

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm

Chapter 4

Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives

Environmental Statement

Volume 1

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited
Document Reference: 6.1.4
RHDHV Reference: PB5640-006-004
Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Date: June 2019
Revision: Version 1
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
12/02/2019	01D	First draft for Norfolk Boreas Limited review	DT	CD/RD/AH/JL	AD/JL
27/02/2019	02D	Second draft for Norfolk Boreas Limited Review	DT	RA/DT/JL/AH	AD/JL
16/04/2019	01F	Final for DCO submission	DT	RA/CD	JL



Table of Contents

4	Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives	1
4.1	Introduction	1
4.2	Key Components of Norfolk Boreas	3
4.3	Legislation and Guidance	4
4.4	Site Selection Process	5
4.5	Project Alternatives	9
4.6	Identification of the Offshore Wind Farm Location	10
4.7	Identification of Provisional Offshore Cable Corridor and Landfall Area.....	13
4.8	Identification of National Grid Connection Point.....	16
4.9	Identification of Landfall Location	18
4.10	Identification of Onshore Cable Corridor	21
4.11	Identification of Onshore Cable Route.....	23
4.12	Identification of Cable Relay Station Locations	24
4.13	Identification of Onshore Project Substation Location	25
4.14	Identification of National Grid Extension Works Location	32
4.15	Onshore Project Infrastructure Refinement.....	33
4.16	Identification of the Project Interconnector Cable Corridor	37
4.17	Summary.....	38
4.18	References	40

Tables

Table 4.1 Norfolk Boreas PEIR Consultation responses	0
Table 4.2 Key strategic project alternatives considered	9
Table 4.3 Landfall ranking results	15
Table 4.4 Application of Horlock Rules to onshore project substation	25
Table 4.5 Summary of site selection decisions	38

Plates

Plate 4.1 Site selection process for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard	8
--	---

Figures (Volume 2)

Figure 4.1 The Former East Anglia Zone	
Figure 4.2 Offshore constraints	
Figure 4.3 Provisional offshore cable corridors to three landfall locations	
Figure 4.4 Ranking of indicative landfall sites	
Figure 4.5 Landfall search area	
Figure 4.6 Landfall site options	
Figure 4.7 Landfall location	
Figure 4.8 Onshore Infrastructure as presented at PEIR	
Figure 4.9 Substation search area	
Figure 4.10 Refined substation search area	
Figure 4.11 Onshore project substation footprint options	
Figure 4.12 Onshore project substation location under Scenario 1	
Figure 4.13 Onshore project substation search area under Scenario 2 as presented at PEIR	
Figure 4.14 Onshore project substation location under Scenario 2	
Figure 4.15 National Grid substation extension under Scenario 1	
Figure 4.16 National Grid substation extension under Scenario 2	
Figure 4.17 Project interconnector cable search area	

Appendices (Volume 3)

Appendix 4.1 Initial HDD Feasibility Report	
Appendix 4.2 Cable Constructability Assessment	
Appendix 4.3 Strategic approach to selecting a grid connection point	
Appendix 4.4 Preferred Landfall Location Technical Note	
Appendix 4.5 Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas Coastal Erosion Study	
Appendix 4.6 HDD Feasibility Reports for Happisburgh and Bacton Green Landfall Sites	
Appendix 4.7 Identification of Onshore Cable Corridor	
Appendix 4.8 Identification of Cable Relay Station Locations	
Appendix 4.9 Identification of Onshore Project Substation Search Sectors	
Appendix 4.10 Onshore Project Substation Site Selection	

Glossary of Acronyms

AfL	Agreement for Lease
AHOB	Ancient Humans of Britain
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CRS	Cable Relay Station
CWS	County Wildlife Site
DCO	Development Consent Order
EAOW	East Anglia Offshore Wind
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
EU	European Union
GMSL	Global Marine Systems Limited
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
kV	Kilovolt
MCZ	Marine Conservation Zone
MW	Megawatt
NCC HES	Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Service
NETS	National Electricity Transmission System
NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission
NHER	Norfolk Heritage Environment Record
NPS	National Policy Statement
NV	Norfolk Vanguard
OESEA	Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment
O&M	Operations & Maintenance
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PEXA	Practice and Exercise Area
PRoW	Public Right of Way
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPR	ScottishPower Renewables
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
VWPL	Vattenfall Wind Power Limited
ZAP	Zonal Appraisal and Planning
ZDP	Zonal Development Plan

Glossary of Terminology

Array cables	Cables which link wind turbine to wind turbine, and wind turbine to offshore electrical platforms.
Cable pulling	Installation of cables within pre-installed ducts from jointing pits located along the onshore cable route.
Cable Relay Station	Primarily comprised of an outdoor compound containing reactors (also called inductors, or coils) and switchgear to increase the power transfer capability of the cables under the HVAC technology scenario as considered in the Scoping Report. This is no longer required for the project as the HVDC technology has been selected.
Constraints Mapping	GIS desk based exercise where a range of environmental data sets within a defined study area are mapped and buffers applied to aid in the process of selecting siting options for onshore electrical infrastructure.
Ducts	A duct is a length of underground piping, which is used to house electrical and communications cables.
Evidence Plan Process	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach to the EIA and information to support the HRA.
Interconnector cables	Offshore cables which link offshore electrical platforms within the Norfolk Boreas site.
Jointing pit	Underground structures constructed at regular intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts.
Landfall	Where the offshore cables come ashore at Happisburgh South.
Landfall compound	Compound at landfall within which HDD drilling would take place.
Link boxes	Underground chambers or above ground cabinets next to the cable trench housing low voltage electrical earthing links.
Mobilisation area	Areas approx. 100 x 100m used as access points to the running track for duct installation. Required to store equipment and provide welfare facilities. Located adjacent to the onshore cable route, accessible from local highways network suitable for the delivery of heavy and oversized materials and equipment.
Mobilisation zone	Area within which a mobilisation area would be located.
National Grid new / replacement overhead line tower	New overhead line towers to be installed at the National Grid substation.
National Grid overhead line modifications	The works to be undertaken to complete the necessary modification to the existing 400kV overhead lines.
National Grid substation extension	The permanent footprint of the National Grid substation extension.
National Grid temporary works area	Land adjacent to the Necton National Grid substation which would be temporarily required during construction of the National Grid substation extension.
Necton National Grid substation	The grid connection location for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard.
Norfolk Vanguard	Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm, sister project of Norfolk Boreas.
Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Vanguard West	The Norfolk Vanguard project includes two offshore wind farm (OWF) sites. Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Vanguard West
Offshore cable corridor	The corridor of seabed from the Norfolk Boreas site to the landfall site within which the offshore export cables will be located.
Offshore electrical platform	A fixed structure located within the Norfolk Boreas site, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbines and convert it into a

	suitable form for export to shore.
Offshore export cables	The cables which transmit power from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
Offshore project area	The area including the Norfolk Boreas site, project interconnector search area and offshore cable corridor.
Offshore service platform	A platform to house workers offshore and/or provide helicopter refuelling facilities. An accommodation vessel may be used as an alternative for housing workers.
Onshore 400kV cable route	Buried high-voltage cables linking the onshore project substation to the Necton National Grid substation.
Onshore cable route	The up to 35m working width within a 45m wide corridor which will contain the buried export cables as well as the temporary running track, topsoil storage and excavated material during construction.
Onshore cables	The cables which take power and communications from landfall to the onshore project substation.
Offshore export cables	The cables which transmit power from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
Onshore project area	The area of the onshore infrastructure (landfall, onshore cable route, accesses, trenchless crossing zones and mobilisation areas; onshore project substation and extension to the Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications).
Onshore project substation	A compound containing electrical equipment to enable connection to the National Grid. The substation will convert the exported power from HVDC to HVAC, to 400kV (grid voltage). This also contains equipment to help maintain stable grid voltage.
Onshore project substation search area	The zone in which the onshore project substation may be constructed under Scenario 2.
Onshore project substation temporary construction compound	Land adjacent to the onshore project substation which would be temporarily required during construction of the onshore project substation.
Project interconnector search area	The area within which the project interconnector cables would be installed.
Project Interconnector cable	Offshore cables which would link an offshore electrical platform or wind turbine in the Norfolk Boreas site with an offshore electrical platform in one of the Norfolk Vanguard sites.
Running track	The track along the onshore cable route which the construction traffic would use to access workfronts.
The Applicant	Norfolk Boreas Limited
The Norfolk Boreas site	The redline boundary of Norfolk Boreas which will contain the wind turbines, offshore platforms and array cables (does not contain the export cable corridor)
The Norfolk Vanguard OWF sites	Term used exclusively to refer to the two distinct offshore wind farm areas, Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Vanguard West (also termed NV East and NV West) which will contain the Norfolk Vanguard arrays.
The project	Norfolk Boreas Wind Farm including the onshore and offshore infrastructure.
Transition pit	Underground structures that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables
Trenchless crossing zone	Areas within the onshore cable route which will house trenchless crossing entry and exit points.
Workfront	A length of onshore cable route within which duct installation works will occur, approximately 150m.

This page is intentionally blank.

4 SITE SELECTION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Introduction

1. This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) provides a description of the site selection process and the approach undertaken to assessing alternative options for a number of different elements of the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm project (herein 'the project'). Norfolk Boreas Limited (the Applicant) and its parent company Vattenfall Wind Power Limited (VWPL) have undertaken a rigorous process to define the current proposed project which is described in Chapter 5 Project Description. The process includes consideration of both the offshore and onshore development and associated infrastructure, and the assessment of reasonable alternatives as the project has developed throughout the pre-application process. An important part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is to describe the reasonable alternatives considered during the evolution of the project, such as development design, technology, location, size and scale, and to set out the main reasons for selecting the chosen option.
2. For the offshore development, the former East Anglia Zone (Zone 5) within which the project is located (as shown in Figure 4.1) was identified as part of The Crown Estate Round 3 Offshore Wind Farm development process. Offshore project site selection was, therefore, limited to areas within the former East Anglia Zone. Where alternatives have been considered offshore, for example as part of the offshore cable corridor selection process, these are discussed within this chapter.
3. Owing to the strategic approach of developing both Norfolk Boreas and the sister project Norfolk Vanguard (see Chapter 1 Introduction and Chapter 5 Project Description for further details on the relationship between Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas), the site selection process, specifically the selection of the location of the offshore cable corridor and all onshore infrastructure, has been driven by the consideration of co-locating infrastructure for both projects. By taking this approach VWPL aim to reduce disruption during construction and to contain the developments within a localised area, thus minimising the extent of potential impacts.
4. Norfolk Vanguard's development schedule is approximately one year ahead of Norfolk Boreas and as such the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for that project was submitted in June 2018. A significant proportion of the site selection work for the two projects has been undertaken by VWPL as part of the Norfolk Vanguard project, however this has always been undertaken in the context that any decisions being made affected both projects.
5. A key driver for the process of developing and refining the design of both Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard has been the development of potential efficiencies and

synergies between the projects. A benefit of this approach is, for example, the opportunity for one main construction period of onshore duct installation to be completed for both projects (see chapter 5 Project description for further detail). The Norfolk Vanguard DCO will allow for onshore ducts to be installed for both projects, thereby reducing the construction period and associated potential impacts with installing two separate projects. Norfolk Boreas onshore cables would then be pulled through the pre-installed ducts during Norfolk Boreas' construction. VWPL has discussed this from an early stage of the projects with relevant consultees.

