

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Norfolk Boreas Project EN010087.
Date: 11 May 2020 22:31:00

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

The applicants comments on my Deadline 9 Submission suggests referring to various documents covering the subject of mitigating potential landscape and visual impacts of the substation. Unfortunately I do not think the answers to the problems regarding the visualisations can be found in any of the applicant documents, as the problem is with generating the visualisations that much subsequent work is based on.

I am familiar with the viewpoints 3&7, and have discovered where large enough margins of error in the process could cause the discrepancies. As all other viewpoint visualisations were generated by the same method, there is a chance that the degree of visual impact rendered at these points may also be underestimations.

The applicant in their comments on Deadline 9 Submissions suggests that further consideration will be given to the use of bunding during the development of the Landscape Management Scheme as part of the overall detail design. I must repeat that I consider the ground level height of the site and the use of bunding and at what height are fundamentals and not detail design. I cannot see any incentive for the applicant to adopt bunding after consent is given.

The applicant refers to ES Chapter4 Site Selection and The Assessment of Alternatives in response to my concerns over their choice of on shore cable rout. Again the answer is just not there. When the applicant had the choice of running a corridor to Swardesden or Necton, and decided Necton, they chose a longer solution with the knock on effects of lengthening Hornsea 3's cable corridor and causing a cable crossing point.

There is a similar situation with the noise level set. Again the documents cannot explain any good reason for setting the sound limit 6.6dB 5mins and 3.6dB 15mins above the average background noise, only that it was a joint decision with the local authority.

I consider these three points to be results of decisions made early on in the process and for whatever reason these tangible issues with real implications still persist unaltered potentially resulting in:

1. Extra cable corridor length.
2. Under estimated visual impact.
3. A noise limit allowing the substation to be heard widely in operation.

Thank You For Your Attention, Colin King 20022983.