

Dear Planning Inspectors,

As this is the last opportunity for comment regarding the Norfolk Boreas offshore substation, I would like to register my dissatisfaction with the way in which the applicant has carried out the application process, (I also include Norfolk Vanguard).

1) The onshore substation site was agreed by representatives from Vattenfall and Breckland District Council, these parties did not take into consideration how this would affect many of the residents of Necton.

2) At the invitation only workshop, July 2017, I asked the applicant's representative about the suggested alternative sites. Her response was that it was definitely going to be built at Necton, as they had already invested much money and resources, with no possibility of change.

3) Vattenfall later argued that public consultation shaped their decision of the siting. At the "workshop" we could potentially influence their site selection by a few hundred meters, this was a very clever tactic as it "ticked the box".

4) When engaging with the public at presentations or sending out brochures, to promote and reassure, the applicant lacked credibility as maps and images were not drawn to scale.

A significant resource was missing as there was nothing to show the size of substation site compared with the village, which to me is a crucial piece of information. Considering there were many meetings regarding Norfolk Vanguard, including pre application meetings as well as the compulsory ones it was surprising this was never shown. Instead an attempt had been made to show people what they were likely to see from their houses. As this was not accurately scaled everything shown looked very tiny, which I feel was misleading.

5) I am concerned that fundamental errors are being carried forward and magnified, eg errors regarding measurements of topography caused by using OS terrain 5, as this has a typical accuracy level greater than 2m RMSE. It was noted that a small wooded area had been erroneously drawn as high ground and the applicant went on to suggest that these "ridges of high ground" and the trees would help hide the substation! [REDACTED] has fields adjoining the site and knows this land very well, so knows this not to be the case.

6) The applicant does not have a meaningful dialogue with people who have local knowledge and whose lives will be changed. When confronted with our concerns Vattenfall has given generic answers or refer back to their previous comments, which do not give satisfactory answers.

Showing no flexibility, they seem to believe their application will be passed if they produce enough statistics and theoretical reasons to fit the required criteria, regardless of contradicting opinions from the people who know the area. I am worried that they are basing the whole project on a bad decision taken early on, as seem convinced this will be passed regardless of views from the local residents.

7) The proposed site is on high ground, it could be better hidden from view if built at Top Farm, Necton, which is lower laying and available, It would also be no closer to residents than the current proposed site is.

8) The planted screening will be inadequate as is proposed mainly to hide the substations from the view of the majority, eg the A47 main road, but the people who will see it every day at Ivy Todd, have been largely ignored.

9) High earth banks/bunding would help considerably, with both visual impact and by deadening noise. But the applicant states "Bunds shall be low and complement the natural flow of the surrounding landscape" This is not enough and just seems a convenient method to use up excess earth from excavations rather than add additional earth which may be necessary, ie "Spoil from the cut and fill works to level land for the substation will be used to create bunds for planting to give an incremental increase to the overall height of screening along this sensitive boundary".

(above quotes are from Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Schedule of Mitigation (Version 4) (Tracked Changes) DCO Document 6.6, Table 22 Landscape and Visual Assessment, 22.6 312 Section 29.7.2 Impact on landscape character and view)

It is ridiculous to speak as if bunding would be an out of character addition to the landscape when we want to disguise the grossly out of character substations.

Extreme mitigation is needed and it would be far more useful and appropriate to totally disguise the substations by lowering the ground level and creating high green banks including the specified planting. Additional grass and trees would be a better fit into the Norfolk countryside than acres of substations.

10) The noise limit has been set as the same as for the Dudgeon substation which is close to the busy main A47 road ( 35dB at 5 mins and 32dB at 15mins) . This is not a fair comparison to the quiet location of Ivy Todd with an average background noise level of only 28.4dB. This noise limit is too high making it very likely the substation hum will be audible. Good practice would be to set the limit up to 10dB lower than the average, to allow for noise creep.

11) some of the applicants answers state fundamental changes are to be made at their discretion as the project progresses. I would expect the finer detail to be amended as necessary eg planting, but it seems the actual ground level of the site is being questioned, which would have a major influence on final height and visual impact.

12) I can only hope their method of flood protection, using attenuation ponds works satisfactorily, to avoid the river Wissey tributary from flooding houses in Ivy Todd.

I am concerned as being such a large project there is scope for human error, as already seen.

With the growing number of windfarms off the cost of East Anglia, please can a better location be found to preserve Necton and rural Norfolk? or better still delay until Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas can both be connected to an offshore ring main.

Yours sincerely

Patricia Lockwood