6. If both projects secure consent and proceed to construction, some enabling works for Norfolk Boreas would be undertaken during construction of the Norfolk Vanguard project (e.g. the aforementioned duct installation and the establishment of some access routes) and would not need to be repeated separately for Norfolk Boreas. This is VWPLs preferred outcome and is considered to be the most likely; however, there is also a need to consider the possibility that the Norfolk Vanguard project may not proceed in which case Norfolk Boreas would be constructed as a stand-alone project. In order for Norfolk Boreas to stand up as an independent project, this scenario must be provided for within the Norfolk Boreas DCO. Thus, there are two alternative scenarios to be considered in the context of the EIA and this ES:
 - **Scenario 1** – Norfolk Vanguard proceeds to construction, and installs ducts and other shared enabling works for Norfolk Boreas.
 - **Scenario 2** – Norfolk Vanguard does not proceed to construction and Norfolk Boreas proceeds alone. Norfolk Boreas undertakes all works required as an independent project.
7. The two scenarios have not materially influenced the site selection process. Albeit that under the different scenarios the onshore project substation and the National Grid substation extension would be sited on slightly different footprints of the same location (see section 4.13 and section 4.14). Offshore the two scenarios are not materially different apart from the fact that under Scenario 1 “project interconnector” cables could be installed between Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard (see Chapter 5 Project Description for further detail).

4.2 Key Components of Norfolk Boreas

8. Norfolk Boreas will comprise the following main offshore components (see Chapter 5 Project Description):
 - Offshore wind turbines and their associated foundations;
 - Scour protection around foundations as required;
 - Offshore electrical platforms supporting required electrical equipment;
 - Possibly an offshore service platform to house workers offshore as required and/or provide helicopter refuelling facilities;
 - Subsea cables and cable protection - array cables, interconnector cables or project interconnector cables, export cables and fibre optic cables;
 - Meteorological masts (met masts) and their associated foundations; and
 - Monitoring equipment including Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) and wave buoys.
9. If developed as an independent project, the main onshore components would include:
 - Up to two ducts installed under the cliff at landfall by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). (Note: An additional drill is included in the impact assessment worst case scenario where applicable, to provide a contingency for the unlikely event of a HDD failure);
 - Onshore export cables installed in ducts and associated infrastructure including transition pits and jointing pits;
 - Trenchless crossing points at roads, railways and certain sensitive features and habitats (e.g. rivers and sites of conservation importance);
 - Running track;
 - Temporary and operational accesses;
 - Temporary mobilisation areas;
 - Onshore project substation; and
 - National Grid extension works including overhead line modifications.
10. If developed with Norfolk Vanguard, some of these components (including ducts, trenchless crossings and the overhead line modifications), would have already been installed during the construction of that project. Further detail on the key components of infrastructure, under each scenario can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description and Appendix 5.1.

4.3 Legislation and Guidance

4.3.1 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations

11. The consideration of alternatives and major design decisions made during the development of a project has been part of EIA legislation since the adoption of the original EIA directive in UK law under the European Union (EU) EIA Directive 85/337/EEC (as amended by Directives 97/11/EC, 2003/35/EC, 2009/31/EC and 2014/52/EU).
12. Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations, both 2009 and 2017 require the applicant to provide within their Environmental Statement, a description of the reasonable alternatives considered in developing the project for which a DCO is sought. The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 advises that this assessment of alternative should include *“a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment”*.

4.3.2 The National Policy Statement EN 1

13. The National Policy Statement (NPS) is clear that *“from a policy perspective this NPS EN-1 does not contain any general requirement to consider alternatives or to establish whether the proposed project represents the best option”*. It does however note that in the execution of a competent EIA *“applicants are obliged to include in their ES, as a matter of fact, information about the main alternatives they have studied.”*

4.3.3 The Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seven

14. The Planning Act 2008 (as amended), and related secondary legislation, establishes the legislative requirements in relation to applications and proposed applications for orders granting development consent for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).
15. The Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seven (The Planning Inspectorate, 2017) suggests that the EIA needs to explain *“the reasonable alternatives considered and the reasons for the chosen option taking into account the effects of the Proposed Development on the environment”*.

4.4 Site Selection Process

16. The siting, design and refinement of the project has followed a site selection process, taking account of environmental, physical, technical, commercial and social considerations and opportunities as well as engineering requirements, with the aim of identifying sites that will be environmentally acceptable whilst also enabling, in the long term, benefits of the lowest energy cost to be passed onto the consumer. A multi-disciplinary design team was formed to undertake the site selection process, which included a team of specialists comprising engineers and EIA consultants whose expertise were drawn upon throughout the site selection process. The site selection process is illustrated in Plate 4.1. This plate shows the chronological order in which the main site selection decisions were taken.
17. Each stage of site selection forms part of an iterative design process undertaken to identify the most suitable locations and configuration, based on criteria outlined above, for project infrastructure. The framework for the site selection process is based upon a set of design principles and engineering requirements for project infrastructure.
18. VWPL, and its affiliate companies, Norfolk Vanguard Limited and Norfolk Boreas Limited, have undertaken extensive pre-application engagement with stakeholders, communities and landowners in order to both seek input to refine the final project design, and to communicate decisions on refinements (for further information see Chapter 7 Technical Consultation and the Consultation report (document reference 5.1)). The Norfolk Boreas Scoping Report (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2017) and the Norfolk Vanguard ES (Norfolk Vanguard Limited, 2018a) set out the process for the development of the onshore and offshore elements of the projects, showing a series of search areas for the landfall, onshore and offshore cable corridors, cable relay station (CRS) locations (which are no longer required) and onshore project substation locations.
19. Consultation on refinements in the project layout and configuration have been undertaken through the informal and formal pre-application stages between Norfolk Vanguard scoping in October 2016 and the present time; feedback received has been, and will continue to be, taken into consideration, through a range of means including (but not exclusively limited to):
 - Targeted letters to statutory consultees, key stakeholders (including locally elected representatives) and individuals and organisations who have registered an interest in the projects and expressed their wish to be informed by the project team. These letters alerted recipients to project milestones, consultation phases and other means to engage with and influence project decision-making.

- Provision of a dedicated project website; and also dedicated e-mail address for correspondence and a telephone line for queries; as well as advertising, the contact details of key project contacts including the Local Liaison Officer, Land team and Fisheries Liaison Officer.
- Drop in Exhibitions, held at locations within and adjacent to the onshore project area;
 - Undertaken in October 2016;
 - Undertaken in March/April 2017;
 - Undertaken in November 2017; and
 - November 2018.
- Reports of community feedback shared with all registered participants, key local and community stakeholders, and on the project website¹;
 - Hearing your Views, I, II, III and IV;
- Community engagement events;
- Newsletters distributed throughout the Scoping Area (October 2017), and subsequently provided to those within the Primary Consultation Zone, as described in the Norfolk Vanguard Statement of Community Consultation and the Norfolk Boreas Consultation Report (document reference 5.1). These newsletters were distributed on the following dates:
 - October 2016;
 - March 2017;
 - June 2017;
 - October 2017;
 - February 2018;
 - June 2018;
 - October 2018; and
 - February 2019
- Direct discussions with landowners;
 - Norfolk Boreas Limited and its affiliate companies have engaged with over 350 different land interests including landowners, tenants, occupiers and other parties with land rights; specifically, engaging with over 100 affected landowners and comments taken on board;
 - Norfolk Boreas Limited has engaged with landowners regarding survey access, through consultation meetings and during the land referencing process. Letters were sent to all affected parties offering to meet to discuss the project proposals;

¹ <https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/norfolkvanguard>

- Norfolk Boreas Limited's land agents have met with over 95% of the affected landowners and have liaised with the land agents representing those not met directly. A number of onshore cable route change suggestions have been put forward by those affected by the red line boundary. After assessing the suggested alternatives against the original design, VWPL have been able to incorporate a number of those suggestions into the current proposed design². Where the assessment of alternative suggestions has not resulted in a change the results of the assessment have been communicated with the landowner and reasons given for why their suggested change has not been incorporated.
- Regular and targeted discussion with regulators and other stakeholder bodies through various means including over 50 Expert Topic Group meetings, undertaken under the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas Evidence Plan Processes where the siting of project infrastructure was discussed in detail. More information is detailed in Chapter 7 Technical Consultation.
- Responses received during the Primary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) consultation have been considered in finalising the project design. The key responses are provided in Table 4.1.

²61 separate change requests were submitted by landowners or their agents of which 42 of these requests were accepted or part accepted and have been incorporated into the order limits. 38 separate landowners submitted change requests of which 9 had multiple changes accepted.

Table 4.1 Norfolk Boreas PEIR Consultation responses

Consultee	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
Norfolk County Council	The County Council welcomes the decision by Vattenfall to pursue a HVDC solution which removes the need for additional onshore infrastructure (cable relay station) in North Norfolk and reduces the potential environmental impact associated with the cable route by narrowing the cable corridor from 100m to 45m.	Norfolk Boreas Limited are pleased that Norfolk County Council and North Norfolk District Council support the decision to commit to high voltage direct current (HVDC) technology.
North Norfolk District Council	North Norfolk District Council welcomes the decision of Vattenfall to commit to the use of high voltage direct current (HVDC) transmission for both the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects. This decision was made following the Vanguard Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) stage at which the District Council and many local residents/business and other consultees raised concerns about the potential adverse impacts from the onshore cable relay stations needed for the high voltage alternating current (HVAC) transmission system in the East Roston / Ridlington area of North Norfolk. In the opinion of North Norfolk District Council, the decision by Vattenfall to adopt the HVDC transmission system meaning that cable relay stations are no longer required and allowing the working corridor of the project to be reduced to 45m, is a hugely positive step in terms of minimising project impacts within the North Norfolk area.	
North Norfolk District Council	The District Council welcomes the proposal by Vattenfall to include the laying of ducting for the Norfolk Boreas project at the same time as laying ducting for the Norfolk Vanguard project. This will, amongst other things, significantly reduce the disturbance time for land/soils along the temporary strip and will allow for earlier delivery of landscape mitigation.	Norfolk Boreas Limited are pleased that North Norfolk District Council support the proposed approaches.
North Norfolk District Council	NNDC welcomes the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) techniques so as to avoid sensitive or designated sites so as to minimise any potential impacts upon them.	
N2RS (no to cable relay stations)	Having been a part of the campaign for HVDC, we are pleased to see that both Boreas and Vanguard are proceeding with the DC as the only option. We just want to reiterate that any departure from this position would be unacceptable and that any backtracking to AC would be a betrayal of our confidence in Vattenfall to deliver the best possible system with the least environmental damage.	This DCO application is being submitted on the basis of using a HDVC electrical transmission. If consent for the project is granted, the consent would not give Norfolk Boreas Limited permission to install cable relay stations nor would the consent boundaries be sufficient to accommodate a HVAC solution.




