

To: Gareth Leigh (beiseip@beis.gov.uk)
FAO: The Rt. Hon. Kwasi Kwarteng
Secretary of State
The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

20th May 2021

Re: DCO determination for the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm

Interested Person Reference: 20011698, Katherine Jones.

Dear Mr. Kwarteng,

I am writing to you with regard to the Norfolk Vanguard re-determination process (email dated 29-04-21). I would like to provide a response to the three points of Paragraph 8 of the letter (reference EN010079).

1) The procedure which the Secretary of State now proposes to follow:

Renewable energy generation is the future of power production in the UK, and as such, new infrastructure is necessary. However, there is a need to create new infrastructure sympathetically and with an honest and open approach. Vattenfall made their two planning applications in quick succession (months apart), despite stating that no information about the second project was available at the time of the submission of the first application. Presumably this was done to increase the chance of a successful application. It is clear that the two projects are heavily linked. They will use the same National Grid connection point, the same on-shore cable ducts and will have a greater cumulative impact on the surrounding environment than each one would individually have had, especially if they are under construction at the same time (and not separated by 10 years as had been advertised to Necton residents). Thus they should be considered together.

2) Whether as part of that procedure, he should ask the Planning Inspectorate to reopen the examination to consider the cumulative landscape and visual impacts at Necton:

The Secretary of State should ask the planning inspectorate to reopen the examination. As stated in my response to point one, the two projects should be considered together. This is the only reasonable way to ensure that the best interests of all parties involved are fully taken into account. This will also ensure that any measures taken to mitigate the cumulative landscape and visual impacts are truly adequate for the whole project. The original examination should have had access to the information from both projects from the beginning so that a rigorous examination of the cumulative impacts would have been possible.

3) Whether Interested Parties agree with the Secretary of State's assessment of the situation set out at paragraph 6 of letter EN010079 regarding the additional materials that will put him in a better position to make the assessment of cumulative landscape and visual impacts in the re-determination of the Norfolk Vanguard application and whether Interested Parties consider there to be any further documents submitted as part of the Norfolk Boreas examination that would be helpful in this regard:

I do not think that the procedure the Secretary of State intends to follow is fit for purpose. I would like to ask the Secretary of State what measures are in place to ensure that the outcomes of the design review are followed or complied with. Simply having a design review does not introduce a requirement for change based on the outcomes. These two projects must be considered together. Only including additional conclusions from the Norfolk Boreas examination is insufficient under the circumstances. Moving forward, the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas applications should be resubmitted as a single project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Jones