

From: [REDACTED]
To: NorfolkVanguard@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Norfolk Vanguard Project - EN010079
Date: 26 May 2019 22:19:42
Attachments: [PINS 26 May 2019.docx](#)

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Registration identification number is 20012181.

Please see my deadline 8 submission, attached

Thank you

Yours sincerely,

Patricia Lockwood

[REDACTED]

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

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

As you are responsible for considering the placement of the world's largest substation, ensuring that it is in the best location, please protect the people of Norfolk's interests. Please give weight to the catastrophic changes this large project will have as you balance the country's demand for clean energy against this proposed dubious location.

Norfolk is a special place with its own character and charm. Please keep industrialisation in check and not let it encroach on the rural landscapes and small villages. Please preserve the visual amenity of natural Norfolk for all to enjoy. Please, if at all possible, put this project on hold as the Off Shore Ring Main solution would save the irrevocable damage about to happen to our countryside and small villages, if a DCO is granted.

During the application process the principle of an offshore ring main has been suggested by concerned Norfolk residents, and we now hear that the National Grid company is considering this as a way forward. This is very good news, as I feel a grave mistake was made in offering Vattenfall a connection point so far inland, 60 miles inland, where swathes of land will be destroyed by cable corridors. The connection in the heart of Norfolk, at Necton, will also spoil tourism for the surrounding area. The constant HGV traffic during construction, particularly through the small historic villages near the coast, with their narrow roads and lack of pavements, will be dangerous and also cause damage to the old buildings.

It is alarming that many more wind farms are destined to follow as there seems to have been a lack of foresight and planning regarding the infrastructure requirements for East Anglia's offshore wind farms; it seems all about maximising profits for Vattenfall and the National Grid Company, quite a conflict of interests. The offshore ring main is essential and will safeguard rural villages and the countryside of Norfolk and Suffolk, keeping offshore wind power offshore for the changing times ahead.

Regarding this need for delaying Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas until the Offshore Ring Main "O.R.M" can be constructed, I refer to "The National Infrastructure Planning Association (NIPA) Insights Programme 2016 Research Project, Professor Janice Morphet and Dr Ben Clifford".

Please could the section highlighting "Flexibility", Chapter 5, be taken into account, as you decide on your recommendations?

Page 6 Infrastructure Delivery: The DCO Process in Context – Main Report

"NIPA holds regular roundtable discussions and events for its members on current issues. At a roundtable in February 2016, some issues emerged There was also a growing concern that some DCOs were consented in a way leading to a lack of flexibility in construction that was causing more expensive and less advantageous methods to be used. (therefore, please consider an O.R.M?)

The NIPA Insights research brief was: Does the Planning Act process deliver the certainty and flexibility necessary to attract investment, permit innovation during the design and construction process and support cost effective infrastructure delivery – whilst providing appropriate protection of affected landowners and communities?"

Page 26, Chapter 5. Is there a need for more flexibility?

There were several rationales put forward for the need for flexibility including:

"Rapid technological change in relation to what is being built (particularly in the energy sector) which must be allowed for when coming to construct schemes years

later (given the long timescales for many NSIPs), and that there can be changes in construction industry technology as to how the project is being built which need to be allowed for (and can sometimes reduce impacts).....(ie please consider an O.R.M.)

“To deliver in ways that are better for affected communities: as constructors develop their working methods for projects, they may find ways of operating that are more beneficial and less disruptive for the affected communities which cannot be applied without either flexibility or amendments to the DCO.”..... *(O.R.M should be considered.)*

If construction of Vattenfall's Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas substations was to be delayed, it would surely be more cost effective for Vattenfall to connect to an Offshore Ring Main than build their own inland infrastructure? Also, surely waiting for an O.R.M. to be built would take no longer than building their own substations and cable corridors?

Regarding “Visual Amenity” I found “The Planner” the official magazine for the Royal Town Planning Institute. I realise NSIPs are outside of this remit, but I was struck by how truly outrageous the Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas proposals actually are when comparing to an entry on 08.June 2018 “An amateur radio hobbyist has been refused permission for a 10 metre retractable aerial mast in his garden, after an inspector decided that it would be visually incongruous in an edge-of-village location. Appeal: Amateur radio mast would be ‘unacceptably intrusive’” !

My concern is, that as awareness of the damaging effects of climate change becomes more prevalent, fuelled by the media, developers can take advantage of this wave of public concern. But it will only be after/during construction that many people will see and feel the impact, as Vattenfall have not been very transparent regarding sizes and scales. People will then question, How did this happen? Who ever let this happen?

From my experiences, over the past 2 years, I have little faith in Vattenfall, they have produced reams of documentation but that does not mean they are accurate and relevant. At their consultation evening, July 2017, they would not allow any group questions or comments ensuring that we could not hear anything other than what they told us! The developer has no local knowledge, uses land agents who also have little local knowledge, carry out surveys capturing limited information as very short term, they rely heavily on historical data which can fast become outdated. I also wonder if they are selective in the methodology they use, giving emphasis to that which best suits their purpose, as I know there is always two trains of thought.

The coast of East Anglia lends itself to the production of the country's clean energy, but there should be no need to sacrifice arable land in Norfolk and Suffolk (substation also proposed at Friston in Suffolk) to infrastructure, diminishing crop production and destroying biodiversity and ecosystems as habitats are lost.

It should not be necessary to blight and devalue Necton to meet the rest of the country's energy demand, so that most people can carry on with their usual day to day activities, while we are detrimentally challenged! The growing need for more electricity, (as gas and oil usage diminish) requires an O.R.M. to supply the WHOLE country as soon as possible.

I wholeheartedly want to see carbon emissions reduced for the good of our environment and future generations. Here is an opportunity to get this right, so please let's pause and get the offshore ring main constructed. Thank you.