Plate 4.1 Site selection process for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard³

³ Strategic decisions regarding fundamental project locations such as the offshore wind farm location and grid connection point have been made in conjunction with the Crown Estate and National Grid respectively.

4.5 Project Alternatives

20. A number of alternatives have been considered as part of the decision-making process. The early strategic project considerations of alternatives which fed directly into the site selection process are detailed in Table 4.2.
21. A number of additional project alternatives have also been considered to inform the project design and site selection process. These are discussed further throughout the chapter and the key decisions are summarised in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Key strategic project alternatives considered

Alternatives considered	Decision	Main Environmental Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic approach to concurrently delivering Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard; or No elements of Norfolk Boreas considered within the design envelope for Norfolk Vanguard 	<p>To take a strategic approach to delivering Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard.</p>	<p>The decision to install cable ducts for Norfolk Boreas during the construction of Norfolk Vanguard, would allow the main civil works for the onshore cable route to be completed in one construction period and in advance of the delivery of cables for the pulling phase. This removes the requirement to reopen the land at a later date for the Norfolk Boreas construction, which minimises the construction periods thus reducing impacts on sensitive receptors, and minimising disruption.</p> <p>Co-location of onshore project infrastructure for both projects will keep these developments contained within a localised area and, in so doing, will contain the extent of potential impacts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overhead lines along the ~60km route from landfall to grid connection location Buried onshore cables within ducts along the ~60km route from landfall to grid connection location 	<p>Buried onshore cables within ducts</p>	<p>The environmental benefit of burying cables as opposed to overhead lines and pylons is a significant reduction of permanent visual impacts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ducts laid in a sectionalised approach to enable pulling through at a later stage Open cut and direct lay of 	<p>Under Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 ducts laid in a sectionalised approach to enable cables to be pulled through the ducts at a later stage. Under Scenario 1 ducts will be laid by</p>	<p>The environmental benefit of installing ducts and backfilling the trenches in discreet sections, rather than installing ducts along the entirety of the route before backfilling would minimise the amount of land being worked on at any one time and would also minimise the duration of works on any given section of the route.</p>

Alternatives considered	Decision	Main Environmental Benefits
onshore cables along the full length of the cable route	Norfolk Vanguard (see above)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deploy HVAC* transmission technology Deploy HVDC* transmission technology 	HVDC technology	The environmental benefits include the removal of the need for CRS infrastructure near the coast, a reduction in the overall area of seabed and land impacted (for example reduction in working width along the onshore cable route from 50m to 35m (for Scenario 2) and a reduction in the number of offshore export cables from six to two), and a reduction in the overall construction time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a short HDD at Landfall exiting in the intertidal Undertake a long HDD at landfall exiting in the subtidal 	Undertake a long HDD at landfall	The environmental benefits include not having to access or disturb the beach and therefore minimising impacts on tourism, potential archaeology and intertidal ecology.

* HVAC = High Voltage Alternating Current and HVDC = High Voltage Direct Current

4.6 Identification of the Offshore Wind Farm Location

4.6.1 Former East Anglia Zone

22. The former East Anglia Zone (Zone 5) (see Figure 4.1) was originally identified by The Crown Estate as a suitable area offering 'potential for offshore wind' as part of the Round 3 Offshore Wind Zone tendering process in 2008. All Round 3 Zones were defined using an iterative process that took account of a number of constraints imposed by existing or future use of the sea.
23. The proposed Round 3 Zones were the subject of the Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment (OESEA) which assessed the implications of developing offshore wind farms within the Zones. The results of this strategic level analysis showed that the Zones represented suitable 'areas of opportunity' for offshore wind projects, and had the ability to deliver the required capacity of offshore wind within acceptable environmental limits. The Zones were subject to an offshore tender round in 2009.

4.6.2 Offshore Wind Farm Sites

24. Following the offshore tender round in 2009, The Crown Estate awarded East Anglia Offshore Wind (EAOW) the rights to develop Zone 5 (the former East Anglia Zone). The former Zone is located off the coast of East Anglia and has a target capacity of 7,200 megawatts (MW).

25. The first projects within the former Zone were identified through the Zonal Appraisal and Planning (ZAP) process conducted by EAOW which commenced in 2010. This resulted in the formation of a Zonal Development Plan (ZDP) in 2012 which identified areas with the least environmental and technical constraints.
26. Where potentially significant cumulative and in-combination impacts were identified, further targeted research was initiated to better understand these potential impacts. This included studies on shipping, birds and marine mammals.
27. Following a decision to split the former East Anglia Zone, VWPL took control of all development activities for projects in the northern half of the Zone, and ScottishPower Renewables (SPR) in the southern half of the Zone. Commercial agreements to finalise this arrangement were completed in February 2016.
28. During 2015, VWPL revisited the ZDP for the northern half of the former Zone. The locations of Norfolk Boreas (and Norfolk Vanguard) were identified using a three-step process:
 - Step 1: Potential development areas which had been identified in the ZDP were reviewed through spatial constraints mapping using up-to-date data. The key environmental and stakeholder constraints considered were:
 - Shipping and navigation;
 - Existing infrastructure, including cables and pipelines and oil and gas platforms;
 - Aggregate dredging grounds;
 - Other offshore wind farms;
 - Nature conservation designations;
 - Commercial and natural fisheries activity; and
 - Civil and military radar coverage and helicopter main routes.
 - Step 2. The areas identified were subject to a review of the following technical aspects:
 - Wind resource to provide production estimates;
 - Metocean data to understand weather downtime;
 - Bathymetry and available seismic and borehole data to assess monopile feasibility;
 - Sandwave data in relation to cable burial;
 - Electrical design and grid connection options; and
 - Development of a preliminary Operations & Maintenance (O&M) strategy.

- Step 3. A cost comparison model was set up for those sites deemed to be technically feasible, to identify which sites would provide the lowest cost of energy. This exercise was based on the following indicative parameters, which were considered to be the base-case scenario:
 - One 75 x 8MW (600 megawatt (MW)) phase of a wind farm;
 - A High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) connection;
 - Monopile foundations;
 - 75 kilovolts (kV) array cables;
 - 220-245kV export cables;
 - Two export cables;
 - One offshore substation; and
 - A connection to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) close to the coast.
29. Based on the review of known site characteristics, the parameters which were deemed differentiable between project areas at this early stage of development were wind farm production, offshore operational costs, offshore transmission costs and foundation installation costs. Preliminary results showed that the location of the wind farms within Norfolk Vanguard (NV) East, NV West and Norfolk Boreas would provide the lowest cost of energy to consumers (in line with Government targets), whilst minimising environmental impacts. The development of these three areas has been undertaken in such a way as to maximise potential efficiencies and synergies between the projects, enhance cost benefits, and reduce potential environmental impacts which could arise if the projects were developed entirely separately. As a result of this review VWPL have made the decision to develop both projects.
30. The main considerations for identifying the location of the offshore wind farm sites are shown in Figure 4.2 and outlined below. The preferred site should be located:
- Beyond 45km from the shore, therefore avoiding shore to sea visual amenity impacts and reducing interaction with inshore fisheries interests;
 - Outside the International Maritime Organisation route and within an area of relatively low density shipping in the context of the former Zone;
 - Outside dredging and aggregate extraction areas;
 - Outside known Ministry of Defence danger and exercise areas;
 - Outside existing Natura 2000 sites and Marine Conservation Zones (MCZ), (at the time of selection). A Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for harbour porpoise has since been designated, however cannot be avoided through site selection;
 - Outside any areas of known significant ornithological activity; increased distance from the nearest existing Special Protection Areas (SPA) for breeding birds (>210km from Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs and >100km from the

- Alde-Ore Estuary) reduces the potential for interaction with breeding and foraging bird species;
- Outside any sandeel, herring or cod spawning areas; and
 - To minimise as far as possible the number of cable and pipeline crossings likely to be required.
31. There is existing oil and gas infrastructure within the Norfolk Boreas site, however through consultation with operators it was determined that much of this infrastructure would be decommissioned before Norfolk Boreas construction is due to start. Nevertheless, the Norfolk Boreas site has been purposefully kept as a large area (725km²) to allow Norfolk Boreas Limited enough space to design the array around the oil and gas infrastructure, if for any reason it has not been fully decommissioned at the time of wind farm construction.
32. In 2016, an Agreement for Lease (AfL) for Norfolk Boreas was awarded to VWPL (and subsequently transferred to Norfolk Boreas Limited) from The Crown Estate. This required a rigorous review process to demonstrate that the site does not conflict with any other developments, that it represents the best and most efficient use of the seabed for energy production, and that its development is in accordance with relevant legislation.
33. An AfL was also awarded to East Anglia Four Limited (subsequently renamed Norfolk Vanguard Limited) for Norfolk Vanguard in 2016, following a similar process.
34. It should be noted that a meteorological mast (met mast) which is owned and operated by EAOW is located in the north-east of the site (Figure 4.1). The met mast and an associated 250m buffer are not part of the Norfolk Boreas AfL. The mast supports various instruments for measuring meteorological conditions.

