
From: NSAG Necton Substation Action Group <nectonsubstationaction@outlook.com>
Sent: 08 December 2021 12:09
To: NI Enquiries <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: EN010079 Vanguard

Regarding the late submission by the applicant (as seen below) have they answered the questions regarding carbon emissions from digging the soil, as we asked for in our previous submission (9th November 2021).

[Farming News - 20 per cent of world's CO2 from ploughing – soil scientist](#)

"When a farmer ploughs and cultivates a paddock it releases CO2 into the atmosphere. The vast majority (95 percent) is released from soil with the other five percent coming from tractor exhausts," Dr Baker says. "The amount of CO2 released by cultivation during reseeding can be approximately three tonnes per hectare"

Information can also be found at this website: [Soil Organic Carbon Content - ESDAC - European Commission \(europa.eu\)](#): Excavation during construction.....

"In constructing a structure excavation plays an important role in making foundations of home, roadways, and building. In this process...The excavated soil gets disturbed by the heavy machinery and the CO2 which is trapped in the soil gets in contact with the atmosphere."

NSAG

From: NI Mail Distribution <ni.mail.distribution@notifications.service.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 December 2021 09:15
To: nectonsubstationaction@outlook.com <nectonsubstationaction@outlook.com>
Subject: Updates for Norfolk Vanguard



EN010079: Norfolk Vanguard Updates

Hi Necton Substation Action Group

The [Applicant has made a further submission to the Secretary of State](#) (PDF, 1 MB) in light of comments submitted by Interested Parties.

See [Norfolk Vanguard](#) for more information.

You are receiving this email because you are subscribed to project updates.

You can [unsubscribe](#) from these updates anytime by clicking unsubscribe or copy and paste the link below into your browser.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/email-unsubscription.php/?email=nectonsubstationaction@outlook.com&project=EN010079&code=fccb26a24386ec80001c2ca400dcf734>

Please note we are now using GOV.UK Notify as our mail service so these updates are sent from a different mail address. There are no other changes to these notifications and you will continue to receive updates as before.

Note: Please do not reply to this message as it was sent from a notification-only address that doesn't accept incoming messages.

From: NSAG Necton Substation Action Group <nectonsubstationaction@outlook.com>

Sent: 08 December 2021 12:18

To: NI Enquiries <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: EN010079 Vanguard

The whole of the projects will create a carbon footprint of Vanguard -1,936,895 tonnes, plus Boreas - 1,939,031 tonnes, a total of over 3millions tonnes of CO2 released into the atmosphere. (apparently not including the CO2 released by digging, which we would like confirmed by the applicant) So a petrol car produces 4.6 tonnes on average which means a car would have to travel 11000 miles a year for 842,592 years to produce the same amount (roughly).

NSAG

From: [NSAG Necton Substation Action Group](#)
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#); [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Carbon Footprint
Date: 10 December 2021 14:12:11

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Why has the Applicant for the Norfolk Vanguard Windfarm project been allowed a further submission, post the closure of the Redetermination, in support of the Norfolk Vanguard Windfarm DCO application? The submission is a direct copy of the 'Carbon Footprint Assessment' for Norfolk Boreas as submitted to the Norfolk Boreas ExA.

It is our belief and contention that Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas should have been assessed as the **single** large project that it is, especially with regards to the cumulative impacts assessments such as the 'Carbon Impact Assessment'. The Carbon Footprint Assessment for Norfolk Vanguard has clearly not been carried out and, therefore, the examination of such is deficient in the DCO Application and Redetermination.

Out of regard for the Planning Act 2008 the Head of Energy Infrastructure Planning should not have allowed this submission. The Judicial Review's quashing of the previous consent for Norfolk Vanguard was clear that the consideration of the timing for any consent decision: *"...does not override the need for compliance with EIA legislation and with principles of public law and procedural fairness."* The allowance of any submission post closure, rides rough shod over the *principles of public law and procedural fairness*, as the IPs have not been allowed time to assess or comment on the detail.

The Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy has shown bias towards Vattenfall. The Carbon Impact Assessments, for both projects, should have been taken into account and examined, before either Norfolk Boreas or Norfolk Vanguard was determined.

NSAG