

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Submission for Deadline 7
Date: 02 May 2019 17:04:34

Dear Planning Inspector,

Further to my comments made at Open Floor Hearing 3 in Dereham on 24th April I would like to expand on those for your consideration and subsequent response from the Applicant.

a) In answer to a question, the National Grid have confirmed it is the Applicants responsibility to undertake consultation on all aspects of their project, including the extensions required to the existing Necton National Grid substation. The Applicant has failed to do this fully.

b) At all consultations held at Necton Community Centre, when asked about the NG substation extension, the Applicants representatives said they could not talk about it. Or, they did not know about it.

c) One of the Applicants representatives showed computer generated views of the Vanguard substation to show people what they might see from their home and/or street or other viewpoint. When asked if he would show a computer generated view of the extension to the existing NG substation he said he could not do that.

d) Notwithstanding the fact that a description of the extension to the NG substation is in the Applicants documentation, Necton residents have been denied details on a significant part of the project, ie we do not know what it will look like. Not even an artist's impression. And I would ask you to take into consideration that Necton has a high proportion of elderly residents who do not have a computer and who could not reasonably be expected to look through all the Applicants books on display in the Community Centre.

e) The Applicant will argue that drawings and cg images have been produced to show the NG substation extension. Those that have been are inadequate to show what this extension will look like on the ground. Rather, those that have been done included a poor wide angle view from certain viewpoints and a block plan view (handy when flying over the site at 10,000 feet). But no cg image or line drawing has been published to show what the NG extension will look like on the ground.

f) With regards as to what will be visible of the Applicant's Vanguard substation itself, the cg views as presented to Necton residents on the consultation days clearly showed how visible and intrusive it would be (this is without taking the extensions to the NG substation also into account).

Some people were seen leaving the venue in tears because of what they were shown they would see of the substation. In fact one couple immediately put their property up for sale.

Yet recent comments from the Applicant's representatives have said that no one will see the substation.

Who is correct? Why should either be believed to be true?

g) From an environmental aspect it has been stated that the HVDC option is the best for Norfolk. Yet this HVDC option is not the best for Necton and the surrounding communities from a visual, blot on the landscape, point of view. Necton was not consulted in making this HVDC v HVAC decision. Yet Mr Haughton (for the Applicant) is very keen to repeat that the Applicant took notice of residents and made changes accordingly. But when/where/how were Necton residents consulted on whether they preferred HVDC or HVAC?

He will not be able to answer that question because Necton residents were not consulted. Rather it was presented to Necton as a fait accompli.

From the foregoing, I put it to you that the Applicant has not done their Consultation adequately enough.

Regards,

Tony Smedley

My Registration Identification No. 20012530.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Submission for Deadline 7
Date: 02 May 2019 17:04:34

Dear Planning Inspector,

Further to my comments made at Open Floor Hearing 3 in Dereham on 24th April I would like to expand on those for your consideration and subsequent response from the Applicant.

a) In answer to a question, the National Grid have confirmed it is the Applicants responsibility to undertake consultation on all aspects of their project, including the extensions required to the existing Necton National Grid substation. The Applicant has failed to do this fully.

b) At all consultations held at Necton Community Centre, when asked about the NG substation extension, the Applicants representatives said they could not talk about it. Or, they did not know about it.

c) One of the Applicants representatives showed computer generated views of the Vanguard substation to show people what they might see from their home and/or street or other viewpoint. When asked if he would show a computer generated view of the extension to the existing NG substation he said he could not do that.

d) Notwithstanding the fact that a description of the extension to the NG substation is in the Applicants documentation, Necton residents have been denied details on a significant part of the project, ie we do not know what it will look like. Not even an artist's impression. And I would ask you to take into consideration that Necton has a high proportion of elderly residents who do not have a computer and who could not reasonably be expected to look through all the Applicants books on display in the Community Centre.

e) The Applicant will argue that drawings and cg images have been produced to show the NG substation extension. Those that have been are inadequate to show what this extension will look like on the ground. Rather, those that have been done included a poor wide angle view from certain viewpoints and a block plan view (handy when flying over the site at 10,000 feet). But no cg image or line drawing has been published to show what the NG extension will look like on the ground.

f) With regards as to what will be visible of the Applicant's Vanguard substation itself, the cg views as presented to Necton residents on the consultation days clearly showed how visible and intrusive it would be (this is without taking the extensions to the NG substation also into account).

Some people were seen leaving the venue in tears because of what they were shown they would see of the substation. In fact one couple immediately put their property up for sale.

Yet recent comments from the Applicant's representatives have said that no one will see the substation.

Who is correct? Why should either be believed to be true?

g) From an environmental aspect it has been stated that the HVDC option is the best for Norfolk. Yet this HVDC option is not the best for Necton and the surrounding communities from a visual, blot on the landscape, point of view. Necton was not consulted in making this HVDC v HVAC decision. Yet Mr Haughton (for the Applicant) is very keen to repeat that the Applicant took notice of residents and made changes accordingly. But when/where/how were Necton residents consulted on whether they preferred HVDC or HVAC?

He will not be able to answer that question because Necton residents were not consulted. Rather it was presented to Necton as a fait accompli.

From the foregoing, I put it to you that the Applicant has not done their Consultation adequately enough.

Regards,

Tony Smedley

My Registration Identification No. 20012530.