be used. The blue zone is further away and should cause less damage as only the underground wiring from the sub-station to the NG existing sub-station will need completely. No possible damage would be caused by to EDF turbines if an industrial site near the east coast is used. Again, residents need assurance that the RWE & NG traffic is strictly controlled and uses the new access roads.

**Eon 1.27** Residents have been told that construction work in Bicker Parish will start in 2016. The whole wording seems to indicate that the project is a "done deal". The RWE and NG projects should be sited on industrial land near the east coast.

**LV 1.21** I have a letter from National Grid stating that the works on the existing sub-station will be "minimal". Residents do not accept that this is correct, and we request that explicit details of exactly what will be constructed at the existing sub-station is taken into account under cumulative effect. We request that all NG traffic uses the new access roads and not Bicker roads. There are at least 4 schemes now in the pipeline at either the NG or Western Power Distribution sub-stations which should be detailed and assessed simultaneously for cumulative effect.

**LV 1.24** The visual impact on Bicker Parish on a cumulative basis is totally unacceptable for this agricultural area. The damage must be spread round or preferably designated to industrial sites elsewhere. Bicker Parish cannot be trashed in the way it is proposed by the existing and new schemes.

**SE 1.1** It is not accepted that the effect on agricultural operations will be negligible on reinstatement. Much of the land is very wet and the construction will cause a lot of damage. This land will not just magically become fertile and usable for a long time, probably years. The effect on farmers incomes and valuations will be severe and ongoing.

**TT 1.11** Regarding traffic data, please analyse the figures very carefully, as we know from bitter experience that traffic figures for the existing NG / WPD sub-stations and 13 turbines were wildly inaccurate, on the low side. This is comparing the figures submitted on the planning applications compared to actual volumes.

Please note that the economic benefits to this area have been non-existent from the existing sub-stations and turbines. Residents were told in the planning applications that cheap electricity and share holdings could be possible, but needless to say when I pursued these aspects I was just told to go away and forget what had been said.

There were no known jobs created in this area from the existing schemes, and Bicker has seen only environmental damage, loss of agricultural income and reductions in property values. The assertions of economic benefit should be closely examined and questioned.

Yours faithfully,

D.J. Bowler & H.P. Bowler

Dear Sir,                    **Summary**

1. List of proposed schemes, now a minimum of 4 and the need for full assessment of cumulative effect and loss of prime agricultural land simultaneously.
2. Residents grounds of objecting 1 – 8 with more detailed expansion of the objections.
3. Comments on Examining Authority's First Written Questions covering  
DCO1.26, 1.29, 1.41, 1.47, 1.70,  
Alt 1.1, 1.8, 1.38, 1.39  
CA1.4, 1.13,  
Eon 1.1, 1.2, 1.15, 1.27  
Lv1.21, 1.24  
SE1.1  
TT1.11
4. Comments on economic benefits.

The overall submission is that the scheme should be rejected because of Government policy on cumulative effect, loss of prime agricultural land, and inadequate consultation.

Yours faithfully,

D.J. Bowler & H.P. Bowler

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.