

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: ExA questions
Date: 12 August 2020 16:23:24

Q5.9.5.5 Breckland Council; Necton Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; NSAG; the NFU and LIG; Landowners and Interested Parties with an interest in Necton Independent Design Review for substations In light of comments received at OFH2 [EV12-002] and OFH3 (Necton Session) [EV13- 011], the decision on Norfolk Vanguard, which gives greater certainty to Scenario 1, and the ExA's ongoing concern about the complexity and detail contained in post-consent approvals for R16 and R18, the resource constraints of Breckland Council and the statements in the NIC Design Principles, the ExA invited the Applicant to consider inclusion of an independent design review at an early stage in the post-consent design process for the substations area, including those for Norfolk Vanguard if appropriate. The Applicant has set out its reasons for not involving an independent design review but has ExQ5 11 August 2020 Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020 Page 22 of 31 ExQ5 Question to: Question: committed to amending the DAS to include a design review at an early stage conducted in a local forum [REP13-018]. Do you: a) Agree that an early design review should take place? b) If so, do you consider it should be conducted in a local forum or as an independent design review – or both?

- a) Yes we do agree.
- b) Both

Thank you for asking.

NSAG

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Q5.9.5.6
Date: 12 August 2020 16:27:19

Q5.9.5.6 The Applicant; Breckland Council; Necton Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; NSAG; The NFU and LIG; Landowners and Interested Parties with an interest in Necton Independent Design Review for substations The ExA is consulting on ways potentially to secure the input of an independent design review and invites without prejudice comments on inclusion of wording in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and/ or the dDCO as follows: DAS [REP7-007,Para 67] The Applicant will engage with Breckland Council and at an early stage with an independent design review panel to review the mitigation and landscape proposals and the architecture of the convertor building of the onshore project substation, at the time when further detailed design information is available. This will be undertaken through the production of a Design Guide. AND [REP7-007, Appendix 1, first para] The Design Guide will be prepared by Norfolk Boreas Limited (the Applicant) and will combine input from specialist consultants and take on board findings as appropriate from the independent design review panel. This part of the Norfolk Boreas project will enable the team to undertake the detailed design of the onshore project substation and ensure that embedded mitigation is integral in this process. The Design Guide will be presented as an A3 document, and will combine text and figures to explain the proposals OR inclusion of additional wording at R16(3) to read: ExQ5 11 August 2020 Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020 Page 23 of 31 ExQ5 Question to: Question: "The onshore project substation must be constructed in accordance with the details approved by the relevant planning authority, which must also have been subject to an early independent design review." OR Both the above.

Both please.

NSAG

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Deadline 14
Date: 25 August 2020 12:41:15

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Regarding the fifth round of questions.

Q5.5.01. The schedule of changes to the Development Consent Order includes the SoS comments to carry across changes from the Norfolk Vanguard as made order and ensure consistency between the two projects.

How can it be right that adjustments be made only from Vanguard to Boreas?

The Vanguard DCO has already been passed by the SoS.

It was made clear that cumulative effects of the substations were not considered by the Vanguard ExA, when recommending action to the SoS.

There seems to be no way of adjusting the Vanguard DCO (after its approval) to match any changes made to the Boreas DCO during its examination.

The two projects therefore can never be made consistent with each other.

Unless the Vanguard decision is reversed by the SoS until such times as the cumulative effects of the substations (in particular) can be assessed and suitable changes made to the Vanguard DCO, so that the projects can be consistent with each other.

NSAG