

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PINS](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 7 - includes 3 different points.  
**Date:** 25 April 2019 10:17:57  
**Attachments:** [1. \[REDACTED\] to Jenny Smedley showing her original question.eml.msg](#)  
[2. Email conversation sent in error.eml.msg](#)  
[3. \[REDACTED\] first response.eml.msg](#)  
[4. Apology \[REDACTED\].eml.msg](#)

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate

#### 1. EMAIL CHAIN

As requested, I attach the original emails with headers that I was asked to submit at the OFH last night (25th April 2019).

Please note while answers were addressed as if to the NSAG – I sent the question to [REDACTED] as a **private** individual. The question they attempted to answer was sent some time previously by NSAG from the group's official email address.

To recap:

I emailed a question to [REDACTED] regarding a statement he made to a small group of us at the preceding Drop In, merely asking him to confirm what he had said.

After a few reminders I got email 2, which showed that he had immediately shared my email with many people, who had then conducted a long email conversation.

This conversation I interpreted as an attempt at collusion by the NG and Vattenfall, discussing my question and finding ways to manipulate it to the best advantage of the developer.

I did not find this behaviour to be honest, and was very concerned by it. It seems to me that the NG and the developer were acting from a perspective of best profit and not best environmental outcome.

[REDACTED]

One of the most informative phrases in the reply was this one which came from [REDACTED] (I have picked this out as the email chain changes fonts and text size and that makes it easy to miss things: *On the alternative site I'm a little wary about implying that two substations sites (Necton as is and another) is definitely worse in environmental terms than extending.*

1. Shows my original question to [REDACTED], which was never in fact answered. The email conversation they sent me in error attempted to answer a question I never asked.

2. Shows the eventual answer to a question I didn't ask and the conversation sent to me in error.

3. Response from [REDACTED]

4. Apology from [REDACTED]

It was an apology, however it was an apology for sending me the conversation, (and thereby implicating themselves) and NOT for sending my private email to 3 different companies.

Regards  
Jenny Smedley

## 2. OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

Many of our questions from Necton residents were not answered by the developer at last night's meeting, and we hope they will therefore be asked by the Inspectorate.

## 3. CONSULTATION

At the OFH last night Mr Houghton (WBD) stated that Vattenfall had made changes such as switching to HVDC in response to popular demand. Where/when was Necton consulted on this? No-one in Necton has ever or would ever have asked for a switch to HVDC. This is an obvious fact. Necton was never consulted on this change.

Necton was never consulted on the final choice of substation site but were presented with a fait accompli of 4 footprints over just a few fields, with very little to choose between them.

They were then presented with the final chosen footprint.

I apologise for leaving the meeting last night before the end, but was constrained by medical advice to do so.

Jenny Smedley

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: EXT || Re: Necton substation  
**Date:** 05 March 2018 11:34:54

---

Hi Jenny, how are you?

Just catching up with mails, apologies for the delay, have been extremely busy.  
I've penned up a draft for a full reply to your question, I'm just awaiting a confirmation from a colleague on a couple of points. Plan to have full reply to you in a couple of days.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jenny Smedley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 March 2018 17:07  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** EXT || Re: Necton substation

Hello [REDACTED] You said to send you any design questions....

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 27, 2018 12:24 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Necton substation

[REDACTED]  
A group of us (Jenny Smedley, Tony Smedley, Alice Spain, Susie Spain and Simon Nunn) spoke to you at Vattenfall's last presentation in 2017, and you told us that Vattenfall had not consulted with the National Grid regarding the possibility of an alternative site that we had suggested to them near Scarning. All those present have confirmed that you said that.

Can you confirm that please?

Thanks  
Jenny

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [catrin.jones@vattenfall.com](mailto:catrin.jones@vattenfall.com); [robert.driver@vattenfall.com](mailto:robert.driver@vattenfall.com); [ruari.lean@vattenfall.com](mailto:ruari.lean@vattenfall.com); [Knight-Gregson, Steve](#)  
**Subject:** RE: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area  
**Date:** 13 April 2018 10:43:33

---

Dear Jenny,

Thank you for your emails of 27 February and 21 March and apologies for not coming back to you sooner.

