

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: In reponse to Vattenfall document
Date: 09 August 2020 10:27:23

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010087/EN010087-002382-Implications%20of%20the%20Norfolk%20Vanguard%20decision%20-%20Baroness%20Cumberledge%20Judgment%20Part%202%202018.pdf>

Dear ExA

We would like to ask the **applicant** the following questions relating to the publication of the above document.

1. Are you saying that this entire planning examination for Norfolk Boreas is a complete waste of time because in your eyes Boreas will have to be passed because Vanguard was passed? paragraph 28 says:
"It is well established, as a general principle, that policies issued to guide the exercise of administrative discretion are an essential means of securing consistency in decision-making, and that such policies should be consistently applied...."
Paragraph 46 says :
"... no reasonable Secretary of State, aware of his responsibility for securing consistency in development control decision-making, would have failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that his own decisions on cases of the same kind, in the same district, taken within the same period, and which, for the same reason, he had recovered to determine himself, were consistent with each other....."
2. Are you therefore implying that which you denied at first, ie that this was a 'tick box' exercise, is in fact true?
3. Are you also saying that the ExA cannot make any changes which make Boreas different to Vanguard?

NSAG