4.7 Identification of Provisional Offshore Cable Corridor and Landfall Area

35. Following the definition of the offshore project areas for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard, site selection for all other infrastructure was assessed in a strategic manner such that the areas identified would be sufficient for both projects in order to minimise potential impacts. The site selection of the offshore cable corridor was undertaken in consultation with The Crown Estate.
36. Possible landfall locations were reviewed within an area from The Wash to Harwich. The majority of the coastline in this area is covered by national and international level designations (see Figure 4.3), including:
- North Norfolk Coast SPA;
 - The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC;
 - North Norfolk Coast Ramsar;

- Broads National Park - from Sea Palling to Lowestoft;
 - North Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) - from Hunstanton to Mundesley, just north of Bacton;
 - Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB - from Kessingland, south of Lowestoft to Felixstowe; and
 - North Norfolk Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
37. In order to avoid these designations, the following potential landfall areas were identified (Figure 4.3):
- Mundesley to Sea Palling (Bacton area);
 - Gorleston-on-Sea; and
 - Lowestoft to Kessingland (Lowestoft area).
38. In parallel with the landfall assessment, VWPL's in-house mapping team identified options for provisional offshore cable corridors to link the Norfolk Boreas site to each of the three landfall options (see Figure 4.3). Offshore constraints included in this exercise were:
- Other offshore wind farms;
 - Shipping and navigation routes;
 - Existing offshore cables;
 - Oil and gas infrastructure including platforms and pipelines;
 - Military Practice and Exercise Areas (PEXAs);
 - Aggregate dredging grounds;
 - Nature conservation designations;
 - Commercial fishing; and
 - Sensitive seabed features.
39. Due to the complex nature of the offshore area, both from a technical perspective and given the large number of activities and designations in the area, a comprehensive assessment was then undertaken to better understand the risks associated with each landfall / offshore cable corridor option. Two external studies were commissioned by VWPL:
- HDD feasibility report (Riggall and Associates Limited, 2016), Appendix 4.1. This report provides a subjective ranking of the indicative 13⁴ landfall sites (Table 4.2) from Bacton to Lowestoft (see Figure 4.4). Ranking, expressed as a series of 4 tiers of site suitability for HDD, was undertaken on the basis of both offshore and onshore risks, including access, distance from residences, environmental constraints, geology and coastal erosion; and

⁴ The 13 later became 15 with the addition of 3a and b and 4a and b.

- Cable constructability assessment (Global Marine Systems Limited (GMSL), 2016), Appendix 4.2. This study assessed geology and seabed topography along offshore cable corridor options to the Bacton area and Gorleston-on-Sea. Cable installation risk and design considerations were assessed, and proposed refinements made to reduce the risks identified. The route to Lowestoft was not included in this study as, at the point of commissioning, this option had been discounted due to the long offshore route length and the high number of offshore cable crossings that would be required.

40. A summary of the outcome of the ranking process within the HDD feasibility report is provided in Table 4.2.

Table 4.3 Landfall ranking results

	Bacton to Sea Palling	Gorleston-on-Sea	Lowestoft to Kessingland
Total sites assessed	7	5	3
Number of 'Tier 1' sites (sites suitable for HDD)	3	0	0
Number of 'Tier 2' sites (sites suitable for HDD with mitigation)	2	0	1
Number of 'Tier 3' sites (significant risks in relation to HDD)	2	3	2
Number of 'Tier 4' sites (not suitable for HDD)	0	2	0

41. The assessment found that Bacton to Sea Palling had several suitable landfall options; whereas Gorleston-on-Sea and Lowestoft to Kessingland had fewer favourable landfall options.
42. The constraints mapping exercise, which takes a broader view than the HDD feasibility report, showed that the offshore cable route to a potential landfall in the Lowestoft area would be considerably longer than the other routes as well as being more complex, requiring a high number of cable/pipeline crossing agreements. The cable route to Lowestoft was therefore considered to be the least preferred.
43. GMSL (2016) reviewed the offshore cable corridor options for Bacton and Gorleston-on-Sea, see Appendix 4.2. The conclusion of this report was that the corridor to Gorleston-on-Sea was less favourable than the corridor to Bacton for the following reasons:
- The approaches to the Gorleston-on-Sea landfall option are within an area of highly mobile sandwaves; and
 - The cable corridor for the Gorleston-on-Sea landfall option is close to both existing and potential aggregate dredging areas which increases the potential for interaction; and
44. Although the Gorleston-on-Sea landfall itself would be outside the Broads National Park (see Figure 4.3), all onshore routes from the Gorleston-on-Sea landfall location

would have to be routed through the Broads National Park. The cable corridor to Gorleston-on-Sea was discounted due to the highly sensitive nature of the Broads National Park and protected areas of standing water and water dependent habitats which were highlighted through consultee feedback around these sensitivities.

45. The provisional offshore cable corridor to the Bacton area (between Bacton and Sea Palling, and encompassing Happisburgh South) was considered most favourable for the following reasons:
- It is one of the shortest routes from the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard OWF sites to landfall;
 - There are fewer cable / pipeline crossings required;
 - Where cable / pipeline crossings are required, routeing these to achieve a 90° angle of crossing is possible which will minimise physical, and in the case of cables, electromagnetic interaction which could affect cable performance;
 - It crosses the shipping deep water route using the shortest distance;
 - It avoids the areas of inshore seabed mobility off Gorleston-on-Sea;
 - It is far enough (6km) from the aggregate dredging grounds off Lowestoft to avoid any interaction;
 - The available corridor width of 2km could accommodate both Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard export cables; and
 - It allows for onshore routeing options outside the Broads National Park.

4.8 Identification of National Grid Connection Point

46. Developers wishing to connect new electricity generation to the NETS must make a connection application. When the proposed development is an offshore wind farm, the connection options are comparatively assessed to identify an efficient, co-ordinated and economical connection location.
47. The identification of the project connection point to the NETS was undertaken by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) in conjunction with VWPL.
48. The aim of the process was to assess available options to connect the project to the NETS and consequently establish a list of preferred onshore connection points. National Grid and VWPL considered the possible onshore connection points from an economic, environmental and strategic perspective, which included consideration of the additional cost and investment required for the connection, the capacity required and the predicted timing of the connection.
49. National Grid are legally bound to 'develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical system of electricity transmission' (Electricity Act 1989, chapter 29, section 9(2)(a)). A guidance note on the National Grid website explains how the

assessment is carried out⁵. The process looks at technical, commercial, regulatory, environmental, planning and deliverability aspects to identify the preferable connection for the consumer. The Electricity Act 1989 requires National Grid when formulating proposals, to be efficient, co-ordinated and economical whilst also having regard to the environment. When the development being connected is offshore, the offshore aspects need to be considered in that evaluation too. The assessment process therefore looks to minimise the total capital and operational cost (total life cost) whilst taking into account other key considerations as outlined.

50. In line with this requirement, a range of onshore connection points and differing technology options have been considered in order to establish an economic and efficient design solution for the project. This has included consideration of deliverability, construction complexity, land issues, consents, technology, costs, and environmental issues (see Appendix 4.3 for further detail).
51. As part of the economic assessment, the whole life cost of the connection was considered by assessing both the capital and projected operational costs to the onshore network (over the project's lifetime) to determine an economic and efficient design option.
52. Following a review of landfalls and the offshore cable corridors, the long list of 14 onshore connection points was refined down to two options, either Necton or Norwich Main. Broad cable corridor search areas were identified for both options using high level siting principles to allow both options to be compared. The assessment of the two study areas found that the Necton study area:
 - Contained fewer road crossings for cables to make;
 - Contained less designated sites to cross;
 - Contained less populated areas (and the associated infrastructure and utilities) to Navigate; and
 - Allowed the Broads National Park to be avoided.
53. Due to these findings, VWPL and National Grid agreed that the most effective and economical option overall was the Necton option.
54. In July 2016, following the process outlined above, an offer was made by National Grid for a connection point at the existing Necton National Grid substation and this was accepted by one of Norfolk Boreas Limited's affiliate companies in November 2016. Following this, an onshore scoping area was defined and the onshore scoping process commenced. This was completed as part of the Norfolk Vanguard scoping (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2016). The onshore scoping area included search areas for

⁵ The Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) Process Guidance Note Issue 3
<https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity/connections/applying-connection>.

the onshore infrastructure which, at that time, included the onshore project substation, CRS and onshore cable corridor, as well as the landfall search area.

55. In line with a strategic approach to the development of Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard, all search areas were identified on the basis that they could accommodate infrastructure for the National Grid connection point for Norfolk Boreas as well as Norfolk Vanguard.

4.8.1 Refining the Offshore Cable Corridor

56. After the National Grid plc connection point was defined and allocated, the offshore cable corridor was refined. When defining the offshore cable corridor, a corridor width of 2km was used in accordance with advice from GMSL on required cable separations (GMSL, 2016).
57. The exception to this is where the cable bends south close to Newarp Bank, where the cable corridor has been widened. The bend in the route is to allow the offshore cable corridor to continue to remain to the south of the Bacton to Zeebrugge gas pipeline and then to enable the cable route to cross the pipeline at as close to 90° as possible to minimise physical interaction. The greater width in this 'dog leg' section of the cable route is required to provide additional space to allow the export cable to be installed using a large cable plough with a wide turning radius (600m) whilst maintaining a safe operating buffer from the gas pipeline. In order to minimise impacts on other marine stakeholders, the cable corridor has been placed as close as practicable to the existing Bacton to Zeebrugge and Bacton to Balgzand pipelines, whilst retaining a 250m buffer along the majority of the cable route.
58. An AfL for the Norfolk Boreas cable corridor was agreed with The Crown Estate in February 2017.
59. The nearshore area of the offshore cable corridor was refined in parallel with the onshore site selection to ensure the offshore cable corridor aligned with the landfall area.

4.9 Identification of Landfall Location

60. Following the decision for the landfall to be located between Bacton and Sea Palling (section 4.7 and presented as part of the Norfolk Vanguard scoping report), the landfall search area was divided into three sectors (Figure 4.5) in order to understand the constraints and opportunities associated with these areas, and to allow more targeted feedback from informal consultation:
- L1 - Bacton Green to Rudram's Gap;
 - L2 – Rudram's Gap to Beach Road; and
 - L3 – Beach Road to Bush Estate.