On the question of alternative connection locations, Vattenfall and National Grid concluded in 2016, after considering a range of options, that Necton was the most co-ordinated, efficient and economical when compared to other options including building a new substation site. That's because building a new substation would result in a larger footprint overall and more extensive works to connect the new site to the transmission network.

I understand my colleague Mr Stokoe explained the broad principles in his email of 30 June last year. Extending the existing Necton 400kV substation to connect the two wind farm projects proposed by Vattenfall would change it from a 6 bay substation to a 17 bay substation. Extending the existing substation in that way is the most co-ordinated, economic and efficient option, because the extended substation would be capable of accommodating the two proposed Vattenfall wind farms and the Dudgeon offshore wind farm that is already connected there. An extended substation configured in that way would meet the National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standard that we operate the network to.

The alternative you suggest would still require a large 14 bay substation just for the two Vattenfall wind farms. That would be in addition to the existing 6 bay Necton 400kV substation which connects the existing Dudgeon offshore windfarm. In addition, there would be more substantive overhead line connection works and a direct connection will be needed to be maintained between the two substation sites to maintain the integrity of the transmission system. Those connection works would be more extensive than the works required in extending the existing Necton substation.

On your question about who is consulting on the National Grid substation extension, Vattenfall is, as it is Vattenfall who are obtaining consent for those works as part of their Development Consent Order application. You can find information about that in Vattenfall's recent consultation documents, in particular:

### **Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)**

#### Chapter 5 Project Description

- Para 2 introduces the extent of the onshore works required which includes the extension to the Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications.
- Para 22 outlines the extension will be included as part of the Development Consent Order.
- Section 5.5.8 and 5.5.9 explains
  - o what is required for the Necton National Grid Substation and Overhead Line Modifications
  - o the location, equipment and dimensions
  - o works required for pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning
  - o a timeline of works.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-1-peir-chapters/chapter-05-project-description-norfolk-vanguard-peir.pdf>

#### Figures

Figure 5.5 of the PEIR demonstrates the figure for the onshore project substation and extension to National Grid substation.

[https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-](https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-1-peir-chapters/chapter-05-project-description-norfolk-vanguard-peir.pdf)

[2017/peir/volume-2-figures/chapter-05-project-description/figure-5.5-onshore-project-substation-and-extension-to-national-grid-substation.pdf](https://peir/volume-2-figures/chapter-05-project-description/figure-5.5-onshore-project-substation-and-extension-to-national-grid-substation.pdf)

Considered within Assessments

PEIR Chapter 19 – 31 the extension required to the National Grid substation is considered inherently as part of the assessments and detailed within the Worst Case outlined as part of the assessments.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/projects/wind-energy-projects/vattenfall-in-norfolk/norfolkvanguard/documents/preliminary-environmental-information-report/>

I hope that's helpful. Thank you again for your questions.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 April 2018 15:13  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

That's great – thanks [REDACTED],

[REDACTED] in a meeting this afternoon, but I'll give him a call and hopefully we can get it out tomorrow if not later today.

We will keep you posted.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 April 2018 15:10  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

Hi [REDACTED]

We've completed our review. No further comment.

Happy for this to go out this week.

Can you or [REDACTED] confirm once it's been sent?

Please keep us in the loop of the reaction...

All the best

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 6:54 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

Hi [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your comments and input. Apologies for not getting a draft to you sooner...I had a short week last week with a [REDACTED] on Thursday.

Hopefully the following revisions cover the points you raised, but do let us know. On the alternative site I'm a little wary about implying that two substations sites (Necton as is and another) is definitely worse in environmental terms than extending. The point the action group are making is that they believe it's better. I'd prefer to stick to the factual aspects - bigger overall footprint and more works to connect a new site to the network.

Let us know what you think. I've also not caught up yet with [REDACTED] on the revisions. [REDACTED] if you have anything to add please let us know...

