From:
To:
Norfolk Vanguar

Subject: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FOLLOWING THE HIGH COURT'S DECISION TO QUASH THE NORFOLK

VANGUARD OFFSHORE WIND FARM ORDER 2020.

Date: 21 May 2021 10:39:06

Your Ref: EN010079 EN010087

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

Following your request for information please see my comments below:

- 1. Whilst it is welcome news that the SoS has said he will Redetermine the Development Application, that in itself does not go far enough. With the Applicants Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas details both available to him, these should be considered together and the SoS should declare that the planning process should go right back to the beginning and consider BOTH applications together as one.
- 2. The SoS has accepted there was a failure to assess the cumulative Landscape and Visual impacts of Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas when considering the Vanguard application. This in itself did not go far enough. He should also accept this failure did not take into account the cumulative effects of Light Pollution and Noise Pollution both during Construction, Commissioning, Operation and scheduled Maintenance Shutdown phases of the Applicants proposed Sub-stations at Necton. These pollution effects should be taken cumulatively with those from the existing Dudgeon Sub-station at Necton.
- 3. When considering the Norfolk Vanguard application, the Examining Authority failed to take into account the applicants own details of their proposed Boreas application. It is a duplicate of Vanguard. It should have been considered.
- 4. The Applicant repeatedly claimed on both Vanguard and Boreas that detailed design was not available. However, given that the Sub-stations are identical, sharing of information should have been done at the time Vanguard was being considered by the Examining Authority and later by the SoS.
- 5. The SoS should take into account that representations from Interested Parties regarding the Vanguard application were possibly not as detailed of knowledgeable as those for the Boreas application. IP's 'learnt' how to give representations as they went along. Therefore, IP's were able to be more proactive against Boreas due to this accumulated knowledge.

Conclusion:

The Planning Inspectorate should be instructed to reopen the examination to consider the cumulative effects of all aspects, including (but not limited to) Landscape, Visual, Light and Noise Pollution of BOTH Vanguard and Boreas together at Necton. Vanguard and Boreas should no longer be considered separately.

Regards, Tony Smedley