

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Norfolk Boreas ExQ5
Date: 24 August 2020 16:06:21

Good afternoon,

Following your publication of the fifth round of written questions, I am submitting our reply to these.

My name is Chris Allhusen from Bradenham Hall Farms. We own the land on which the south-eastern end of the Norfolk Boreas sub-station will be constructed. This project will have a considerable detrimental effect on our Estate and farming operations, not only from a practical point of view, but also noise, visual effects and light pollution. I wish to make the following points on some of the questions, as follows –

- 5.4.0.1. Cumulative Effects. The splitting up of the Vattenfall applications to PINS of Vanguard and Boreas is an attempt to reduce the perceived overall size of the project. I see from this question that PINS consider the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal projects may have a cumulative impact on Boreas, but surely the Vanguard project has a major cumulative impact as well, especially as regards the cumulative effect of the twin sub-stations.
- 5.4.0.7. Community Liaison. Could I please ask that a further question of the Agricultural Liaison Officer, in that he or she is qualified for the position. They will need to have a considerable knowledge of agriculture, land use, drainage, ecology to name a few skills.
- 5.9.5.1. 12m Strip for large machinery. This is to enable us to farm the adjacent pieces of land. Please ask that the boundary is a straight line, not a curve, as from a practical point of view, the area will need to be fenced, and that in addition it is a minimum of 12 metres wide at the narrowest point.
- 5.9.5.3.a & b. Sketch designs etc. We have been asking this for over a year, with no reply. Surely by now, Vattenfall must have made some decisions as regards Vanguard so the same will apply to Boreas as they are sister projects. Nothing produced to date has truly indicated the size of these buildings. In their replies at REP13-015, page 17, Boreas states that they have provided photographs of similar sub-stations. Whilst they have provided some photographs of sub-stations, they all appear far small that that proposed; nor were any dimensions or capacities included. In addition, Vattenfall are always saying that they have to use ‘the worst-case scenario’; if they know in more detail the size of the sub-station buildings that they are proposing, why cannot they say so?

Cladding. The same applies to cladding, which can make an enormous difference to the impact of a large building. We have seen nothing about this, other than their photo montages, which are purely indicative.

Tree Screening. The tree screening has been discussed but the current

plans show a screen of only 15 m wide. This would only allow for approx. 4 rows of trees, almost totally ineffective. In my experience this should be 30 metres wide and on both the south east and north east sides. Whilst I have been in contact with the Jo Phillips, Boreas's ecologist, I have not had any assurances from Boreas that what we agree will happen. In addition, for any trees to have the slightest possibility of screening these buildings, they will need to be of a considerable age and height when planted and not very small whips.

Noise. Referring again to Boreas's replies at REP13-015, page 17, Vattenfall were indeed refused permission to put a noise monitoring station on the terrace of our house! They never asked, despite our requests, to put one anywhere else on the Estate. They never even suggested placing one between Bradenham Hall and the sub-station site, so we can measure before and after noise levels. The site they claim to have used is adjacent to a public highway, our farm buildings and farmyard, so would have picked up all those noises. We live in primarily a rural environment, so such a site is worthless. I would like to see a number of sites established, once the trees have lost their leaves this winter, to measure the base line noise. I do not consider this an unreasonable request. Although [REDACTED] e-mail of the 23rd August 2020 suggests such monitoring might take place, I would like to see them publicly commit to this.

- 5.9.5.5 & 5.9.5.6. Independent design review. No offense to the people who work at Breckland Council, but unfortunately, I have little faith in them acting in the best interests of the residents and affected parties. Whilst I am sure that they have dedicated people, this is a huge project for them to undertake. Breckland are both underfunded and understaffed, especially following the Covid 19 crisis. I would also not support this being done in a local forum as, from experience, local meetings with Vattenfall were not at all well run and have degenerated into irrelevant arguments almost immediately. I would strongly support the inclusion of an independent design review, and panel. If this were to go ahead, who would choose and appoint members of the review panel?
- 5.9.5.8. Updated DAS & OLEMS. Please see the points raised in this e-mail.
- 5.16.0.1. SoS. I am delighted to see this question! The decision of the SoS on Vanguard makes a mockery of the whole PINS process. The process took months, if not years, and involved a great deal of many people's time, not least the Examining Authority. The reasons for overturning the ExA's recommendations were entirely political and I see no reason why this should not happen again with Boreas. It is, therefore, vital that Boreas agree to as many details as possible at this stage and, from a personal point of view, that covers most of the points above. In addition, just because Vanguard was given the green light, this does not mean that approval for Boreas must automatically follow.
- 5.16.0.3. Need. A decision on this project should be put on hold until the Offshore review is concluded. The use of an offshore ring main would negate the need to destroy even more of Norfolk's countryside, yet

Vattenfall, understandably, will not support it.

In addition, I would still maintain that the original site selection process was seriously flawed in that a number of sites, for example Top Farm, were never seriously considered by Vattenfall, with excuse like flooding etc.

- 5.16.0.5. Additional information. Sub-station site purchase and heads of terms. Whilst we are frequently being portrayed by Boreas as holding up negotiations, this cannot be further from the truth. We, and our agents, have been asking for more details so as to progress the agreement on the purchase of the sub-station site and its heads of terms, since last autumn. Our agent, Savills, have requested quite reasonable information with no reply, yet we are being continually pressed by them to 'sign up'. I would like to point out to PINS that any delay in this progress lies entirely with Boreas, and we do not take kindly to the suggestion by Vattenfall that we are being obstructive.

As always, I am happy to discuss any of the above points with PINS or Vattenfall.

Kind regards,

Chris Allhusen

Chris Allhusen