*Dear Jenny,*

*Thank you for your emails of 27 February and 21 March and apologies for not coming back to you sooner.*

*On the question of alternative connection locations, Vattenfall and National Grid concluded in 2016, after considering a range of options, that Necton was the most co-ordinated, efficient and economical when compared to other options including building a new substation site. That's because building a new substation would result in a larger footprint overall and more extensive works to connect the new site to the transmission network.*

*I understand my colleague Mr Stokoe explained the broad principles in his email of [30 June](#) last year. Extending the existing Necton 400kV substation to connect the two wind farm projects proposed by Vattenfall would change it from a 6 bay substation to a 17 bay substation. Extending the existing substation in that way is the most co-ordinated, economic and efficient option, because the extended substation would be capable of accommodating the two proposed Vattenfall wind farms and the Dudgeon offshore wind farm that is already connected there. An extended substation configured in that way would meet the National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standard that we operate the network to.*

*The alternative you suggest would still require a large 14 bay substation just for the two Vattenfall wind farms. That would be in addition to the existing 6 bay Necton 400kV substation which connects Dudgeon. In addition, there would be more substantive overhead line connection works and a direct connection would also be needed between the two substation sites. Those connection works would be more extensive than the works required in extending the existing Necton substation.*

*On your question about who is consulting on the National Grid substation extension, Vattenfall is, as it is Vattenfall who are obtaining consent for those works as part of their Development Consent Order application. You can find information about that in Vattenfall's recent consultation documents, in particular:*

**Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)**

**Chapter 5 Project Description**

- Para 2 introduces the extent of the onshore works required which includes the extension to the Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications.
- Para 22 outlines the extension will be included as part of the Development Consent Order.
- Section 5.5.8 and 5.5.9 explains
  - what is required for the Necton National Grid Substation and Overhead Line Modifications
  - the location, equipment and dimensions
  - works required for pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning
  - a timeline of works.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-1-peir-chapters/chapter-05-project-description-norfolk-vanguard-peir.pdf>

**Figures**

Figure 5.5 of the PEIR demonstrates the figure for the onshore project substation and extension to National Grid substation.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-2-figures/chapter-05-project-description/figure-5.5-onshore-project-substation-and-extension-to-national-grid-substation.pdf>

**Considered within Assessments**

PEIR Chapter 19 – 31 the extension required to the National Grid substation is considered inherently as part of the assessments and detailed within the Worst Case outlined as part of the assessments.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/projects/wind-energy-projects/vattenfall-in-norfolk/norfolk-vanguard/documents/preliminary-environmental-information-report/>

*I hope that's helpful. Thank you again for your questions.*

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Apr 2018, at 10:48, "[REDACTED]" wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]  
Hope you had a good break.  
Are you planning to circulate an updated draft response this week for review our end?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 29, 2018 4:21 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** FW: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

Dear [REDACTED] and all,

I understand you are on leave now, and then [REDACTED]  
We'd like to see/sign-off the response please before you send – these are such sensitive matters, that we feel it's crucial to provide really spot-on info and messaging right now – so please wait until we've done that after 9<sup>th</sup>.

Thanks [REDACTED] and wishing you & team a good break,  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 28, 2018 9:00 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] given the thumbs up but has asked whether you can add some substance on the point about greater impacts of building a new 400kV sub elsewhere?

In terms of really get a stake in the ground on the point about Vattenfall consulting on the National Grid works, below are the relevant signposts to reference.

I am in meetings most of the day, then out tomorrow attending a [REDACTED] and Friday is a BH. Both [REDACTED] are on leave next week.

Either [REDACTED] signs the final draft off tomorrow or we wait until wk 9<sup>th</sup>?

