

Orby Parish Council

Written Representation 30th November 2015

For the Attention of:

Kelvin MacDonald MCIH FRTPI FRSA
Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors
The Planning Inspectorate
3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Our ExA Ref: 10031785

30th November 2015

Dear Sir

Please find below details of the written representation with regards to: Application by Triton Knoll Offshore Windfarm Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Triton Knoll Electrical System EN020019.

On behalf of Orby Parish Council (OPC) and residents of the Parish and others please accept this as our written representation.

OPC have noted during the recent hearings with regards to the site selection for the IEC and the subsequent alternatives consultation, that the 'Vision for Skegness' has been repeatedly cited as a hard constraint with regards to the removal of the brown zone from the options process. Given that this would appear to date back to 2011, can it be shown that suitable alternatives had been identified for the location of the IEC. (Given that ELDC and LCC wholeheartedly back the 'Vision for Skegness' project). This has led to the identification of the Western Bypass as a hard constraint, which has a direct impact on the suitability of the 'brown zone'. However with the route as planned through the IEC situated at Orby there has been no consideration of the cumulative impact of these 2 major developments (not withstanding VikingLink) within the course of the application to date. I am not able to understand how this can be used as a hard constraint which affects the site selection however the impact of such a project is not considered during the application process with regards to the electrical system.

Whilst reading through the relevant documentation in relation to the DCO application it can be noted repeatedly that this project has to date predominantly been carried out as a desk based proposal, with many of the key factors within the Environmental Statement being based on assumptions as opposed to actual data or detailed investigation. Land access agreements have not been reached and as such important archaeological, ecological and environmental surveys are still to be carried out. Public Consultations have been inadequate given the scale and duration of the

project and the 'significant' impacts of the project as a whole within the wider area. In particular the total consultation / notification with OPC has been as follows:

1. Feb / Apr 2013 The alternatives consultation – no meeting was held in Orby and as such many people were not even aware of the proposed siting of the IEC or the implications of such development.
2. 12th Feb 2014 – RWE invite OPC to a presentation on 6th March
3. 6th March 2014 – RWE presentation to Orby Parish Councillors only – *At each presentation TKOWFL gave a presentation on the project and a summary of the engagement with local residents and communities that would be carried out. (From RWE document)*
4. 30th April 2014 – RWE response and thank you for attending the presentation.
5. 7th May 2014 – OPC invite RWE to present to the residents of Orby at the OPC AGM.
6. 9th May 2014 – RWE respond that they will not be able to attend the AGM at Orby as they do not feel that the AGM is the best forum for a public project update – please refer people to our website.
7. 5th September 2014 – Interface Selection Assessment Report published.
8. 22nd Oct 2014 – Public exhibition at Orby Village hall (This was **not** carried out with the Parish Council.
9. 31st October 2014 – Complaint to RWE in relation to mis-representation by Mr Hain in the September Newsletter which referred to a meeting with Orby Parish Council to conduct a walk-through of the village in relation to transport infrastructure and unsuitability for construction traffic. This was however carried out with a resident of Orby and therefore any views expressed during this time did not equate to the views / response from the Parish Council. At the present time no response to this complaint has been received.

Some disputed discussion has been held with regards to the communication between landowners and the applicant with regards to land being available to carry out surveys. Whilst looking at the Statement of Reasons Revision B Annexe 2 Figures 2 & 3 show visually colour coded areas that have permission granted / refused / awaiting information. From these it can be clearly seen that it would appear that vast parcels of land have been 'moved' from the permission refused group to the awaiting information group – is it possible to have that data to back these up and the definitions used in order to define the groups as notated on the figures, (would it not be correct to assume that if express permission has not been granted then access to privately owned land would not be permitted.).

The next comment is still in place from previous submission as due to time constraints at the hearings the subject matter has not been further discussed and will be included during second questions. The only update is that during a conversation with the applicant it was stated that they do not have the information with regards to the EMF's and that they have utilised the statement that the system will comply with exposure limits indicated by ICNIRP or they will not be able to operate.

Moving on in more detail to queries regarding the analysis and consideration of the impacts and levels of Electromagnetic Fields produced during the routine daily functioning of the entire cable route. Within the DECC Code of Practice with regards to demonstrating compliance with EMF exposure guidelines it states that when evidence of compliance is needed that '*a calculation or*

measurement of the maximum fields (directly above the cable) is supplied and that if this exceeds ICNIRP guideline levels then it is necessary to provide:

'A calculation or measurement of the field at the location of the closest property at which public exposure guidelines apply'.

With this in mind then the Environmental Statement – Volume 3, 1.112 quotes that National Grid Data indicates that the maximum magnetic flux density from a 400kV cable buried 1m below ground would be about 100µT at 1m above the ground directly over the cable and that potential electromagnetic fields from the onshore electrical circuits will comply with the ICNIRP recommended exposure limits for the public.

Given that a 400kV circuit would produce substantial quantities of heat, thus meaning that the trefoil presentation of the 3 cable phases is highly unlikely, therefore insufficient data has been presented to enable this calculation which is essential to demonstrate compliance with the DECC Code of Practice and thus it CANNOT be proven that EMF's produced by the cable circuits either individually or cumulatively (6 trefoils @ 3.5m spacing) will be within safe limits. Concern should also be raised with regards to the reported potential for an increase in the EMF at joint pits situated every 600-1000m along the entire length of the route, once again by omission of data the impact does not appear to have been considered.

Timescales within the application are incredibly vague and we are unable to get a clear idea of the timing sequence or even an outline critical path with regards to the programming of a huge project which will severely impact the local economy and community for a period of 'up to' 6 years. Particularly with what would appear to be minor discrepancies between things like cable order lead times, at 1 point stated as 4-5 years and then a few minutes later as 12-18 months for each cable, does this not then put the first export date past the August 2019 time given during the hearing?

Other considerations have been raised by members of the community but as these are being dealt with by other parties we have not covered these matters, however we would reserve the right to raise further representations at a later date as appropriate and necessary.

Orby Parish Council would also like to draw attention to the Planning Act 2008 – Nationally significant infrastructure projects Application Form Guidance (Sept 2009: updated 3 June 2013) which states as follows

Section 1 General Issues – 6:

The application information must be provided to a sufficient degree of detail that will enable the Secretary of State (and all interested parties) to appropriately consider the proposal. If the applicant considers that it is not feasible to provide full and final details of any element of the proposal at the point of submitting the application, the applicant should clearly set out its reasoning for this in its Explanatory Memorandum or, if more appropriate, in its planning statement if one is submitted with the application. However, in such circumstances, the applicant should still submit sufficient information on those elements to enable them to be considered during the examination. The applicant should consider discussing these issues with the Planning Inspectorate ("the Inspectorate") in advance of submitting an application

Thank-you for your attention to this written representation.

Yours Sincerely

Alison Watson
Orby Parish Council