

Please see attached,
thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Patricia Lockwood

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
also family home, [REDACTED]

Further to the "REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FOLLOWING THE HIGH COURT'S DECISION TO QUASH THE NORFOLK VANGUARD OFFSHORE WIND FARM ORDER 2020"

My thoughts regarding paragraph 8 "• the procedure which the Secretary of State now proposes to follow;"

Are;

"• 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;"

My response to the above statement is Yes

it is very clear that the substations of Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas share the same site and cable corridor, but as Vattenfall were never prepared to discuss the two projects holistically, the opportunity to get pertinent mitigation was missed.

And;

"• whether Interested Parties agree with the Secretary of State's assessment of the situation set out at paragraph 6....."

My response is No.

I disagree, as think greater transparency is needed regarding the size and scale of the substations site at Necton, which contains BOTH substations, and should be examined en masse. As very little information about Boreas was available during the Vanguard examination, it was difficult for local residents to determine the cumulative effects regarding the size, noise and visual impact and If continued to be examined separately, there will no improvement. The substations should be should be redetermined cumulatively, not only for visual impact but also noise.

At the "workshop" I attended in July 2017, the applicant explained how having the one cable corridor would benefit the environment (and their costs). But, when anyone tried to question them about Boreas they refused to be drawn, saying that the meeting was purely about Vanguard and were very dismissive of Boreas, it was like, don't be concerned about that now, that's a long way off and we only need to focus on Vanguard at this stage, trying to minimize its impact.

It would also seem a limited re-examination of cumulative effects if only landscape and visual impacts issues are covered. I would think that the combined noise from both substations should be re-examined as a whole, as I am concerned that when Boreas becomes operational the combined noise could breach the limit of acceptable background noise in this quiet rural area. (I would also like to point out that the sound monitoring was very incomplete at the closest residential location to the substation, SSR2, at Ivy Todd and feel this should be re-done.)

Better visual and sound mitigation should be called for, as the proposed planting mitigation was actually reduced over the course of the consultation period. I would like to see improved and appropriately robust mitigation for a project of this scale when taking into account that both substations share one footprint.

The final point that concerns me is, If the two substations were re-examined as one, would the location still be deemed as acceptable?