Thanks  
[REDACTED]

## **PEIR**

### **Chapter 5 Project Description**

- Para 2 introduces the extent of the onshore works required which includes the extension to the Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications.
- Para 22 outlines the extension will be included as part of the Development Consent Order.
- Section 5.5.8 and 5.5.9 explains
  - what is required for the Necton National Grid Substation and Overhead Line Modifications
  - the location, equipment and dimensions
  - works required for pre-construction, construction, operation and decommissioning
  - a timeline of works.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-1-peir-chapters/chapter-05-project-description-norfolk-vanguard-peir.pdf>

## Figures

Figure 5.5 of the PEIR demonstrates the figure for the onshore project substation and extension to National Grid substation.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/globalassets/uk/projects/norfolk-vanguard/consultation-peir-oct-2017/peir/volume-2-figures/chapter-05-project-description/figure-5.5-onshore-project-substation-and-extension-to-national-grid-substation.pdf>

## Considered within Assessments

PEIR Chapter 19 – 31 the extension required to the National Grid substation is considered inherently as part of the assessments and detailed within the Worst Case outlined as part of the assessments.

<https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/projects/wind-energy-projects/vattenfall-in-norfolk/norfolkvanguard/documents/preliminary-environmental-information-report/>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2018 3:36 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

[REDACTED]

Apologies for not getting back to you sooner on this. As discussed earlier NSAG asked a supplementary question of [REDACTED] last week. I've wrapped both up in this email with a potential draft response for discussion/review with yourselves. I'll be in the office in Leeds tomorrow and in London on Wednesday and then I'll be away too until after the bank holiday. I've copied [REDACTED] in too at our end.

Do let us know if you have any comments/suggestions or if you would appreciate a call to chat through and co-ordinate?...

**NSAG emailed question to RP 27-2-18:** A group of us (Jenny Smedley, Tony Smedley, Alice Spain, Susie Spain and Simon Nunn) spoke to you at Vattenfall's last presentation in 2017, and you told us that Vattenfall had not consulted with the National Grid regarding the possibility of an alternative site that we had suggested to them near Scarning. All those present have confirmed that you said that. Can you confirm that please?

**NSAG follow-up email to RP 21-3-18:** [REDACTED], Be good to get an answer on this. Also, another question. According to the BEIS Vattenfall have been designing the new NG extensions at Necton, with the NG. That being the case should it be them or the National Grid who were meant to do a full consultation on it? We have been told (again by BEIS) that one of the two should have done a full consultation on the NG extensions and other works, but they are not sure which. Do you know?

We were only told (and not consulted) about this part of the project less than a month before the end of the consultation period. Vattenfall had strenuously refused to answer any questions about it up until then, telling people enquiring, 'We aren't allowed to show you that'.

**Draft National Grid response 26-3-18:**

Dear Jenny,

Thank you for your emails of 27 February and 21 March and apologies for not coming back to you sooner.

On the question of alternative connection locations, Vattenfall and National Grid concluded in 2016, after considering a range of options, that Necton was the most co-ordinated, efficient and economical when compared to other options including building a new substation site.

I understand my colleague Mr Stokoe explained the broad principles in his email of 30 June last year. Extending the existing Necton 400kV substation to connect the two wind farm projects proposed by Vattenfall would change it from a 6 bay substation to a 17 bay substation. Extending the existing substation in that way is the most co-ordinated, economic and efficient option, because the extended substation would be capable of accommodating the two proposed Vattenfall wind farms and the Dudgeon offshore wind farm that is already connected there. An extended substation configured in that way would meet the National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standard that we operate the network to.

The alternative you suggest would still require a large 14 bay substation just for the two Vattenfall wind farms. That would be in addition to the existing 6 bay Necton 400kV substation which connects Dudgeon. In addition, there would be more substantive overhead line connection works and a direct connection would also be needed between the two substation sites.

On your question about who is consulting on the National Grid substation extension, Vattenfall is, as it is Vattenfall who are obtaining consent for those works as part of their Development Consent Order application. **You can find information about that in Vattenfall's recent consultation documents**[\[SKG1\]](#)

I hope that's helpful. Thank you again for your questions.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] **Web:**  
[www.nationalgrid.com](http://www.nationalgrid.com)

Visit our [Connecting](#) website for energy industry news, debate and analysis

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 March 2018 10:38  
**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** EXT || RE: National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

Hi [REDACTED]

Has your draft response to NSAG progressed at all?

