

Mrs Kerry Culley
Bilsby & Farlesthorpe P.C. Clerk
56 Bridgeways
Alford
Lincs
LN13 6FA

The Planning Inspectorate
By email: easterngreenlink3and4@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

27 August 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: EN0210003 - Eastern Green Link 3 and Eastern Green Link 4 - EIA Scoping Notification and Consultation

I am writing on behalf of Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council with regard to the above matter.

The switching and converter stations which is proposed to be built at Asserby in the Bilsby Parish area, will have a direct and negative impact upon our parish and parishioners.

The people in our parish have grave concerns about the industrialisation of the countryside by both the pylons and switching and converter buildings which are proposed. The footprint of these buildings is estimated to be 100,000 sq. metres for the switching station and 20,000 sq. metres for the converter station. Both buildings are proposed to be up to 30m tall, The area these are planned for, is flat and the vistas both to the coast and inland to the Wolds area, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) would be severely blighted, and have a detrimental effect on the area's two main forms of income and employment, namely the farming sector, which generates £1.3billion across the county and the tourism industry is worth £824m.

The Parish Council firmly believes the country's No.1 priority should be food production. That seems to have been sacrificed on the altar of biodiversity. The amount of top quality land being lost to food production would have a detrimental effect on Britain striving to become more self-sufficient in feeding itself. It would increase the amount of food needed to be imported and inevitably increase the field to fork mileage and increase our nation's carbon output when we should be doing everything to reduce this to achieve the governments net zero goal.

Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council would therefore like to see included with any application, compliance with regulation 5(2) of the EIA Regulations as set out below:

(2) The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors—

(a) population and human health;

(b) biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC(14) and Directive 2009/147/EC(15);

(c) land, soil, water, air and climate;

(d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape;

(e) the interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d).

(3) The effects referred to in paragraph (2) on the factors set out in that paragraph must include the operational effects of the proposed development, where the proposed development will have operational effects.

(4) The significant effects to be identified, described and assessed under paragraph (2) include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the vulnerability of the proposed development to major accidents or disasters that are relevant to that development.

(5) The Secretary of State or relevant authority, as the case may be, must ensure that they have, or have access as necessary to, sufficient expertise to examine the environmental statement or updated environmental statement, as appropriate.

In addition, details should be included which specifically identify and include:

1. Impact on the loss of agricultural land currently important in helping the UK in its food security measures.
2. Comprehensive study and report on the impact such development will have on the tourist industry. In particular, the erection of the interconnector and substations along the main route to the coast and the visual impact from the Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
3. A survey of all local roads and impact thereon in terms of construction traffic both within the parishes affected and along the major routes to be used to access the site(s)
4. A comprehensive and extensive bat survey for the proposed route and the proposed interconnector sites.
5. A comprehensive wildlife habitat and species survey for the proposed route and the interconnector sites and up to 10 metres outside the range of the application site(s), together with mitigation measures to protect all wildlife species in the area including flora and fauna.
6. Impact Assessment on existing underground infrastructure.
7. The cost of repairing the damage caused by heavy vehicles during the construction stages to the road infrastructure, which will probably last years.
8. Calculations for compensation payable to local people whose properties would be blighted or the businesses who would see a substantial drop in their ability to maintain a viable income.
9. The disruption which will undoubtedly be caused to local residences including, disruption to daily activities, light and dust pollution,
10. Impact on local medical and mental health and access to emergency services.
11. Impact on existing infrastructure including damage/pollution to water courses, broad band and telephone disruption due to pylons.

The parish council and the majority of people in our parish would prefer the cabling to continue under the sea and come onshore further south, (in line with National Grid “Beyond 2030 Report). This would negate the need to build the switching and converter stations.

We would urge decision makers to consider all the relevant points and come to the conclusion that the alternative option to build an offshore integrated grid would completely remove the need to destroy prestige countryside by taking the cabling further south where the power is required.

Yours Faithfully

K Culley

Kerry Culley
Parish Clerk
Bilsby & Farlesthorne PC