

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Norfolk Boreas EXQ2
Date: 13 February 2020 13:06:05

Good Morning,

I wish to respond to your request for further comments on the proposed Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm, its route across Norfolk, the siting and design of the sub-station at Necton. My comments and questions relate primarily to your questions Q2.9.6.4 through to Q2.9.6.7 –

1. I farm at Bradenham Hall Farms. Not only are Vanguard/Boreas planning to dive their corridor through 15 of our fields, but also part of the substation may be sited on our land.
2. I understand that serious consideration is being given to the use of an offshore ring main to avoid having to tear up the Norfolk countryside by taking the Boreas connection to Necton. I would fully support this.
3. If the sub-station is to come to Necton, then the proposed siting of the Boreas substation in the Necton area is seriously misguided, as was Vanguard's. The proposed site is the highest of the four original proposals and in fact 17 metres above the one destined for the stream valley. This stream site would take advantage of the natural screening of the land enabling it to be better landscaped and hidden. Alternatively, an even better site, which you have visited is Top Farm, adjacent to the A47 and existing sub-station, as well as being even lower than any of the four option sites. Boreas have never given good reasons as to why either of these far lower sites cannot be used.
4. Boreas have never explained how they intend to landscape these enormous buildings. It would take 40 years for trees to either hide them or reduce the sound impact of their operation.
5. In one of Boreas's scenarios, part of the sub-station buildings seems to have crept onto our land. This has never been mentioned or discussed with me.
6. I met with Boreas on the 14th November and asked a lot of questions about the sub-station as it impacts on our land, namely detailed layout of the site, design and colour of the buildings, landscape intrusion mitigation, tree planting, the possibility of part burying the buildings to name a few. I have had no reply to any of our questions. We asked similar questions of Vanguard, also with no reply nor any information provided.
7. At that meeting, Boreas claimed that I had refused to negotiate with them. This is totally untrue, but I believe their strategy is that once they have DCO permission from PINS, they will use their CPO powers to do whatever they wish rather than entering into a voluntary agreement where I can have some input and influence of the significant effect of the scheme on my historic estate.

8. At the site visit that you had on the 23rd January 2020, Boreas were not at all clear what had in fact been marked out, nor could I do so from the various plans I have. I have asked this question of them but have not had any reply. However, I see in the report of the inspection, and to quote “Bradenham Hall Farm, corner of small copse, position north east of north east corner of proposed site of Norfolk Boreas project substation (Scenario 1). Existing features observed/ pointed out: hedge line boundary between landownerships, Necton Wood to the north west, rich sandy soil. Project features pointed out: pegged out north east corner of proposed project substation, sites for temporary works area, cable route and landscape”, that they seem to admit that the pegged-out site has buildings on it. They also claim that the site is a “rich sandy soil”. This admirably demonstrates their lack of knowledge as it is medium to heavy clay!
9. I would suggest another site visit should be conducted, with detailed plans submitted by Boreas and pegged out, and in better weather then the visual effect of the site could be seen. This should include some physical evidence of the proposed height of the buildings and installations.
10. Despite having plenty of time to do so, Vattenfall have failed to request to be done or conduct any surveys over our land covering the selected route to see if there are any archaeological features, rare species etc.
11. No noise surveys have been requested or conducted to assess the background noise of the land. I would consider this of the highest importance if the sub-station is to be built at Necton.
12. I am very concerned about both the noise and light pollution from the site, both during construction and operation, as being on a high point, both the light and noise will carry a considerable distance. During the construction and early operation of the existing sub-station, this became a serious concern and nuisance for local people.
13. It is a great concern to me that Vattenfall are requesting DCO powers without providing sufficient information on their intentions. In reality I do not believe that they have answers to some of the questions which have been asked of them. I very strongly object to the principle of Vattenfall being able to use compulsory purchase powers to force their decisions through without having the need to negotiate with Landowners.

Please consider my comments and I would much appreciate a reply to each point.

Kind regards

Chris Allhusen