61. Information from the landfall feasibility review undertaken by Riggall and Associates Limited (2016) (Appendix 4.1) as well as a further review of environmental considerations and informal consultation responses (Appendix 4.4) allowed the landfall search areas to be refined from 5 potentially feasible landfall locations identified with sectors L1, L2 and L3 down to three (Figure 4.6):
 - Bacton Green;
 - Walcott Gap; and
 - Happisburgh South.
62. To assist with the selection of a preferred landfall site, a number of studies were undertaken including a study to better understand coastal erosion at these locations (Appendix 4.5) and site specific HDD feasibility reports (Appendix 4.6). The coastal erosion study considered the coastal geomorphology and coastal management policies along the Bacton Gas Terminal to Eccles-on-Sea frontage in order to assist the landfall selection and design.
63. The coastal erosion study (Appendix 4.5) concluded that there was significant uncertainty regarding the erosion dynamics on this stretch of coastline, in particular in relation to the sandscaping scheme proposed for the Bacton Gas Terminal. The site to the south of Happisburgh Village was considered to be least affected by the potential changes in sedimentation (which might take place if the sandscaping project at Bacton Terminal proceeded). However, the report noted that the Happisburgh South site was subject to natural erosion which would need to be considered as part of the engineering design if this site was taken forward.
64. In addition to the coastal erosion report, the constraints mapping exercise (Appendix 4.4) and engineering reviews (Appendix 4.6) were taken into consideration to identify the preferred landfall location. This was an iterative process which considered potential onshore CRS locations (outlined in section 4.12). Areas of sensitivity, including potential impacts on heritage setting, flood risk, proximity to populated areas, access and archaeology were considered. Consultation with key regulators, such as Natural England, was undertaken and discussions with the operators of the Bacton Gas Terminal site, and North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) also informed the process.
65. Happisburgh South was selected as the preferred landfall location for the following key reasons:
 - Avoids the nationally designated MCZ (the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds);
 - Allows co-location of Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas landfall which reduces total amount of area directly impacted;
 - Avoids populated areas as far as possible;

- Avoids areas at risk of flooding as far as possible;
 - Provides opportunities associated with Happisburgh archaeology - consultation ongoing with Natural History Museum, British Museum, Queen Mary University of London and Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Service; and
 - Avoids technical engineering and feasibility risks associated with locating infrastructure in the brownfield site within the Bacton Gas Terminal land.
66. In choosing the landfall location and the location of the associated transition pits, areas with residential dwellings and areas of high amenity value (e.g. footpaths) were avoided as far as possible.
67. The preferred landfall site (Figure 4.7) lies to the south of Happisburgh (herein 'Happisburgh South') in an area fronted by unprotected cliffs which are eroding. The proposed HDD drilling compound and transition pit are proposed to be located in an agricultural field and suitably set back from the cliff edge to ensure natural coastal erosion should not affect the drilled cable or transition pits within the conceivable lifetime of the project. The transition pits would be excavated below ground level and following jointing and cable pulling activities would be suitably backfilled to ensure visual and land management impacts are minimised (see section 5.6.1.3 of Chapter 5 Project Description for further details).
68. A specific, independent academic steering group has been established with respect to coastal, intertidal and nearshore archaeological considerations at the landfall. Early consultation is underway with members of the Ancient Humans of Britain (AHOB) research team, Historic England and Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Service (NCC HES). The project is seeking to maximise opportunities and knowledge gained from pre-construction and construction activities with support and assistance from the AHOB project. Further details are provided within Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.
69. The project would use a long HDD technique at landfall which would be set well back from the cliff and exit approximately 700m from the shore, thus passing well below the cliff and minimising any physical impacts. The long HDD option also requires no works on the beach or construction vehicle access to the foreshore. This removes impacts to the intertidal area including those on archaeology, recreation, intertidal ecology and physical processes (Table 4.4). This would result in no restrictions or closures to the beach and public access would be maintained throughout construction.

4.10 Identification of Onshore Cable Corridor

70. Following identification of the landfall search area and the connection point at Necton, a process to identify the onshore cable corridor was undertaken. As discussed in section 4.8, in order to minimise permanent visual impacts during the operational life of the project, the onshore cables between the landfall and the electrical connection point would involve a new underground (buried) cable system rather than any new overhead lines.
71. In considering options for the onshore cable corridor, a number of key design principles were followed wherever practical. These guiding principles were:
- Minimise overall length of cable route where practicable;
 - Avoid proximity to residential dwellings;
 - Avoid proximity to historic buildings;
 - Avoid designated sites;
 - Minimise impacts to local residents in relation to access to services and road usage, including footpath closures;
 - Seek to utilise open agricultural land;
 - Minimise requirement for complex crossing arrangements, e.g. road, river and rail crossings;
 - Avoid areas of important habitat, trees, ponds and agricultural ditches;
 - Install cables in flat terrain maintaining a straight route where possible for ease of pulling cables through ducts;
 - Avoid other services (e.g. gas pipelines) or aim to cross services at right angles where crossings are required;
 - Minimise the number of hedgerow crossings, utilising existing gaps in field boundaries; and
 - Minimise impacts on agricultural practices and access, avoid rendering parcels of agricultural land inaccessible during construction and installing cables along field boundaries preferentially.
72. An iterative and multidisciplinary approach incorporating engineering, buildability, cost, environment, landowner, community, and stakeholder considerations was used in the development of cable corridor options. A series of internal project team workshops were held to ensure each of the factors were considered effectively.
73. Appendix 4.7 presents the findings of the various stages of site selection work which have led to the identification of the preferred option for the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard onshore cable routes. These stages were:

- Identification and characterisation of the onshore project area;
- Refinement of the cable corridors into a study area (shown at Scoping stage) and identification and assessment of more detailed cable ‘branches’;
- Production of the chosen cable corridor option;
- Review of the preferred cable corridor option;
- Production of the cable corridor option for Norfolk Vanguard PEIR consultation;
- Review of the cable corridor following Norfolk Vanguard PEIR consultation; and
- Final cable route option presented in the Norfolk Vanguard ES.

74. Each one of these stages is outlined below.

4.10.1 Identification and Characterisation of the Onshore Project Area (Norfolk Vanguard Scoping Area)

75. As a first step in the assessment process, an onshore study area was developed (the Scoping Area). This involved identifying the preferred landfall location (between Bacton and Sea Palling) and applying a 10km buffer around the Necton National Grid connection location. A broad area of land was then identified to join these two geographical areas, which was then further refined to avoid the settlements of Fakenham and Briston to the north and Norwich and surrounding settlements to the south. An area south-west of Sea Palling was also removed as this encompassed a large area of the Broads National Park. Using the study area identified, an exercise of mapping environmental considerations was undertaken.

76. To aid consideration following the identification and characterisation of the study area, a number of broad cable corridors (3km in width) were identified. These were developed using high-level design principles, which were applied during different stages of the site selection process, and are shown in Plate 3 of Appendix 4.7.

4.10.2 Refinement of the Cable Corridors into a Study Area (shown at Norfolk Vanguard Scoping Stage) and Identification and Assessment of more Detailed Cable ‘Branches’

77. After the grid connection offer of Necton was taken forward into the site selection process, two indicative Cable Corridors A and B were taken forward as the Cable Corridor Study Area, as shown in Plate 4 of Appendix 4.7 (and shown at Norfolk Vanguard Scoping stage). The Cable Corridor Study Area was defined from the western edge of the Cable Relay Station Study Area, along Corridors A and B and to the eastern edge of the Substation Study Area. Cable Corridor options were then identified throughout the cable corridor search area (as shown in Plate 5 of Appendix 4.7). Each 200m wide ‘branch’ of the cable route option was given a unique code to allow for identification. Relevant considerations within each of the 200m cable ‘branches’ were identified. Following this, a classification was attributed to each

element based on a qualitative assessment and expert judgement. A preferred cable corridor for the site selection process was subsequently selected, based upon environmental and engineering considerations and other key factors as identified above.

4.10.3 Review of the Preferred Cable Corridor Option

78. The next stage of the cable corridor site selection process was reviewing the preferred cable corridor option (as shown in Plate 6 of Appendix 4.7), primarily to remove features such as clipped land registry boundaries, road margins, access tracks and areas of sensitive habitats, whilst still maintaining up to 200m cable corridor width (where possible) to allow for engineering flexibility. The review also considered a minimum cable corridor of 100m which was considered wide enough to allow for the co-location of both Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard cables. The review primarily consisted of aligning the cable corridor along land registry boundaries and field margins to avoid isolating parcels of land where possible. The overall benefits of the cable corridor review process included:

- Reducing the number of potentially affected landowners;
- Avoiding direct impacts to a number of sensitive habitats and features;
- Reviewing the engineering feasibility and constructability; and
- Identifying potential cable pinch points.

79. The preferred cable corridor was presented during the Norfolk Vanguard PEIR stage (Norfolk Vanguard Limited, 2017) as a single 200m wide onshore cable corridor to accommodate either HVAC or HVDC options, as shown in Plate 7 of Appendix 4.7. The approach to the cable installation work is discussed in detail in Chapter 5 Project Description.

4.11 Identification of Onshore Cable Route

80. Following Norfolk Vanguard PEIR (October 2017), the project design was subsequently refined in response to consultation feedback. This included a decision to deploy HVDC technology as the export system. The commitment to HVDC technology (compared to the alternative HVAC solution which was also presented as part of the Norfolk Vanguard PEIR) significantly minimises environmental impacts through the following design considerations:

- HVDC requires fewer cables than the HVAC solution. During the duct installation phase, this reduces the cable route working width (for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas combined) to 45m from the previously identified worst case of 100m. As a result, the overall footprint of the onshore cable route required for the duct installation phase is reduced from approximately 600ha to 270ha;
- The width of permanent cable easement is also reduced from 54m to 20m;

- Removing the requirement for a CRS as permanent above ground infrastructure; and
 - Reducing the maximum number of jointing pits for Norfolk Boreas from 450 to 150.
81. As a result of design responses to consultation feedback received, the cable route was refined as shown in Figure 4.8. The cable route displayed in Figure 4.8 was used for the Norfolk Vanguard DCO submission and also for the Norfolk Boreas PEIR.
82. Following the submission of the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application a number of requests were made by landowners to make minor changes to the onshore cable route. Each of the requests was considered on their own merit and a separate assessment was conducted to assess whether each proposed change would materially affect the assessments that had already been completed. The changes that were accepted are detailed in the Change Report, which was submitted as part of the Norfolk Vanguard Examination process (Norfolk Vanguard Limited, 2018b).
83. The majority of changes recorded within the Norfolk Vanguard Change Report were relatively minor. The most significant change being that the two cable route options included at PEIR on the approach to the onshore project substation (Figure 4.8 Map 9 of 9) were refined down to a single route. The PEIR assessed both the northern and southern options. Further discussion with the landowner and the property owner located in proximity to both options has since identified a preferred route which crosses between the two previously assessed routes, across two arable fields.
84. The final preferred cable route defined for Norfolk Vanguard in this process is the route that has been used for the Norfolk Boreas DCO application which includes these changes as presented in Figure 5.4.

