

From: Katie Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 January 2019 12:38
To: Hornsea Project Three
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: N2RS transcript of Orsted OFH as requested

Please find attached the transcript of the N2RS verbal submission to last night's open floor hearing as requested.

Regards
Katie Taylor
N2RS

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

OFH ORSTED

January 28th 2019

Transcript of N2RS submission

N2RS is a locally based organisation backed by around 1,000 supporters. It was established primarily to question and challenge offshore wind farm projects in Norfolk which opt for HVAC technology. We've made written submissions which can be read on the inspectorate's website. We also have a Facebook page. It is our position that in terms of transmission systems, HVDC is the lesser of two evils. Whilst not everyone sees it this way, this is the general feeling given our understanding of all the works that are required onshore from landfall to the national grid.

The overall strategic plan for offshore wind farms in East Anglia is hugely dynamic and over time, it will extend beyond the plans submitted by Orsted for Hornsea 3 (2.4GW) and Vattenfall (3.6GW). This is because the Crown Estates website has announced that it will be disposing of more areas in our region enabling the Government to commission several more offshore wind farm projects in the future. N2RS represents residents who fear that we will have to live with short term disruption and long-term damage to the environment if our voices are not heard or respected.

For this reason, we felt it was important to come tonight to try to influence the proceedings keeping the environmental impact at the top of the agenda. We're under no illusion that energy companies accept commissions to make money and that is not the issue here. The issue is that their enterprises are not done at the expense of peoples' livelihoods and Norfolk's unique environment. We should assume and expect companies to want to conserve our heritage and to go the extra mile to support our aims.

Orsted's stated position is to keep its options open regarding transmission. So far in this examination, Orsted has given evidence regarding issues to do with deliverability, costs and supply chains (and many other points of course) all with an underlying preference for adopting HVAC technology. Given the number of people and statutory bodies who have expressed a preference for HVDC, Orsted has responded by describing HVDC on December 4th as a maturing technology suggesting that it may not be deliverable.

A while ago, N2RS was delighted when Vattenfall made its decision to adopt HVDC. Recently though Orsted has taken the opportunity to pour cold water on this; casting doubt on Vattenfall's commitment to HVDC. But Orsted says it's keeping its options open on AC and DC. This is a confusing, ambiguous position to take and whilst we are sure it is not their intention to do so, nevertheless it makes them look aloof and disinterested in the people of Norfolk who have campaigned to keep environmental issues on the agenda.

We are not experts, but we are aware that HVDC carried over long distances (i.e. over 100km) is in fact the optimal choice over HVAC. Hornsea 3 is 120 kilometres off shore. Arguably, this makes HVAC sub optimal for Hornsea 3. We hope this crucial

matter will continue to be a key line of further enquiry for the examining authority. The holding open of options under the Rochdale Envelope on such a crucial issue with a major impact on the lives of people in Norfolk is too important to just let go. It essentially gives those with a vested interest the upper hand. This cannot be fair or ethical.

We conclude by expressing alarm that Orsted appears at this stage in the proceedings to be dismissive of HVDC at a time when there is an ideal opportunity to pioneer it not just for this project but to blaze a trail for other projects to follow. International research suggests that supply chain issues should not be a major impediment.

Our campaign has never been about challenging wind farms per se despite the growing chorus of concerns from America to Australia and many places in between. It is about leaving the place as you found it with the absolute minimum impact on our environment.

If the issue of HVDC or HVAC comes down to marginal costs and claims of a real or imagined supply chain block, the deciding factor in our view should be the option which preserves our environment. On *that* basis, as everyone knows, HVDC is the optimal choice.

Thankyou.

END
