

Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

Written summary of the Applicant's oral case at the Open Floor Hearing

Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited
Document Reference: ExA; OFH; 10.D3.4
Deadline 3

Date: February 2019
Author: Womble Bond Dickinson

Photo: Kentish Flats Offshore Wind Farm



Glossary

ES	Environmental Statement
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
N2RS	No to Relay Stations
NSAG	Necton substation Action Group
OCP	Onshore Connection Point
OFH	Open Floor Hearing
RR	Relevant Representation
WQ	Written Question
WR	Written Representation

Summary Response on topics raised at the Open Floor Hearing - 6 February 2019

1. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS – RESPONSES BY THE APPLICANT

Many of the issues raised at the Open Floor Hearing (**OFH**) have been addressed in the Applicant's responses to Written Representations (**WRs**) (ExA; WRR: 10.D2.2), the Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations (**RRs**) (ExA; RR: 10.D1.1), and the Applicant's responses to the Examining Panel's Written Questions (**WQs**) (ExA; WQ; 10.D1.3).

2. CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Applicant feels that criticism of the extensive consultation process, as recorded in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.01), is misguided and misrepresents the comprehensive and robust process carried out by the Applicant, in compliance with the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project process as set out by the Planning Act 2008. As per Section 1.28 Consultation and Requests for Additional Information of the Applicant's responses to RRs, the Applicant has followed a programme of extensive pre-application consultation with local communities and statutory and non-statutory consultees and the effectiveness of the consultation process is demonstrated by the Applicant having made a number of significant changes to the project design post-consultation. Changes include:

- Decision to adopt High Voltage Direct Current (**HVDC**) transmission technology
- Locating landfall at Happisburgh South
- Determining that long Horizontal Directional Drilling should be deployed at the landfall
- Commitment to ducting Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas in one construction process
- Refinements to the onshore cable corridor construction process
- Agreements how to manage sandbank habitats of conservation importance within the Order limits of the offshore cable corridor
- Undertaking extensive geophysical surveying along the onshore cable corridor and environmental survey area
- Developing informed supply chain and education and skills strategies

These and other decisions made in response to consultation are described in full in the Consultation Report.

3. CHOICE OF ONSHORE CONNECTION POINT (OCP) AT NECTON

The OCP was determined through a statutorily mandated process involving both the Applicant and National Grid to identify a direct connection to the 400kV national transmission system. See:

- Report on the strategic approach to selecting a grid connection point for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard (Pre-ExA; OCP Report; 9.2);
- Response to Necton substation Action Group (**NSAG**) WR – "Siting of the onshore project substation and National Grid substation at Necton";
- Responses to RRs – "Site selection" (1.2) – "Approach with National Grid to selecting to a grid connection point at Necton"; and

- Response to WQ 2.1.

4. ALTERNATIVE LANDFALL SITES

Offshore and onshore cable routes were chosen by the Applicant to minimise environmental impacts, and selection of the location for the landfall was a key part of this consideration. See:

- Responses to RRs – "Site selection" (1.2) – "Alternative sites (landfall location – e.g. Bacton/Walpole); and
- Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives.

5. CHOICE OF SUBSTATION SITE AT NECTON

The process of identifying the most appropriate location to site the onshore project substation took into account the National Grid guidelines on substation siting and design (Horlock Rules (Table 4.3 of ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives)); extensive pre-application engagement over a 20 month period with stakeholders, communities and landowners (as detailed in the Consultation Report) and taking forward, within a 3km search area, those areas with fewer environmental constraints. See

- Response to WQ 2.1;
- Response to RRs – "Site selection" – "Alternative sites (onshore project substation)";
- Response to WRs from e.g. NSAG and Diana Lockwood.

6. SUBSTATION SITES PROPOSED BY THIRD PARTIES

6.1 The Applicant considered proposals by stakeholders to site the onshore project substation on land to the north-east of Necton either within or beyond the 3km radius search area. The development constraints within the search area are described in ES Chapter 4 Site Selection. The site beyond the 3km radius was the subject of a considered response by the Applicant in September 2017. See:

- Response to WQ 2.1; and
- Response to WRs from e.g. Patricia Lockwood and NSAG.

7. VISUAL IMPACT OF THE SUBSTATION FROM NECTON

The proposed onshore project substation footprint makes effective use of topographic undulations and natural screening and the proposal includes additional mitigation planting. Issues related to visual impact and mitigation have been fully considered in ES Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. See:

- Response to RRs 1.24 – Mitigation (and visual impact of the onshore projects site); and
- Response to WRs from e.g. Julian Pearson, NSAG and Colin King.

8. ABSENCE OF INFORMATION ON HORNSEA PROJECT 3

The Applicant is working closely with Orsted to identify potential cumulative impacts with Hornsea Project 3. See:

- Responses to WQ 11.10, 11.11, 11.12, 12.5 and 13.4; and
- Responses to WRs from e.g. Oulton Parish Council.

9. REASSURANCE ON CHANGE FROM HVDC

The Applicant notes that it would not be physically possible to construct an HVAC export system - involving a wider cable corridor, additional cables and a cable relay station - within the submitted Order limits. Any change to such a system would require a material amendment to the DCO. See:

- Response to WQ 20.2; and
- Response to WR from e.g. No to Relay Stations (N2RS).

10. F-16 PLANE CRASH

The Applicant has committed to producing a Contaminated Land and Groundwater Plan for dealing with contamination post-consent. See:

- Response to RRs 1.3; and
- Response to WQ 12.9; response to WRs from e.g. George Freeman MP, Patricia Lockwood and NSAG.

11. LIGHTING

Proposed lighting and assessed impacts have been set out for mobilisation areas, the onshore project substation and National Grid substation extension. See:

- Response to WQ 10.1.

12. EMF'S – INTERACTION OF HORNSEA PROJECT THREE AND NORFOLK VANGUARD ONSHORE CABLES

Orsted and Vattenfall have jointly commissioned an independent study and resulting report which explores the "worst case" EMFs where the power cables for the two projects will cross. See:

- Response to RRs 1.22 – Electromagnetic fields/radiation;
- Response to WQ 12.7;
- Response to WRs from e.g. Ray Pearce and Diana Lockwood.

13. HOLIDAY LET BUSINESSES NEAR NECTON

Four holiday let businesses located approximately 1km away from the onshore project substation in the general direction of Necton were assessed in Chapter 30 Tourism and Recreation as low sensitivity receptors (because it is not a tourist attraction in and of itself) and the assessment was undertaken on the basis of that sensitivity. See:

- Response to WQ 19.23;
- Response to WR from e.g. Ray Pearce;
- Response to RRs 1.25 Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation (disruption to local residents and businesses (near onshore project substation)).