4.12 Identification of Cable Relay Station Locations

85. Consultation was undertaken on the basis of two options for the electrical transmission system, an HVAC or an HVDC system. The HVAC option required a CRS to ensure the efficiency of the HVAC transmission. In response to consultation feedback, a HVDC export system will be deployed which removes the requirement for a CRS as permanent above ground infrastructure.
86. Prior to this decision, two potential CRS locations were identified; Appendix 4.8 provides further detail on how the CRS locations were identified (whilst CRS are no longer required, Appendix 4.8 provides useful information regarding the CRS site selection process). This included consideration of National Grid's Guidelines on Substation Siting and Design (The Horlock Rules) which document National Grid's best practice for the consideration of siting of electricity network infrastructure.

4.13 Identification of Onshore Project Substation Location

87. The onshore project substation would consist of up to two HVDC converter stations housing DC filter equipment and power electronics to convert HVDC to HVAC power for connection to National Grid, and the following (See Chapter 5 Project description for further detail):

- 2x outdoor compounds – each compound will contain one or more 400kV transformers, plus filters, busbars and cable sealing ends;
- Control building – housing SCADA and protection equipment;
- Access roads – for operation and maintenance access to equipment; and
- Associated connections between equipment via overhead busbar and cabling, including buried earthing system.

88. In order to identify the most appropriate location to site the onshore project substation, National Grid’s Guidelines on Substation Siting and Design (The Horlock Rules) have been taken into consideration. These guidelines document National Grid’s best practice for the consideration of relevant constraints associated with the siting of substations. The Horlock Rules have been considered as part of the development of the onshore project substation location and this is outlined within Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Application of Horlock Rules to onshore project substation

National Grid’s Approach to Design and Siting of Substations (Overall System Options and Site Selection)	Norfolk Boreas onshore project substation considerations
<p>In the development of system options including new substations, consideration must be given to environmental issues from the earliest stage to balance the technical benefits and capital cost requirements for new developments against the consequential environmental effects, in order to keep adverse effects to a reasonably practicable minimum</p>	<p>Environmental constraints and opportunities have been considered throughout the development phase of the project and reported within the Norfolk Boreas PEIR and the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application (Norfolk Vanguard, 2018a).</p>
Amenity, Cultural or Scientific Value of Sites	
<p>The siting of new National Grid Company substations, sealing end compounds and line entries should as far as reasonably practicable seek to avoid altogether internationally and nationally designated areas of the highest amenity, cultural or scientific value by the overall planning of the system connections.</p>	<p>Internationally and nationally designated sites have been avoided and the onshore project substation is not located within a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Park; - AONB; - Heritage Coast; - World Heritage Site; - Ramsar Site; - SSSI; - National Nature Reserve; - SPA; and/or - SAC. <p>Consideration has also been given to historic sites with statutory protection. See Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>

National Grid's Approach to Design and Siting of Substations (Overall System Options and Site Selection)	Norfolk Boreas onshore project substation considerations
Local Context, Land Use and Site Planning	
<p>Areas of local amenity value, important existing habitats and landscape features including ancient woodland, historic hedgerows, surface and ground water sources and nature conservation areas should be protected as far as reasonably practicable.</p>	<p>Areas of local amenity value in the location of the onshore project substation have been protected as far as reasonably practicable as part of the site selection process. See Chapter 30 Tourism and Recreation.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to existing habitats and landscape features including ancient woodland (e.g. Necton Wood, Great Wood, North Grove) historic hedgerows, surface and ground water sources and nature conservation areas (e.g. County Wildlife Sites). See Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology.</p>
<p>The siting of substations, extensions and associated proposals should take advantage of the screening provided by land form and existing features and the potential use of site layout and levels to keep intrusion into surrounding areas to a reasonably practicable minimum.</p>	<p>The onshore project substation benefits from relatively substantial existing hedgerows and woodland blocks within the local area (e.g. Great Wood and Necton Wood). These provide a level of mitigation of landscape and visual effects from the outset and can be strengthened with planting proposals during the construction phases of the proposed project to ensure robust screening. See Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for further details.</p> <p>In addition, the project has made a further commitment to incorporate effective, appropriate and suitable landscape screening and planting (as part of the ongoing onshore project substation design) in order to reduce landscape and visual impacts, as well as any indirect impacts upon the setting of heritage assets (an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) will be prepared and submitted with the DCO application, planned for June 2019).</p>
<p>The proposals should keep the visual, noise and other environmental effects to a reasonably practicable minimum.</p>	<p>Visual, noise and other environmental effects have been minimised as far as possible through the site selection. For example, consideration was given to existing screening and locating away from built up areas. See Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>Noise reduction technology and design approach is discussed in Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration of the PEIR. Suitable mitigation measures will be incorporated in the detailed substation design to ensure that noise emissions will not exceed the permitted noise levels of the existing Necton substation. This has been agreed in principle with the Environmental Health Officer at Breckland Council.</p>
<p>The land use effects of the proposal should be considered when planning the siting of substations or extensions.</p>	<p>The effects on land use have been considered as part of the site selection process. The impacts on land use are considered within Chapter 21 Land Use and Agriculture.</p>
Design	
<p>In the design of new substations or line entries, early consideration should be given to the options available for terminal towers, equipment, buildings and ancillary development appropriate to individual locations, seeking to keep effects to a reasonably practicable minimum.</p>	<p>Landscape and visual impact will be minimised by avoiding the use of tall structures and buildings wherever possible. The onshore project substation will be subject to detailed design post consent.</p>

National Grid's Approach to Design and Siting of Substations (Overall System Options and Site Selection)	Norfolk Boreas onshore project substation considerations
Space should be used effectively to limit the area required for development consistent with appropriate mitigation measures and to minimise the adverse effects on existing land use and rights of way, whilst also having regard to future extension of the substation.	The permanent footprint for the onshore project substation is based on maximum preliminary layouts. More space-efficient solutions may be developed during the detailed design process; if so, this would reduce the area required for development. The location of the onshore project substation has avoided direct impacts to public rights of way (see Chapter 30 Tourism and Recreation for further information).
The design of access roads, perimeter fencing, earth shaping, planting and ancillary development should form an integral part of the site layout and design to fit in with the surroundings.	The design of access roads, perimeter fencing, earth shaping, planting and ancillary development will be subject to final detailed design, however these will be designed in accordance with principles of a Design and Access Statement (which will be provided as part of the final DCO submission, planned for June 2019) to minimise impacts on surroundings.
Line Entry	
In open landscape especially, high voltage line entries should be kept, as far as possible, visually separate from low voltage lines and other overhead lines so as to avoid a confusing appearance.	All cables to the connection point will be buried underground. Modifications to the existing overhead line structures adjacent to the National Grid substation would be required to provide a double turn-in arrangement ⁶ . The net new number of towers required to accommodate the works is one, and will be in close proximity to the existing corner tower (to the north east of the existing Necton National Grid substation). The design approach taken would be confirmed at detailed design phase, post consent but would be in keeping with the existing substation design.
The inter-relationship between towers and substation structures and background and foreground features should be studied to reduce the prominence of structures from main viewpoints. Where practicable the exposure of terminal towers on prominent ridges should be minimised by siting towers against a background of trees rather than open skylines.	

89. An initial high-level desk based exercise was undertaken to map sensitive features in the vicinity of the connection point; this is shown in Appendix 4.9. This included consideration of designated sites of nature conservation, historical sites, local amenity value, important existing habitats and ancient woodland, surface and ground water sources, areas at risk of flooding and nature conservation areas.
90. In order to minimise the distance to the existing Necton National Grid substation from the onshore project substation (and to mitigate transmission losses), the onshore project substation search area was defined as a 3km radius from the existing Necton National Grid substation (see Figure 4.9). The search area was divided into separate sectors in order to identify the constraints and opportunities associated with the onshore project substation search area.
91. The search area was consulted upon as part of the Norfolk Vanguard Scoping Report (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2016), as well as during community drop in exhibitions, and

⁶ Each overhead line tower carries two 400kV circuits. In this arrangement, both circuits are turned into the substation busbar structure.

meetings with landowners, stakeholders and regulators undertaken on behalf of both projects. The search area was also presented widely through the project website and newsletter distributions.

92. Following the Horlock Rules outlined above, “*consideration must be given to environmental issues from the earliest stage*”, and therefore the areas with relatively fewer or less sensitive features were considered to be preferred in order to identify the location for the onshore project substation.
93. The least constrained areas were within sector 1 and sector 5 of the onshore project substation search area due to the absence of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and environmental designations e.g. for ecological and archaeological features within these sectors, as well as being less influenced by the residential buffer zones; these sectors were therefore considered areas of least environmental impact, and therefore preferred for identifying a suitable location for the onshore project substation.
94. The benefits of these areas were that:
 - Sector 1 (pink sector): Contains existing natural screening (in accordance with the Horlock Rules) afforded by Great Wood, Necton Wood and a network of hedgerows in order to potentially reduce landscape and visual impacts.
 - Sector 5 had the advantage of aggregating electrical infrastructure in proximity to the existing National Grid substation which not only reduces transmission losses but also keeps intrusion of electrical infrastructure into surrounding areas to a reasonably practicable minimum.
 - With the proposed cable corridor approaching from the east, these sectors also represented areas which would allow the most direct cable route to reduce transmission losses.
95. As a result of this assessment and along with feedback from stakeholders, the substation search area was refined to a ‘keyhole’ shape, as shown in Figure 4.10. This refined ‘keyhole’ onshore project substation zone was presented as part of the March 2017 community drop in events and stakeholder meetings, as well as being circulated through the project website and newsletter.
96. Since March 2017, the onshore project substation zone has been further refined through more detailed consideration of constraints, drawing on a range of engineering and environmental expertise and informed by further discussion with landowners and stakeholders, as detailed below.
97. The specific design principles / requirements used in identifying preferred location options for the onshore project substation locations included:

- An area of 250m x 300m area for Norfolk Boreas (see Chapter 5 Project Description for the onshore project substation dimensions);
 - An area of 200m x 100m area for a temporary construction compound;
 - Access from the A47 to the onshore project substation during construction and operation;
 - Use of existing features present (woodland and topography) to aid screening;
 - Avoid PRowS;
 - Avoid siting under overhead lines and other utilities;
 - Avoid siting within Flood Zones 2 and 3⁷;
 - Avoid residential properties;
 - Avoid where possible key archaeological assets; and
 - Avoid where possible ecological habitats.
98. Due to the strategic nature of the development of Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard, the potential to co-locate the onshore project substations for both projects was also a key consideration in identifying location options.
99. Following the initial constraints mapping exercise, as well as consideration of technical constraints and information gathered at site visits and consultation events, four possible substation configurations were developed for further investigation, shown in Figure 4.11. Appendix 4.10 provides detail on the further assessments undertaken to identify the substation locations.
100. In July 2017, VWPL (representing Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard) held a meeting with local residents and representatives, to present the four site options and request their views, including identifying key issues and opportunities associated with each option, and to consider options that might reduce concerns. Participants were also shown photomontages which featured examples of the potential planting schemes that would help to reduce visual impacts.
101. During consultation, it was recognised that noise is a sensitive issue; minimising noise through careful siting and investment in further mitigation measures was therefore an important consideration in the development of the project design. Noise impacts and mitigation are considered in detail in Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration.
102. Taking feedback into account, the four options were considered, and Option 4 (Figure 4.11) was discounted due to concerns relating to visibility from nearby properties and Necton Village. It was also considered to present a potentially high risk of buried archaeological impacts. Other factors, including potential impact and

⁷ For further details on flood zones, see <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#flood-zone-and-flood-risk-tables>

need for diversion or removal of field drainage systems, were also highlighted in respect to Option 4.

