

I object to the siting of the Norfolk Boreas substation at Necton, Norfolk.

Boreas is not the only large substation, there is already Dudgeon and potentially Norfolk Vanguard. The cumulative effect is unprecedented worldwide, so I am not reassured when Vattenfall quote historical comparisons to say they are safe. The probability of disasters and breakdowns that cause unsafe working of plant, fire risk, pollution etc must proportionally increase with a much larger than average power plant in one area.

The substation and Ivy Todd Farm, my family home, are separated by 450m of arable land, cropped usually with cereals which are dry and ready for harvest during July/August and a potential fire hazard/risk.

My elderly mother is also fearful of terrorism, this mass of important infrastructure could be a greater target for terrorists, so I am not reassured when the applicant says that this has never happened in the UK.

Necton is expected to accept 70 acres of Substation (compare to Wembley stadium of 11 acres) so the rest of the country can go about their daily lives, why should Necton be so disadvantaged to allow them this normality? This should be constructed in an industrial area not a rural residential village.

The applicant dismisses the holiday let businesses, the busy A47 junction, flooding, property blight, exposure to extensive EMFs, other potential risks to health and mental health, the visually overbearing impact, fire risk, terrorist attack risks and disturbing contaminated land as all being negligible. I know this area well so find it an astonishing conclusion.

I question the accuracy of their research methodology and findings – I'm not happy that they place great emphasis on historical data and statistics which could affect the local population if not current and correct.

The substation would be built on agricultural land draining into a stream, a tributary of the River Wissey, running alongside Ivy Todd farm which regularly floods, once coming through the house, so flood risk needs emphasising and giving due consideration.

Construction will alter the water table of such a sensitively drained area.

In their glossy handouts Vattenfall say they will enhance the village!? But are not prepared to ensure residents are protected from increased flooding risk of their making, by improving the capacity of this small natural waterway.

Human Rights Protocol 1, Article 1 protects your right to enjoy your property peacefully. Dudgeon substation produces an "acceptable" level of background noise but with additional larger substations it would be very difficult to remain within the legally required noise limit. Extra noise, both operational and during the years of construction is unacceptable.

This feels unethical. It feels like exploitation as Necton people cannot afford to employ numerous professionals to argue against this. But feelings are not taken into

consideration; it has to be factual. But we don't have access to all the relevant information, we're reliant on Vattenfall's research and interpretations as we are not all lawyers or scientists or engineers; we have our own jobs and families to attend to so find this a frustrating situation.

Why was the site selection for the "world's largest substation" limited only to different areas around Necton, a small village in rural Norfolk? Has this fully discharged the applicant's obligation to look at alternative sites?

The applicant has used the Horlock rules for guidance, but only in a selective way. They quote "Consideration is given to placing the electrical infrastructure as close as possible to the existing National Grid connection point (if feasible) in order to minimise the landscape and visual effects..." ,

But they also say they have followed Horlock rules advice 1.5.6, to avoid where possible "Community; Proximity to residential properties; and Sensitive land uses, e.g. schools, hospitals.") But Necton residents and village primary school are only one mile away which does not seem reasonable.

Vattenfall state "In the case of the Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas projects, the assessment of options was carried out over a period of several months in late 2015 and early 2016, with the active participation of both National Grid and Vattenfall. But was there was no consultation with the Parish Council or local residents who will be directly affected by this at that time. This site was decided on without being shaped by local knowledge, this must surely contravene article 6 of the Aarhus Convention. "Article 6, paragraph 1, Requires Parties to guarantee public participation in decision-making with a potentially significant environmental impact"; "Article 6, paragraph 4, Requires that public participation take place early in decision-making"; "Article 6, paragraph 8, "Parties must ensure that decision takes due account of public participation".

Vattenfall states that Necton was chosen for ease of connection and economic advantage. Adding Boreas soon after Vanguard gives strategic advantages regarding environmental impact. But they have not considered the overbearing visual impact of this saturation of industrialisation in a rural area. They have not considered the impact on the villages of Mid-Norfolk and the residents of Necton.

The main mitigation offered is planted screening to hide the 25m tall structures, Indigenous tree species would take 20-30 years to reach mature height (and some faster growing non-natives) but as Boreas (and Vanguard) would be built on some of the highest ground in the area it would be impossible for even mature trees to adequately hide it from view.

Vattenfall's before and after images with proposed mitigation were not to scale making it difficult for people to grasp the true impact of the proposals. I feel their statement in small print of "this view is not an appropriately scaled photomontage" misleading and inadequate.

The combination of many inaccuracies makes me question Vattenfall's findings and their competency.

I am also concerned about the mental health and wellbeing of residents as there is a proven link between environment and mental health. When a population chooses to live in a rural area it follows that they will enjoy the positive impacts of living near natural environments, but there is also a sense of loss when suddenly deprived of such an inherent part of their lives. This gives a potential for a two-fold negative effect on mental wellbeing

Necton has a higher than average ageing population whose mental health is more susceptible to stress. There is also evidence that older people value nature highly and that interaction with green spaces not only improved levels of concentration but also reduced stress (Talbot & Kaplan, 1991; Ottosson & Grahn, 2005).

The inflexibility of the applicant in considering other sites has caused many people much anxiety and stress over the last 3 years.

Vattenfall mentions the Human Rights Act, Article 8 requires you to “strike a balance between a person’s private rights and the needs of other people or society as a whole.” But the applicant also needs to look at THE PRINCIPLE OF PROPORTIONALITY, at the heart of the Human Rights Act i.e. “*But the interference must be necessary (not just reasonable) and it should be ‘proportionate’ – that is, not more than is needed to achieve the aim desired.*” “The principle can perhaps most easily be understood by the saying ‘Don’t use a sledgehammer to crack a nut’.” TO CONCENTRATE THE COUNTRY’S ENERGY PRODUCTION NEXT TO A SMALL VILLAGE to their detriment, goes against this.

There seems no forward thinking or strategic planning. Miles of extra cable corridors, that could be avoided, are being built as the National Grid Company offer connection on a first come first served basis, Eg the long cable corridor (80m wide by 55km long) from coastal Happisburgh to the planned substation at Necton. With this haphazard approach, I question if the National Grid are carrying out their duties of developing an efficient, co-ordinated, economic electricity transmission system for England and Wales.

The government is under pressure to quickly react to climate change and global warming. But the very world that we are trying to protect will be damaged by this venture, the time/resources would be better employed engineering the Offshore Ring Main, running under the sea bed that all windfarms can connect to.

I have looked at The National Infrastructure Planning Association Insights Programme 2016 Research Project, Page 26, Chapter 5. “Is there a need for more flexibility?”

“Rapid technological change in relation to what is being built (particularly in the energy sector) which must be allowed for when coming to construct schemes years later (given the long timescales for many NSIPs), and that there can be changes in construction industry technology as to how the project is being built which need to be allowed for (and can sometimes reduce impacts).....(ie please consider an O.R.M.)

“To deliver in ways that are better for affected communities: as constructors develop their working methods for projects, they may find ways of operating that are more beneficial and less disruptive for the affected communities which cannot be applied without either flexibility or amendments to the DCO.”.....(*ie please consider an O.R.M.*)

There is a need for clean energy but why irrevocably ruin the landscape blighting villages and homes in the process?