

The Rt. Hon. Kwasi Kwarteng Secretary of State The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Dear Mr. Kwarteng,

## Re: The re-determination of the DCO for the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm

Further to your letter of the 29<sup>th</sup> of April where you set out the process for the re-determination of the DCO for the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and you invited comments. I am not in favour of the proposed process.

The reasons why many ordinary people in Norfolk raised thousands of pounds to protect their coast and countryside by funding a successful Judicial Review quashing the perverse decision of the previous SoS to award the Vanguard DCO need to be addressed.

The previous SoS admitted that he did not have all the necessary information to properly assess the cumulative impact of Boreas when he awarded the Vanguard DCO. This is a consequence of Vattenfall proposing two separate schemes when it really one much larger scheme with much larger impact (at least twice).

The question of alternative sites for the substation both in Necton or elsewhere were dismissed by the applicant and therefore not considered.

The question of mitigation was not dealt with adequately as the full extent of the cumulative visual and environmental impact were not available. (and are still not).

The current SoS should now also give serious consideration to the emerging methodology for connecting offshore wind farms via an Offshore Transmission Network. Only yesterday the PM reiterated his support for this technology during question time. Surely these two schemes would make an excellent pathfinder project.

In my opinion unless either Vanguard and Boreas are considered as one scheme or as two scheme but in parallel the same mistakes will be made again.

The Judge in the High Court was keen that this was dealt with promptly, but not at the expense of thoroughness.

I am in favour of Green Energy and see offshore wind as a sensible way to achieve our Carbon neutral targets in the short to medium term. However a proper consideration of the benefits versus the harm of these schemes must be made especially where relatively easy and cost effective remedies for the harm can be achieved.

Yours sincerely

Fraser Bateman