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2018 2:42 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** National Grid - Response to NSAG enquiry regarding alternative Scarning area

H [REDACTED]

As discussed, attached is what Vattenfall issued at the end of September 2017 to NSAG wrt considering the area of Scarning as an alternative to Necton.

I understand that Jenny has now got back in touch with NG wrt to this matter and [REDACTED] and yourself are considering how to structure a response. Please can you keep this group informed on your draft response so we can ensure NG and Vattenfall are aligned on the key messages going forward. Personally I think this is a good opportunity to quote chapter and verse on policy, regulation and process to ensure the most efficient, economic and coordinated grid connection solutions are delivered to major infrastructure projects. If you can circulate NSAG's latest enquiry that would be helpful.

Perhaps we can set up a teleconference after we have had time to consider your draft response.

All the best

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[www.vattenfall.com](http://www.vattenfall.com)

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

This e-mail is meant only for the intended recipient of the transmission, is confidential and may be a communication privileged by law. If you have received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete the e-mail from your system. We do not accept any liability or responsibility for (i) changes made to this e-mail or any attachment after it was sent or (ii) viruses transmitted through this e-mail or any attachment.

The following notice applies to e-mails originating in the UK. E-mails sent on behalf of Vattenfall are sent on behalf of the relevant Vattenfall company below. Except as indicated below, these are registered in England and Wales with registered office at First Floor, 1 Tudor Street, London EC4Y 0AH, UK and number as shown: Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd 06205750, Border Wind Limited 02692708, Border Wind Farms Limited 02731769, BW Ops Limited 02951085, Clashindarroch Wind Farm Limited 05358030, Eclipse Energy UK Limited 05461926, Norfolk Boreas Limited 03722058, Kentish Flats Limited 04130301, Norfolk Vanguard Limited 08141115, Ormonde Energy Limited 04874027, Ourack Wind Farm One Limited 05532689, Ourack Wind Farm Two Limited 05475126, Thanet Offshore Wind Limited 04512200. Nant Bach Wind Farm Limited 06834016, Nuon UK Limited 03446477, Parc Cynog Wind Farm Limited 02840895, Pen Y Cymoedd Wind Farm Limited 03494498, Pendine Wind Farm Limited 03292728, Rheola Wind Farm Limited 03494533 and Swinford Wind Farm Limited 06941519 are registered in England and Wales with registered office at Abbey Warehouse, Abbey Slip, Penzance, Cornwall, TR18 4AR, UK. Llanerfyl Access Road Consortium Limited 06118626 is registered in England and Wales with registered office at Beaufort Court Egg Farm Lane, Off Station Road, Kings Langley Hertfordshire, United Kingdom, WD4 8LR East Anglia Offshore Wind Limited 06990367, is registered in England and Wales with registered office at Third Floor, 1 Tudor Street, London EC4Y 0AH Ourack Wind Farm LLP SO305106 is registered in Scotland with registered office at Third Floor, The Tun Building, 4 Jackson's Entry, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8AE. Aberdeen Offshore Wind Farm Limited SC278869 is registered in Scotland at Third Floor, The Tun Building, 4 Jackson's Entry, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8AE Aberdeen Wind Deployment Centre Limited SC380657 is registered in Scotland at Third Floor, The Tun Building, 4 Jackson's Entry, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8AE.

---

We have recently changed the registered offices of a number of our companies. The following are now registered at 1 Tudor Street, London, EC4Y 0AH:  
Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd, Border Wind Ltd, Border Wind Farms Ltd, BW Ops Ltd, Clashindarroch Wind Farm Ltd, Eclipse Energy UK Ltd, Eclipse Energy Company Ltd, Kentish Flats Ltd, Ormonde Energy Ltd, Ormonde Energy Holdings Ltd, Ormonde Project Company Ltd, Thanet Offshore

