

**From:** [Jenny Smedley](#)  
**To:** [PINS](#)  
**Subject:** Open Floor Hearing on 6th February 2019-Vanguard  
**Date:** 12 February 2019 15:55:58

---

Dear Planning Inspectors, having listened to the recording of the above Hearing, I would very much like to make 2 points.

1. Mr Horton said, 'The Application will only get accepted if the consultation report is up to standard.' He used this to hammer home his view that the consultation carried out by VF was not a 'box-ticking' exercise and had been carried out correctly.

I feel that whilst the Consultation Report may have been 'up to standard' – all this means is that it ticked all the academic/on paper boxes, and the Planning Inspectorate then have to examine it in order to judge whether the developer actually created a consultation where any meaningful dialogue or communication took place, and where the public were made aware of all the facts necessary for them to make meaningful comments.

The so called workshop, (the first and only time a site proposal was shown) showed that this was not the case when the 80+ invitation only audience were shushed, literally as if they were schoolchildren, not allowed to interact (which is surely the meaning of 'workshop').

This same audience had never been invited to the proposed site, had never seen it, were only shown 4 squares on a map which had (characteristically of Vattenfall) had all detail including contour lines faded out, and therefore the audience had no basis whatsoever to make reasoned comments on them.

2. Mr Horton also complained that many of the points raised in last week's meetings had already been mentioned in written representations and had been answered.

However, my understanding of the purpose of the written representations was as stated on PINS' website, 'a summary of a person's views on an application, made in writing'. And as the written representations were explained to the public, this was only a summary, (maximum of 500 words) and that they would be allowed to discuss these points in full at the Hearings. To answer them broadly and vaguely before the Hearings was disingenuous and deceptive from Vattenfall. In any case the answers given by Vattenfall were cherry-picked from the points made.

Further on the subject of consultations. I have an email from National Grid stating that Vattenfall were responsible for carrying out a consultation on the NG substation extensions. In their big screen presentations VF were repeatedly asked, 'What about the National Grid? What will that look like', and the response (from a man only known as 'Sean', was 'We're not allowed to show you that.' The only time any information about the NG extensions was forthcoming was at the final presentation, (which was very sparse) and

which gave no time for digestion or comment.

Thank you for your attention.

Regards

Jenny Smedley (NSAG)

---

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

---