

**From:** [Jenny Smedley](#)  
**To:** [Norfolk Vanguard](#)  
**Subject:** EN010079 Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) Vattenfall Vanguard  
**Date:** 09 January 2019 10:17:25

---

Dear Sirs

I would like to register my intention to attend the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) in Norwich on 6th February 2019.

My comments on onshore environmental matters are as follows:

Vattenfall's environmental damage has been admitted now in the Errata to be worse than was published during the consultation. This means people did not have enough facts to make reasoned environmental comments/objections during the consultation, which should therefore be done again with the errata in it.

The rush, panic and confusion which has been the basis for this consultation has meant that alternative scenarios which could have mitigated the entire environmental situation have been ignored and not considered.

National Grid have admitted in that the environmental impact would have been less if Vattenfall had adopted the alternative site at Scarning that was suggested to them, using the farm there that was for sale on the open market.

The same applies if Vattenfall had bought Top Farm, Necton, which was offered to them. Top Farm being used for both substations (and even possibly National Grid extensions) would mean there would be no circular route all the way around the Dudgeon site, and no ruining of Dudgeon's landscaping, some of which was planted in 2014.

Currently the access road runs from the A47 right along the length of Top Farm, with off-shoots going towards the NG substation – it then crosses land to the Vanguard and Boreas substations' proposed sites, where it meets the incoming cable corridor. Then there is another (transformed) cable corridor running from the substations all the way back towards the A47, parallel (but on the other side of Dudgeon to) the access road which runs in the opposite direction, thereby creating a complete circle as the cables then cross between Dudgeon and the A47. On paper this looks ridiculous.

Other environmental advantages in using Top Farm are:

Less incoming cabling to substations and thence to National Grid from Top Farm.

Only 1 farm severed and blighted instead of 3. (Currently both Top Farm – with access road, and Necton Farm with substations and cables would be severed and blighted.) And Ivy Todd Farm would be blighted for any future resale, or any diversification changes to its current use (with no compensation whatsoever).

Less mitigation would be required if Top Farm were used, as ground there is much lower than the chosen site, and has its own mature planting which would largely hide even an enormous site.

This is the biggest offshore, onshore infrastructure in the world. Compensation must be offered to Necton to mitigate the terrible environmental price it is being expected to pay, and compensation should in fact match this scale. And yet no solid compensation whatsoever has been offered by Vattenfall for Necton. Our action group agreed to come to the table with George Freeman and Vattenfall to try and find compromise. Vattenfall refused to attend.

Vattenfall have provably misdirected at their presentations, to mislead opposition. Several

people who said they worked for Vattenfall made statements, such as that Boreas would be 'very small', and 'add on', 'need not be worried about'. We know that all along Boreas was intended to match Vanguard in size, and would double the environmental damage to this area.

Noise - Dudgeon/Statoil who built our current substation, have remained within the operational noise constraints applied by Breckland. However at 4.5 times the size of Dudgeon, it is impossible to imagine that Vanguard and Boreas can do the same, especially as the noise made by Dudgeon has taken up some of the permitted noise.

On paper it seems more efficient to put all infrastructure together and ruin just one area environmentally, but in practice the massive sizes proposed, show it isn't efficient or environmentally friendly. Whilst a village could deal with one project, placing three next to one village is inhumane.

It goes against: "DM8 Design, local landscape and townscape character. Development will be permitted if it will not harm the conservation of, or prevent the enhancement of, key characteristics of its surroundings with regard to the character of the landscape and townscape, including consideration of its historic character and settlement pattern, taking into account any appropriate mitigation measures."

No documentation can be found that compares the environmental damage caused by wind farms, from their own carbon footprint from conception to reality, to any environmental good they might do. When one considers fully the implications of low efficiency of energy transfer, the constraints payments, the actuality of the load factor (ie reality in power produced compared to power potential, which is wrongly quoted as factual), the international pollution and environmental damage that is caused by the mining and production of rare earths for the pylons, the tonnes of concrete and steel, the fossil fuel used in the transportation of materials, the very fact that carbon emissions have actually worsened since the increase of construction of wind farms, it would appear to be obvious that wind farms per se are not environmentally friendly.

Regards  
Jenny Smedley (Spokesperson for NSAG)

---

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

---

**From:** [Jenny Smedley](#)  
**To:** [Norfolk Vanguard](#)  
**Subject:** Additional from Necton Substation Action Group  
**Date:** 15 January 2019 09:04:12

---

Dear Sirs

In addition to the NSAG plane crash report which you kindly published, the MOD have recently sent a little more information which is relevant.

Their comments follow. These comments show that there is no evidence that the required monitoring of the site was ever carried out, and that there is no evidence to suggest that the site was ever declared clear. We therefore are of the opinion that the MOD should carry out checks before any other body is allowed to excavate any ground deeper than a plough, as the MOD are the ones who will be held accountable if there is any detrimental affects on the health of local residents caused by the disturbance of any contamination on the site by the developers. The fact that Public Health UK are already carrying out out an investigation into a possible cancer cluster in the area, serve to underline this.

"b. Arrangements should be made for the DCRO to return [to] the crash site to take part in the handover of the field to the farmer and his agent once it has been cleared of all contamination.

c. A monitoring strategy should be set up by a competent person, in consultation with the Defence Land Agency, to continue to assess the whole area for further environmental impact, including the possibility of carbon fibres (if any) entering the food chain and the biodegradation of the aviation fuel on agricultural land."

5

Para 20 also states:

"Following the meeting between the DCRO, the Defence Land Agent, the farmer and the farmer's agent during the handover of the field, the pollution monitoring team from PHMDiv have been tasked to carry out further monitoring of the site of the F16 aircraft crash in the arable field for any adverse environmental effects and the reemergence, if any, of carbon composite fibres".

In order to meet the obligation to provide environmental information relating to the monitoring of the crash site, a more comprehensive search has been carried out of the department involving AHB(RAF), the MOD file store and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO — formerly the Defence Lands Agency). I can confirm that no other information has been found relating to any follow-up environmental assessments after January 1997. In addition, no information is held on the advice (if any) to the farmer or landowner about the future use of the land.

Jenny Smedley (on behalf of Necton Substation Action Group).

---

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

---