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>

---

We have recently changed the registered offices of a number of our companies. The following are now registered at 1 Tudor Street, London, EC4Y 0AH:  
Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd, Border Wind Ltd, Border Wind Farms Ltd, BW Ops Ltd, Clashindarroch Wind Farm Ltd, Eclipse Energy UK Ltd, Eclipse Energy Company Ltd, Kentish Flats Ltd, Ormonde Energy Ltd, Ormonde Energy Holdings Ltd, Ormonde Project Company Ltd, Thanet Offshore

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>

---

We have recently changed the registered offices of a number of our companies. The following are now registered at 1 Tudor Street, London, EC4Y 0AH:  
Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd, Border Wind Ltd, Border Wind Farms Ltd, BW Ops Ltd,  
Clashindarroch Wind Farm Ltd, Eclipse Energy UK Ltd,  
Eclipse Energy Company Ltd, Kentish Flats Ltd, Ormonde Energy Ltd, Ormonde Energy Holdings Ltd, Ormonde Project Company Ltd, Thanet Offshore

---

Can we include links in the response? Whilst I've not comprehensively been through all the consultation materials, I could only find indicative footprint information and couldn't see layout or elevation information, which may be what NSAG is getting at?

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: EXT || [REDACTED] National Grid  
**Date:** 30 April 2018 08:43:34

---

Dear Ms Smedley

Thank you for drawing this to my attention. You raise some serious issues and I would like to investigate carefully. I will ask [REDACTED], who leads the National Grid business in the UK to respond to you more fully as soon as that is done.

In the meantime, it would help us to investigate more quickly if you are able to please forward me a copy of the email exchange between you and Roger which you refer to below.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**From:** Jenny Smedley [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 20 April 2018 at 08:56:26 BST  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** EXT || [REDACTED] National Grid

Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

This is about an email I had from the National Grid that will shock you.

I live in Necton in Norfolk where Vattenfall and the National Grid are trying to insert a ridiculously mammoth set of infrastructure that Vattenfall's own PEIR says is too large for the area.

During the course of protesting and researching about this I asked your employee, [REDACTED] a simple question. We had seen him at the project's most recent presentation last November, and he had stated in front of 3 other residents, that although Vattenfall had promised in writing to consult with the National Grid on a perfectly viable (according to National Grid) alternative site we had suggested, they had not in fact consulted with the National Grid. I sent him an email at the beginning of March 2018 asking if he could confirm saying that.

He replied this week, but under 'his' response he had included an entire email conversation, between himself, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED], and possibly others also were sharing this as some conversation appears to have taken place on messenger.

It shows clearly that first the NG have broken the data protection laws by sharing a private email of mine, with all these people, and second that it has broken them again by sending all this to me, including everyone's email address and most of their phone numbers.

Apart from this the question asked was never answered, and other comments showed that we were quite right to offer the alternative site, and that despite it having no existing infrastructure, because the original site is unsuitable, so the NG should nevertheless have considered the alternative and offered it to Vattenfall. We guessed that Vattenfall wouldn't genuinely consider it so we asked the NG privately and were told in writing that it was technically feasible.

It will require a very small extra piece of infrastructure but will make a much better environmental option. When rejecting this site (which they did very briefly in a sentence or two) Vattenfall claimed it would be more costly – however, they are building two projects here, Vanguard and Boreas and had not taken into account the savings of 5 km of underground cabling for Boreas.

There is also the question of whether, now that Vattenfall have opted for HVDC, they might not even need the extra infrastructure, as the converter halls would do its job.

It's a disgrace that this is being dealt with as it is, but this email conversation I have, proving that the National Grid is merely Vattenfall's puppet, and have run to them to answer a simple yes or no question, giving out many other details at the same time, is extraordinary.

I hope you are someone who can finally deal with this matter in a knowledgeable and convincing way. Your team dealing with this project is frankly a disgrace. What do you intend to do about it before I consider my own next actions?

I am meeting with George Freeman MP this afternoon and will discuss the matter with him, because so far I have had no response about it from the NG or Vattenfall.



Jenny Smedley

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: EXT || [REDACTED] National Grid  
**Date:** 01 May 2018 09:55:11

---

Dear Ms Smedley

I am responding to the email you sent to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on 20 April. I understand that you have also sent a separate email to National Grid on 17 April on behalf of the Necton Substation Action Group on the same subject. Please accept this response as our reply to that email too.

