

**From:** [Lucy Sheringham](#)  
**To:** [Norfolk Vanguard](#)  
**Subject:** Written Representation - Lucy Sheringham 20012868  
**Date:** 15 January 2019 23:02:19  
**Attachments:** [Written Representation - Lucy Sheringham 20012868.pdf](#)

---

Attached is my Written Representation - Lucy Sheringham 20012868

---

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

---

## Written Representation - Lucy Sheringham 20012868

Expanding upon my Relevant Representation already submitted.

As a local resident I am strongly objecting to this planning application for the reasons outlined in my Relevant Representation. I would like to further expand upon two particular reasons; the flawed public consultation, and the lack of alternative solutions considered.

### Flawed public consultation

- No alternative sites were consulted on
- Vattenfall provided insufficient and misleading information on the National Grid extensions. At the first 'drop in session' held by Vattenfall I was told, along with others that the connection from the new substations to the existing one would just be a cable, we learnt at the next session that it had grown somewhat, so extensions would have to be built either side to accommodate the sheer size of the new substations.
- Incorrectly stating no other suitable connection sites were possible
- Allowing comments on 4 footprint options which were in different locations but all within the same field to an invitation only audience.

### Alternative Solution

Vattenfall did not consider alternative solutions to a 47km onshore cable route. Alternative solutions such as a shorter cable route and a ring main connection despite providing less disruption and damage to the environment and to Norfolk residents were not considered.

Vattenfall disregarded all other options on the bases of cost rather than considering any other contributing factors. On multiple occasions requests have been made to Vattenfall to provide evidence of their decision making process with regards to the site location to the substations. The only evidence I received was verbal confirmation during a 'drop in centre' that the decision had been made based on cost and that a substation already exists in the location. However the extensions to the existing substation and the addition of two new substations (largest of its kind in the world) have been situated in a completely unsuitable site next to villages, very visible, with dangerous access points and 47km from the coast.

A ring main connection off the coast with a marine cable running offshore into Walpole where there is already a substation suitable for expansion with minimal disturbance to the environment and people. This would prevent the cable route coming 47km across the Norfolk countryside. This would also result in other wind farms having the ability to connect to it if required, which would eradicate cables crossing repeatedly over Norfolk. See map below



Black Line - Ring Main into Walpole Substation

Blue Line - Vattenfall cable corridor for Vanguard & Boreas Wind Farms

Red Line - Orsted cable corridor for Hornsea 3 Wind Farm

A marine cable would limit the damage to soils which is critically important for farmers to be able to produce food and make a living. It also restricts the loss and destruction of established trees and hedges, reduces the impact to the wildlife and the disruption to many for years to come.

Another alternative would be to make a connection on any suitable pylon on the 400KV overhead existing cable lines, which alters the poor sites Vattenfall have proposed around Necton. This would reduce the distance the cable would have to come inland and provide a larger search area for a suitable site away from houses or villages. Vattenfall have claimed doing the above is a far more expensive option - instead Vattenfall would rather increase their profits at the expense of the Norfolk countryside, the environment and the local population.