103. Option 3 (Figure 4.11) was also considered a less favourable site primarily due to concerns in relation to the likely presence of buried archaeological features. The site was also considered to be more visible from nearby properties in comparison to other options. The site is located adjacent to a disused common clay and shale pit which posed potential ground contamination issues when undertaking excavations in this area.
104. Option 1 and Option 2 (Figure 4.11) were therefore preferred, with Option 1 considered to have slightly greater noise, ecology, traffic and access impacts compared to Option 2. Of the four substation options, Option 2 was considered to be the preferred option for the following reasons:
- It provides a site within the original substation search area (in proximity to the Necton National Grid substation) and allows a comparatively simple alignment of cables coming from the onshore cable corridor, through the onshore project substation site and joining to existing infrastructure at the Necton National Grid substation;
 - The increased distance from the village of Necton assists in minimising visual impacts;
 - The site has good ground conditions that are relatively level which minimises earthworks,
 - The site has comparatively low risk from flooding;
 - The site is deemed to have comparatively less potential impact associated with known buried archaeology;
 - It poses the lowest potential noise impacts;
 - It has good potential for the development of screening planting and other mitigation measures that will be provided to help to mitigate the impacts of the development; and
 - Existing mature hedge lines will be retained and used as natural screening.
105. Traffic and access to the site and the potential presence of foraging bats along the hedgerows were highlighted as areas for further consideration and mitigation (see Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology and Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport for further information).
106. As a result of this process of option development and evaluation, Option 2 has been taken forward as the preferred development site for the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard onshore project substations under Scenario 1 (see Figure 4.12).

4.13.1 Identifying onshore project substation under Scenario 2

4.13.1.1 For the PEIR

107. Prior to the consultation on the PEIR it was determined that under Scenario 2, where Norfolk Vanguard does not proceed, the location that had been identified for the Norfolk Vanguard onshore project substation would be a suitable location for the Norfolk Boreas onshore project substation. However, for completeness and certainty this site selection exercise was repeated for Norfolk Boreas and the Project identified that a small area of land to the east of the NV substation would be isolated and difficult to farm. Therefore, to accommodate this within the PEIR a search area which covered the Norfolk Vanguard footprint as well as area of land to the east (Figure 4.13) was assessed and therefore consulted on as part of the PEIR (Norfolk Boreas Limited, 2018).

4.13.1.2 Post PEIR

108. Following consultation on the PEIR the decision was made to define the location of the onshore project substation footprint for Scenario 2 within the search area. In order to do this the following options were considered:

- Option A - locate the onshore project substation to align with the western boundary of the search area; or
- Option B - locate the onshore project substation to align with the eastern boundary of the search area.

109. In order to make the decision the following factors were taken into consideration for both options:

- Landowner requests;
- Environmental impacts (such as landscape and visual, noise, archaeology, ecology and flood risk); and
- Engineering requirements.

110. No responses to the PEIR indicated a preference for either option A or B, as such Norfolk Boreas Limited has selected to proceed with Option B as this would not isolate a section of land rendering it un-usable. Discussions are ongoing with the affected landowner under Option B.

111. The assessment of environmental factors concluded that for many aspects, such as ecology, flood risk, air quality there was no clear preference for either option A or B. The assessment of landscape and visual impacts showed that Option A was the worst case and therefore Option B would cause marginally less impact.

112. With regards to the operational noise assessment Option B was found to be result in a slightly higher unmitigated noise levels at one receptor location, however as Norfolk Boreas Limited have committed to designing the project so that noise levels

are mitigated and will fall within the 32dB(Z) 100hz condition limit and also results in no impact at identified receptor locations in accordance with BS 4142:2014 derived impact magnitudes (Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration), therefore there will no impact regardless whether option A or B were progressed.

113. An onshore archaeological feature was identified in the PEIR as a “moated site of possible medieval date and associated ditches”. The potential eastern extent of this feature would border the western extent of Option A. Although neither Option A or B would overlap with the extent of the moated site, Option B would be located further away from the feature and would therefore be slightly preferable.
114. Considering all of the factors stated above the decision was made to use Option B, and locate the onshore project substation under Scenario 2 at the eastern extent of the search area as shown in Figure 4.14

4.14 Identification of National Grid Extension Works Location

115. The existing Necton National Grid substation would require an extension to accommodate both the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard connection points. The Necton National Grid substation would need to accommodate the circuit breakers which are the connection points for both projects with associated busbar structures (metal bars that conduct electricity within a substation) and which allow connection onto the existing 400kV overhead line for generation to be transmitted onto the wider National Grid system. In addition to the Necton National Grid substation itself, modifications to the existing overhead line structures adjacent to the substation would be required to provide a double turn-in arrangement⁸ for the overhead cables.
116. The existing Necton National Grid substation outdoor busbars would be extended in an easterly direction for up to approximately 130m for Norfolk Boreas under Scenario 1 and in a westerly direction under Scenario 2 of approximately 200m. These parameters are considered to be the maximum worst case scenario, as assessed in line with the Rochdale Envelope principles (see Chapter 6 EIA Methodology for further detail).
117. Two new overhead line towers would be required to accommodate Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard in proximity to the existing corner tower (to the north east of the existing Necton National Grid substation) with a maximum height of 55m. The existing corner tower would be demolished such that the net number of new towers would be one. The design approach taken would be confirmed at detailed design phase, post consent. Under Scenario 1 these works would be undertaken by Norfolk

⁸ Each overhead line tower carries two 400kV circuits. In this arrangement, both circuits are turned into the substation busbar structure.

Vanguard but under Scenario 2 these works would fall under the Norfolk Boreas consent (See Chapter 5 Project description for further detail).

118. The location of the National Grid substation extension, and associated overhead line works is largely determined by the location and configuration of the existing Necton National Grid substation. The extension works would need to be oriented in line with the existing busbar infrastructure to ensure the most efficient use of space and most effective operation of the extended onshore project substation.
119. An indicative development area for the extension works to the existing Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications was provided in the material provided to stakeholders, communities and landowners and in public drop in exhibitions in March 2017 and consulted on as part of the Norfolk Vanguard Section 42 consultation stage.
120. The existing Necton National Grid substation, the National Grid substation extension, overhead line modifications and the temporary works area are shown on Figures 4.15 and 4.16.
121. Norfolk Boreas Limited are continuing to work closely with National Grid as more detailed designs are developed.

4.15 Onshore Project Infrastructure Refinement

122. Following the Section 42 consultations on the Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas PEIRs and additional data and information collection reviews of the following were undertaken:
 - Landowner and community feedback;
 - Ecological survey data;
 - Results from the priority programme of archaeological geophysical survey; and
 - Landscaping design proposals.
123. This information has helped to refine the project design further (for details see Chapter 5 Project Description).

4.15.1 Landowner Consultation

124. Non-statutory pre-application consultation has been undertaken with landowners since March 2017 (for further details see the Norfolk Boreas Consultation Report (document reference 5.1) and the Norfolk Vanguard Change report (Norfolk Vanguard Limited, 2018b). Comments and suggestions put forward by landowners have helped to refine the proposed project design and resulted in changes to the location of the project infrastructure. Landowner comments can be summarised broadly as follows:

- Aligning to field boundaries during construction;
 - Requests to reroute the cable corridor as far from residential properties as possible (in some instances); and
 - Reducing the amount of land that is required for the project.
125. More detail regarding the ongoing consultation with landowners is discussed in section 4.4.
126. Norfolk Boreas Limited's land agents have met and liaised with the land agents representing those landowners not met directly. Where possible, the site selection of the onshore project infrastructure, with particular respect to the onshore cable route, has been revised to take into account this consultation and incorporate the feedback into the proposed design.

4.15.2 Onshore Ecology and Recreational Features

127. In response to comments from stakeholders through the Norfolk Vanguard Evidence Plan Process (particularly The Wildlife Trust, Natural England, local authorities and the Environment Agency), the project design has been refined as follows:

4.15.2.1 County Wildlife Sites

128. As described in section 4.10 County Wildlife Sites (CWS) have been avoided where possible through the site selection process. Further to this trenchless crossing techniques (e.g. HDD) will be employed at all CWS and proposed CWS crossed by the onshore project area in order to minimise the impacts upon the habitats contained within these sites. This includes proposed trenchless crossings at the following locations:

- Wendling Carr CWS (CWS no. 1013);
 - Little Wood CWS (CWS no. 2024),
 - Land South of Dillington Carr CWS (CWS no. 1025),
 - Kerdiston proposed CWS (no CWS number);
 - Marriott's Way CWS (CWS no. 2176) (in two locations); and
 - Paston Way and Knapton Cutting CWS (CWS no. 1175).
129. At five of these six locations, no works will be undertaken within the CWS boundary. At one location, Wendling Carr CWS, a running track would be required to pass through the CWS in order to maintain access at the trenchless crossing works. This would be a 6m wide by up to 180m long access road located within the CWS.
130. Trenchless crossings in these locations also have the benefit of reducing impacts to some recreational features such as the Marriott's Way long distance trail; potential impacts that were also raised during the Norfolk Vanguard PEIR consultation process.

4.15.2.2 Hedgerows

131. The maximum size of the hedgerow gap created (if required) has been minimised within the project design as far as possible. Through the selection of a HVDC electrical solution, the maximum width of hedgerow gaps that are required has been further reduced. The maximum size of the hedgerow gap created during the two-year duct installation phase is 13m⁹, thus reducing the amount of hedgerow removed during construction by over 50% compared with a HVAC transmission. Hedgerow gaps at the majority of locations would only be created under Scenario 2.
132. Where hedgerow gaps are required beyond the two-year duct installation phase (i.e. for the duration of the subsequent two-year pulling phase), the number of gaps required will be minimised as far as possible and the width will be no wider than 6m. It is at these locations where hedge row gaps may be required under Scenario 1.