You asked for comment on an email from my colleague [REDACTED] which copied in members of the Vattenfall project team. I think you are referring to an email dated 13 April 2018 (if not, please can you forward me a copy). [REDACTED] admits that this email should not have copied in Vattenfall employees, or included the email chain below his email to you. Please accept my apologies for this error. We have reinforced the importance of data management to the National Grid project team.

Vattenfall is promoting the Development Consent Order and is responsible for carrying out the public consultation activities associated with the onshore wind farm project. With your permission, we would be prepared to convey your concerns about the offshore wind farm connection works to our customer Vattenfall. Going forward, to avoid any unnecessary delay, I suggest that you raise your comments directly with Vattenfall.

I would like to apologise again for sending the details of your email to Vattenfall employees.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jenny Smedley [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 20 April 2018 at 08:56:26 BST  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
<[John.Pettigrew@nationalgrid.com](mailto:John.Pettigrew@nationalgrid.com)>  
**Subject:** EXT || [REDACTED] National Grid

Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

This is about an email I had from the National Grid that will shock you.

I live in Necton in Norfolk where Vattenfall and the National Grid are trying to insert a ridiculously mammoth set of infrastructure that Vattenfall's own PEIR says is too large for the area.

During the course of protesting and researching about this I asked your employee, [REDACTED] a simple question. We had seen him at the project's most recent presentation last November, and he had stated in front of 3 other residents, that although Vattenfall had promised in writing to consult with the National Grid on a perfectly viable (according to National Grid) alternative site we had suggested, they had not in fact consulted with the National Grid. I sent him an email at the beginning of March 2018 asking if he could confirm saying that.

He replied this week, but under 'his' response he had included an entire email conversation, between himself, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and possibly others also were sharing this as some conversation appears to have taken place on messenger.

It shows clearly that first the NG have broken the data protection laws by sharing a private email of mine, with all these people, and second that it has broken them again by sending all this to me, including everyone's email address and most of their phone numbers.

Apart from this the question asked was never answered, and other comments showed that we were quite right to offer the alternative site, and that despite it having no existing infrastructure, because the original site is unsuitable, so the NG should nevertheless have considered the alternative and offered it to Vattenfall. We guessed that Vattenfall wouldn't genuinely consider it so we asked the NG privately and were told in writing that it was technically feasible.

It will require a very small extra piece of infrastructure but will make a much better environmental option. When rejecting this site (which they did very briefly in a sentence or two) Vattenfall claimed it would be more costly – however, they are building two projects here, Vanguard and Boreas and had not taken into account the savings of 5 km of underground cabling for Boreas.

There is also the question of whether, now that Vattenfall have opted for HVDC, they might not even need the extra infrastructure, as the converter halls would do its job.

It's a disgrace that this is being dealt with as it is, but this email conversation I have, proving that the National Grid is merely Vattenfall's puppet, and have run to them to answer a simple yes or no question, giving out many other details at the same time, is extraordinary.

I hope you are someone who can finally deal with this matter in a knowledgeable and convincing way. Your team dealing with this project is frankly a disgrace. What do you intend to do about it before I consider my own next actions?

I am meeting with George Freeman MP this afternoon and will discuss the matter with him, because so far I have had no response about it from the NG or Vattenfall.

Jenny Smedley

This e-mail, and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended for the addressee(s) only. The content may also contain legal, professional or other privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the e-mail and any attachments. You should not disclose, copy or take any action in reliance on this transmission.

You may report the matter by contacting us via our [UK Contacts Page](#) or our [US Contacts Page](#) (accessed by clicking on the appropriate link)

Please ensure you have adequate virus protection before you open or detach any documents from this transmission. National Grid plc and its affiliates do not accept any liability for viruses. An e-mail reply to this address may be subject to monitoring for operational reasons or lawful business practices.

For the registered information on the UK operating companies within the National Grid group please use the attached link: <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/corporate-registrations>