
From: Beverley Wigg [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 February 2019 17:46
To: Hornsea Project Three
Subject: SUBMISSION FOR DEADLINE 6

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission attached.

Kind regards

Beverley Wigg
N2RS – No to Relay Stations
N2rs.org.uk

[REDACTED]

01692 650780

[REDACTED]

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



SUBMISSION FOR DEADLINE 6

Concerns about Public Engagement and Observations on the Current Project Design

Background

N2RS is based to the east of the county inland from Happisburgh. It was formed in response to the consultations relating to Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas and its goal was to campaign for an HVDC system to be adopted so that cable relay stations would not be needed and the cable corridor would be halved thus significantly reducing the environmental impact. Vattenfall's early commitment to HVDC has therefore been warmly welcomed.

The similarities between Hornsea Three and Vanguard/Boreas are obvious and although we have been unable to replicate the enormous time and effort required for our original campaign, we have followed the Hornsea Three application as best we can and wish to make the following observations about the inequalities that exist between the communities affected and the applicants and also comment on some of the current design elements.

The Herculean Task for Communities

We know from many conversations with stakeholders, consultees and individuals that there is also a strong preference for HVDC for Hornsea Three and while even the applicant has acknowledged this we are not sure that the strength of feeling is fully realised. We have learnt how difficult it is to make an impact when dealing with billion pound energy companies who have apparently unlimited resources.

The people who are most affected by major NSIP projects and who will have to live through the temporary - but in the case of Hornsea Three, long winded - disruption during construction and the lasting legacy of permanent infrastructure are local people who have no professional support. Although landowners are able to instruct land consultants at no cost to themselves in order to extract the best terms, local people have limited means to navigate the complexity of these proposals and few are in a position to spend the time necessary to properly read and digest the multitudinous pages of detail, let alone fully understand it and know how best to react.

It took thousands of man-hours and a dedicated team of individuals – who had no previous experience - to even scratch the surface of the Vanguard/Boreas consultations. Campaigns such as these are fought at the expense of businesses, families and personal wellbeing – and for those facing the worst of the impact, there is the ongoing stress created by uncertainty about the future, their quality of life and the potential to see their homes and businesses devalued.

Not everyone has the skills, expertise and resources to fully articulate their concerns and relatively few people are comfortable speaking at hearings, despite the Planning Inspectorate's best efforts to encourage participation.

Contrast this to the teams fielded by the developers both throughout the consultations and at the hearings themselves. We are no match for the fully funded and possibly highly paid lawyers, engineers, environmental consultants, PR and communications experts. It is no wonder that ordinary people feel disenfranchised, disheartened and unable to compete and in the end campaign fatigue tends to set in.

It is telling that when N2RS approached two planning consultants for advice nearly two years ago - with a view to possibly commissioning their services - we were told not to waste our money as the chances of influencing an NSIP process were minimal. We were advised that the cards were very much stacked in the developer's favour.

Norfolk also faces additional challenges in that many villages and communities are geographically scattered often consisting of clusters of houses and small hamlets. This contributes to the charm and character of the area that is so loved by locals and tourists alike – but it makes mobilisation of communities much harder to achieve. Of course Parish Councils should be the key to much of this but it appears that they also lack the resources to fully participate. Many have day jobs and they too seem to be overwhelmed by projects of this magnitude.

We were fortunate, with regard to Vanguard and Boreas, that the North Norfolk District Council, The Norfolk County Council and the CPRE were amongst those to vigorously endorse the need for HVDC but these organisations are also having to face several large applications, running side by side, and they too are under resourced.

Latest Observations on the Current Project Design

We therefore watch with some concern and a certain amount of helplessness, as the Hornsea Three examination unfolds. Not only does the region face an HVAC project – involving a large and unsightly booster station in unspoilt countryside but by proceeding over two phases, those affected will be condemned to years of disruption as well as the cumulative effect of Norfolk Vanguard, Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Three.

And ironically, despite the enormous resources at the applicant's disposal, its team (at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 31st January 2019) was unable to answer two important questions: exactly how the Norfolk Vanguard/Boreas cabling would interact with that of Hornsea Three at the crossing point near Saul – in terms of the type of drilling used - and whether the mix of HVAC (Hornsea Three) and HVDC (Norfolk Vanguard) cables would create any technical challenges or influence the depth at which each would need to be installed.

We reiterate that we are not against offshore wind farms per se and appreciate the need for renewable energy but those companies which seek to develop such projects should be compelled to do so with the utmost respect for the host communities. The phasing of Hornsea Three alone is a major cause for concern and with the prospect of an HVAC system and its accompanying booster station we do not feel that this project has the best interests of the region at heart.

If the onshore works were to take place in an unpopulated or remote area, there might be more justification but cutting through a picturesque rural tourist area over an extended period of time reflects poor judgement in our view and gives the distinct impression that the applicant has scant regard for our way of life, landscape and businesses.

N2RS
1st February 2019