4.15.3 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

133. Onshore archaeological and cultural heritage considerations have fed into the micro-siting of onshore project infrastructure. These are discussed below.

4.15.3.1 Avoidance, micro-siting and route refinement

134. In addition to avoiding direct physical impacts on designated heritage assets from the outset (see Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage), non-designated above ground heritage assets and potential sub-surface archaeological remains have also been avoided by means of route refinement where possible.
135. Heritage assets recorded by the Norfolk Heritage Environment Record (NHER), the results of the aerial photographic and LiDAR data assessment and the results of the priority programme of archaeological geophysical survey have been used in the iterative design process. This data has been reviewed throughout a series of workshops so that features and areas indicative of more substantial sub-surface archaeological remains identified to date have been avoided, wherever possible.
136. This process has enabled the project design to be developed in a manner which takes into account known and potential features of likely high heritage significance (e.g. possible Prehistoric ring ditches) or concentrated areas of complex archaeological features indicative of Prehistoric, Roman and medieval enclosures and settlement activity so that direct impacts can be avoided (where possible).
137. This approach is directly in-line with the wider project aims of minimising the environmental and historic environment impacts arising from the project, and

⁹ This width assumes that the onshore cable route bisects each hedgerow in a perpendicular fashion. In reality, some hedgerows will be crossed at an angle, therefore increasing the maximum width of the gap required up to a possible 16.5m.

represents a good practice example of detailed and methodical embedded mitigation.

138. In the event that non-designated heritage assets cannot be avoided, initial informative stages of mitigation work will be employed and undertaken post-consent, followed by additional mitigation measures, as required (see Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural heritage).

4.15.4 Strategic Landscape Mitigation

139. In addition to the decision to commit to an undergrounded HVDC electrical solution thereby removing the need for cable relay stations, overhead lines and associated impacts, the project has made a further commitment to incorporate effective, appropriate and suitable landscape screening and planting (as part of the ongoing onshore project substation design). This will reduce landscape and visual impacts, as well as any indirect impacts upon the setting of heritage assets to a level that is considered to be non-significant in EIA terms, wherever possible.
140. Mitigation measures associated with the onshore project substation, Necton National Grid substation extension and A47 form part of a strategic approach to enhancing landscape character and biodiversity in the local area. Figure 29.11 (for Scenario 1) and Figure 29.22 (for Scenario 2) in Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment shows how mitigation planting will contribute to the wider landscape structure of the area and help consolidate green corridors for wildlife.
141. Mitigation planting for the onshore project substation is shown in Figure 29.9 (for Scenario 1) and 29.19 (for Scenario 2). This has been designed to help screen the onshore project substation as far as possible. Details of the mitigation planting are presented in section of Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The mitigation planting under Scenario 2 has been revised to reflect the defined substation, as detailed in section 4.13.1.2. The location of the mitigation planting has been devised in consultation with the relevant landowners (see Chapter 7 Technical Consultation and the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 for further detail)).
142. Mitigation planting for the National Grid substation extension is shown in Figure 29.10b (for Scenario 1) and 29.20b (for Scenario 2). This has been designed to screen the National Grid substation extension in views from Necton. Details of the mitigation planting are presented in section 29.7.2 in Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

4.16 Identification of the Project Interconnector Cable Corridor

143. Following the decision to commit to a HVDC transmission technology (Table 4.1) in March 2018, VWPL engaged with possible suppliers to provide more certainty on the most efficient way to export energy from both the Norfolk Boreas and the Norfolk Vanguard projects. Following this engagement one of the proposed solutions was to export some of the power from the Norfolk Boreas site via an offshore electrical platform located within NV East or NV West. In order to achieve this, project interconnector cables would be required to connect the two projects. These cables would need to be consented as part of Norfolk Boreas and therefore a project interconnector cable search area was defined within which the cables would be installed.
144. When defining the project interconnector cable search area, the following offshore constraints were considered:
- Existing AfLs for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard;
 - Existing installed offshore cables;
 - Oil and gas infrastructure including platforms and pipelines;
 - Engineering constraints;
 - Efficiencies in reducing the cost of energy;
 - Other offshore wind farms;
 - Shipping and navigation routes;
 - Nature conservation designations;
 - Commercial fishing; and
 - Sensitive seabed features.
145. The project interconnector search area was first consulted on through the Norfolk Boreas PEIR. The boundaries of the interconnector search area were defined by a desire to minimise cable crossings, for both commercial and environmental reasons. The central part of the project interconnector search area was defined by the boundary of the existing AfL for the offshore cable corridor as this had already been identified as suitable for cable installation (section 4.8.1) and had been extensively surveyed. The area within Norfolk Vanguard OWF sites has also been extensively surveyed.
146. Following the consultation on the PEIR further project design optimisation work was undertaken. This highlighted the fact that under one of the HVDC electrical solutions being considered (see section 5.4.12 of Chapter 5 Project description for further details), installing project interconnector cables directly across the area of seabed between Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard East would maximise installation and energy efficiency and minimise seabed disturbance.

147. The project interconnector search area was therefore extended slightly to bridge the gap between Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard East. A targeted consultation was then undertaken (see Chapter 7 Technical consultation and the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1, section 27)) to inform stakeholders of the change and seek feedback on the proposed approach to updating the Environmental Impact assessment to take account of the change.
148. The consultation took place in February 2019 and received only a small number of responses, none of which resulted in any amendments to the new proposed project interconnector search area. The final Project interconnector search area is shown in Figure 4.17 and the area which was added post PEIR is identified in orange hatching.

4.17 Summary

149. In summary, Norfolk Boreas Limited (as well as VWPL and Norfolk Vanguard Limited on behalf of Norfolk Boreas Limited) has considered options and alternatives in an objective way which has led to the refinement of the project description provided in Chapter 5 Project Description of this ES. The options and the process of refining the original project design from the broad search areas for the offshore infrastructure, landfall, onshore cable route, onshore project substation and National Grid substation extension have been informed by community, stakeholder and landowner consultation alongside environmental considerations and engineering requirements. Table 4.4 gives an overview of the site selection decisions that have been discussed throughout sections 4.6 - 4.16.

Table 4.5 Summary of site selection decisions

Infrastructure element	Options considered	Decision	Main environmental benefits
Subsea cable route	Northern Route to Mundesley to Sea Palling Middle Route to Gorleston on Sea Southern Route to Lowestoft	Northern Route to Mundesley to Sea Palling with a landfall at Happisburgh South	Cable route is short and direct, avoids need to cross The Broads National Park, minimises active cable and pipeline crossings and avoids MCZ to the North.
Landfall	Initial landfall search area was Bacton to Sea Palling. The area was then divided into sectors (L1, L2 and L3), with the following sites taken forward: Bacton Green Walcott Gap Happisburgh South	Happisburgh South	Avoids the nationally designated MCZ (the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds), allows co-location of Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard landfall and reduces total amount of area directly impacted. It avoids populated areas and those at risk of flooding as far as possible. Provides opportunities associated with Happisburgh archaeology and avoids technical engineering and feasibility risks associated with Bacton Gas Terminal land (Appendix 4.4)

Infrastructure element	Options considered	Decision	Main environmental benefits
Cable relay station	The decision for an HVDC export system removed the requirement for a CRS as permanent above ground infrastructure (Appendix 4.8 however outlines the process of site selection taken).		
Onshore cable route	Option A Option B Option C (Appendix 4.7, plate 3). Cable Corridors A and B were taken forward as the Cable Corridor Study Area (Plate 5 of Appendix 4.7).	Refinement of Cable Corridor Study Area based upon design principles listed in section 4.10 was undertaken. The preferred cable corridor presented in the Norfolk Vanguard PEIR was a single 200m wide onshore cable corridor as shown in Plate 7 of Appendix 4.7. As a result of design responses to consultation feedback (including HVDC decision), the cable route was refined as shown in Figure 4.8.	The cable route proposed was selected based upon guiding design principles (section 4.10) and a cable corridor refinement process which included consultation feedback.
Onshore project substation	Options 1-4	Option 2 (Appendix 4.10)	This option is 1.5km distant from Necton village and is within the substation search area (section 4.13), being 1.2km from the Necton National Grid substation, has relatively level ground conditions (minimising earthwork requirements), with comparatively low risk from flooding. There is less potential impact associated with known buried archaeology and has the lowest potential noise impacts. It also has good potential for the development of screening planting with existing mature hedge lines used as natural screening.
National Grid connection point	An appraisal of appropriate connection options was undertaken and from this a short list of preferred onshore connection points. A grid offer was made by National Grid for a connection point at Necton and this was accepted by Norfolk Boreas Limited in November 2016.		
National Grid Extension Works	The location was largely determined by the location and configuration of the existing Necton National Grid substation. The options considered are limited to within the National Grid substation extension area (see Figure 4.15), the National Grid overhead line modifications area, and the National Grid temporary works area.		

150. The final parameters for this ES which are described in Chapter 5 Project Description and shown in Figures 5.1 to 5.6 have been determined through extensive assessment of many different alternatives.

4.18 References

Global Marine Systems Limited (GMSL) (2016). Cable constructability assessment.
National Grid (undated) Guidelines on Substation Siting and Design (The Horlock Rules) Available online at: www2.nationalgrid.com/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=13796 . Accessed 09/10/2017.
Norfolk Boreas Limited (2018) Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Preliminary Environmental Information Report. Available at: https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/projects/wind-energy-projects/vattenfall-in-norfolk/norfolkboreas/documents/
Norfolk Vanguard Limited (2017). Norfolk Vanguard Preliminary Environmental Information Report available online at: https://corporate.vattenfall.co.uk/projects/wind-energy-projects/vattenfall-in-norfolk/norfolkvanguard/documents/preliminary-environmental-information-report/
Norfolk Vanguard Limited (2018a) Norfolk Vanguard Environmental Statement. available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/norfolk-vanguard/?ipcsection=docs&stage=app&filter1=Environmental+Statement
Norfolk Vanguard Limited (2018b) Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm: Change report. Available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010079/EN010079-002205-Norfolk%20Vanguard%20-%20Change%20Report.pdf
Riggall and Associates Limited (2016). Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) feasibility report.
Royal HaskoningDHV (2016). Norfolk Vanguard Scoping Report available online at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010079/EN010079-001286-Scoping%20Report%20Redacted.pdf
Royal HaskoningDHV (2017) Norfolk Boreas Scoping report. Available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010087/EN010087-000015-Scoping%20Report.pdf
The Planning Inspectorate (2017) Advice Note Seven EIA: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information, and Environmental Statements.

This page is intentionally blank.