

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PINS](#)  
**Subject:** Open Floor Hearing 24th April  
**Date:** 29 March 2019 10:40:11

---

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/61934/national\\_risk\\_register.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61934/national_risk_register.pdf)  
Risk

2.88 Many of the impacts which could result from industrial accidents, technical failure or severe weather could also result from a terrorist attack on critical infrastructure. The risk and impact varies according to the importance of the specific infrastructure asset attacked.

2.90 Terrorists in the UK have previously attacked, or planned to attack, national infrastructure. Attempts were made to attack electricity substations in the 1990s. Bishopsgate, in the City of London, was attacked in 1993 and South Quay in London's Docklands in 1996. These attacks resulted in widespread damage and disruption but relatively few casualties. Elsewhere in the world terrorists have carried out attacks against energy infrastructure (in Saudi Arabia and Yemen in 2006) and against financial institutions and government buildings (such as the attacks on the World Trade Centre in 1993 and 2001).

1. Can the applicant assure us that an explosive attack on their substations (perhaps by drones) would not cause widespread damage/loss of life to the communities that will surround them?
2. Can the applicant guarantee us that putting the biggest onshore or offshore windfarm in the world in a readily accessible, highly populated and prominent position will not attract the attention of terrorists?
3. Would the applicant agree that an offshore ring main, with just two substations (away from the population) would be eminently more defensible than many dotted around rural areas? We appreciate that currently an offshore ring main is not available, but if it were, would the applicant agree that it would be a better solution?
4. Does the applicant accept that residents are terrified of the prospect of their 55 acres (Vanguard + Boreas + plus NG extensions), catching fire and becoming a major conflagration, which would also likely spread to Dudgeon, and most likely destroy at least one community, depending on the wind direction?
5. Does the applicant accept that this is an unfair burden to place on an area within reach of peoples' homes?

Jenny Smedley

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PINS](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 6  
**Date:** 30 March 2019 08:43:44

---

Options to help mitigation have been suggested to the developer, wrapping the buildings (this is done in cities and towns) and is a form of camouflage, sinking the site, and underground substations.

<https://www.siemens.com/content/dam/webassetpool/mam/tag-siemens-com/smdb/energy-management/high-voltage-power-transmission/high-voltage-substations/high-voltage-substations/internet/documents/substations-special-buildings-underground.pdf>, but all have been rejected without consideration by the applicant.

Question 1: Can the applicant explain why all these options have been summarily dismissed?

Vattenfall have brazenly manipulated the public. An example of the manipulative effects of the way the 'questionnaires' are phrased. One question asks people simply are you in favour of offshore wind or against it? This is such an open and non-specific question that it is no surprise that the vast majority ticked as in favour.

Should the question not have been more on the lines of are you in favour of having offshore wind infrastructure onshore? *Or*

Do you think each and every windfarm should have it's own cable corridor to the very centre of Norfolk, its own landfall and substation, or do you think there should be an offshore ring main, just one proper substation, a very short cable corridor, and one landfall for ALL of them?

This might have generated a very different result and been fair and open instead of as it was, being couched very much in Vattenfall's favour.

This bias and manipulation has sadly, been the flavour of the whole consultation.

Question 2: Does the applicant deny that their questionnaires have been biased towards themselves?

Question 3: Can the applicant give examples of unbiased questions on the questionnaires?

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PINS](#)  
**Subject:** OSPAR - Deadline 6  
**Date:** 02 April 2019 09:17:20

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I would like to draw your attention to the findings of the OSPAR Commission (OSPAR is the mechanism by which 15 Governments & the EU cooperate to protect the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic – link below) and NASA

OSPAR – pages 2 and 3.

1. electric cable to shore – increase of temperature in sediments during operation - increased risk of botulism in coastal areas (eulittoral) resulting in an increased death rate for wading birds and water birds

2. local destruction and sediment plumes during the construction of foundations - permanent covering of the seafloor - temporary and permanent habitat loss Macrophytes - change of current dynamics and sediment conditions - introduction of artificial hard substrate - habitat loss - alteration in the plant community composition

Point 2 corroborates NASA's finding on sediment wakes from Turbines (2nd link below)

Could the applicant demonstrate that they have taken note of both these items, and answer the following questions please?

1. Does the applicant accept that these two points are correct?
2. What steps are they taking to investigate and mitigate these effects?

[https://qsr2010.ospar.org/media/assessments/p00385\\_supplements/p00385\\_suppl\\_1\\_what\\_is\\_the\\_problem.pdf](https://qsr2010.ospar.org/media/assessments/p00385_supplements/p00385_suppl_1_what_is_the_problem.pdf)  
<https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/89063/offshore-wind-farms-make-wakes>

Thank you  
Jenny Smedley

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---