

Norfolk Vanguard Project - EN010079

Our reference: 20011733

HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND FARM - EN010080

Our reference: 20010156

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

We live adjacent to the planned crossing point of the transmission cables from the Hornsea Project Three, Norfolk Vanguard Project and Norfolk Boreas Project wind farms. We have submitted our written evidence to both panels. As 'Interested Parties' we are of the opinion that the continuance of individual developers making requests for connections to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS), without an independent co-ordination body, is a fundamental failing of the infrastructure planning for off-shore renewable energy provision.

We contend that the current situation with National Grid (NG) plc, a for profits company, allocating NETS connections on a "first come, first served" process (as described in our individual submissions) will be more damaging to the environment than an organised and co-ordinated plan to meet future electricity demands would be. NG know when and where current power stations will be decommissioned and therefore where shortfalls in power provision are likely to be. It is incomprehensible to us that the current system of first come first served, as close to where NG have capacity to take up any new power generation, is acceptable. It is also clear in our exchanges with NG that they do not intend to either invest in any new substations, or upgrade any existing substations, on the NETS to accept the renewable off-shore energy; Walpole substation being a casing point for the acceptance of Hornsea Three. We wonder why NG has not been invited to contribute to the examination process for either Vanguard or Hornsea Three considering their contribution to the plans and, as of April 2019, their intent to devolve the management of power transmission to a new company?

Both Vattenfall, for Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas Projects, and Ørsted for Hornsea Project Three, are foreign companies with a vested interest in making profits for their shareholders (Vattenfall being 100% owned by the Swedish Government). It is therefore astonishing that the UK's responsible company, NG plc, has such an out dated licence to govern NETS connections, issued when the National Grid was denationalised at the end of the 1980's.

There are alternatives to how off-shore generated renewable energy can be brought on-shore, as we have provided in our responses to both companies' PEIRs. A simple off-shore extension to the NETS, outside of any Marine Conservation Zones, with collecting substations on platforms similar to those proposed by both projects for their wind farms, could easily be designed and constructed. Off-shore wind farm developers could then pay a connection levy to access the "Off-shore Ring Main" (ORM) which would cover the cost of construction and may even generate a profit for the UK. Developers would save all the costs of design and construction for individual on-shore transmission systems making such a project very attractive. A graphic of our suggested ORM is attached.

We implore the Planning Inspectorate to take a view on the connection issue and bring to the attention of the Secretary of State for the Environment that successive off-shore developers will continue to apply for consent to bury transmission cables, criss-cross across the UK countryside, with an increasing number of transmission systems. The cost to the environment in Norfolk alone, will be unprecedented. Also, and more importantly, leaving the allocation of NETS connection on a first come first served, with an outdated licence, under the governance of NG is untenable.

We understand that this multifaceted issue is difficult but, in all earnest, the UK countryside will suffer irrevocably if the future of off-shore renewable energy transmission is merely left to chance.

Yours faithfully,

R. S. & D Pearce

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

