

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Norfolk Vanguard Project - EN010079 - Deadline 7 - Representation
Date: 02 May 2019 23:30:09

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

My deadline 7 representation is regarding the site selection for the National Grid extension and the Vattenfall Vanguard & Boreas substations.

Having looked at Vattenfall's document detailing the onshore site selection process (Reference: Pre-ExA; OCP Report; 9.2 dated October 18) I still have some open questions on the site that has been selected. Can you please help in getting these answered

- There is no evidence of all the connection points provided by National Grid - can we please see a full list of connection options?
- How did Vattenfall quantify environmental impacts and compare them with commercial impacts resulting from increased infrastructure?
- It could have been more environmentally friendly to create the substation infrastructure closer to the landfall and in a more appropriate site on low lying land away from populated areas. So from an environmental point of view, why were connection points disregarded if they didn't already have infrastructure in place?...Because it is cheaper to use the pre-existing substation but at the expense of the environment and local residents.
- The connection site selected in Necton already has a substation, how were the environmental impacts from the extension considered in the decision making process?
- Why were different sites inside and outside their 3km radius not considered, why not choose a site in lower ground where there will be less visual pollution. Where is the evidence Vattenfall even looked?

The document reads as though it was written after the decision had already been made, and one by one the different connection points were eliminated (mostly due to cost not environmental factors) to get to the connection point that they had already agreed upon with National Grid. This process was not carried out adequately and was a post decision tick box exercise.

My wife and I attended many of the drop-in sessions at Necton Community Centre, and we were left extremely fearful of what the future might hold for the Norfolk countryside. The extensions and new substations would be very visible from our and many other's properties and it sickens me, and upsets me to think a monstrosity such as this may be allowed to be developed when more suitable options exist.

Just because Vattenfall have evidenced a site selection process that they have followed, it does not mean it is acceptable or justifiable in anyway. They have taken the easy route in setting up shop where a substation already exists. Please do not let the terrible Dudgeon substation planning decision lead to two more terrible decisions.

Regards,

Paul Haddow

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