From: [redacted]
To: Norfolk Boreas
Subject: EN010087 – Norfolk Boreas
Date: 20 August 2021 23:32:13

My Reference: 20022964
Response to Onshore Project Substation Masterplan Principles

Dear secretary of state,

This seems a theoretical overview, promising great things, but I can't see that any significant changes have been made, apart from using the words "holistically", "collectively" and "cumulatively". There is no detail as to how they will address the problems at Ivy Todd Farm, being the closest resident, and for other nearby residents.

In response to the first bullet point• "Continued commitment to co-location of onshore project substation infrastructure to keep these developments contained within a localised area" is highly contentious for those living in that "localised area"

Location is a key element, fundamental to this project, and I feel that the applicant and Breckland council have been negligent in not finding a better location further away from a populated area.

This first point, as above, demonstrates the applicant's lack of care, knowledge and understanding of local resident's concerns. On numerous occasions it has been pointed out that this infrastructure is far too large for this rural location. The applicant claims to have had meaningful dialogue and consultation with local householders, but they have not been willing to make any changes regarding this massive intrusion, have made no attempts to change anything, as they are obviously primarily providing for the masses.
Necton Parish council or affected members of the public were not consulted until after the decision was made, with no room for manoeuvre. As we live in a democratic country this appears to be oppressing people holding minority views.

It is difficult to believe the applicant will make good with mitigation when they show such a lack of understanding and disregard of resident's concerns.

I understand and agree with the drive for green energy but I could be classed as a Nimby, lacking knowledge and understanding of the principles of such a large project but I agree with an article in the New Statesman 8 Dec 2020 — *"Sometimes the people whose backyard is at stake are best placed to see the value in preserving it – not just its value to them, but its intrinsic value. Far from being at odds with the public good, they may even help ward off public bads.....*

Regarding the third bullet point• "*Strategic approach to landscaping to minimise visual effects, both alone and cumulatively…..* Please explain "strategic approach to landscaping.." would this be geared to hiding the view from the masses, eg those travelling along the distant A47 road or will it actually address hiding the view from the closest residents who are most affected, ie Ivy Todd Farm, Ivy Todd and Necton

Regarding the fourth bullet point • "*Locally specific landscape mitigation measures will be developed considering how the infrastructure of the onshore project substations can be collectively integrated into the existing rural landscape*". This does not seem possible as

sited on higher ground, how can this be integrated into the existing rural landscape? It would need to be sunken or high earth banks produced, in excess of just using the spoils from construction as already suggested (and as in the fifth bullet point mentioned below). And planting schemes would be certainly ineffective on their own. . Please explain how this could be achieved?

Re fifth bullet point• "*Consideration of reuse of earthworks generated as part of level change across both projects to maximise the efficient use of earthworks generated material in a co-ordinated way, as well as to maximise opportunities for a holistic approach to landscaping."* This sounds like a generic paragraph saying the right things just to get this project passed, as "consideration of reuse of earthworks" is not good enough, we need a guarantee plus bringing in more earth if necessary to adequately hide the substations. This is so vague that it doesn't bode well for the applicant providing the substantial mitigation measures needed and deserved. If Necton has to have this infrastructure in such close proximity, I think the least we can expect is robust mitigation from the applicant.

Thank you
Yours sincerely
Patricia Lockwood

[redacted]