

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Boreas](#)
Subject: Deadline 13
Date: 16 July 2020 13:54:49

To the applicant

If the applicant had taken the HVAC path, the substations at Necton would have been more adequately screened by the proposed mitigation for that option. Why was it considered acceptable to only screen the bottom half of the converter halls once the HVDC decision was made? Shouldn't a different mitigation strategy have formed part of the HVDC proposal, so whether HVAC or HVDC was used, either type of substation would be equally well screened? Why is HVDC only half mitigated?

To the ExA

The final statement from the ExA on Vanguard was ... ***"whilst the Norfolk Boreas Offshore wind farm has been included in the Applicant's LVIA cumulative impact assessment, the ExA have not considered it in this part of the assessment due to the limited amount of details available. The ExA considers it would most appropriate for cumulative impacts to be considered in any future examination into Norfolk Boreas."***

How can it be legal to ignore part of the LVIA cumulative impact assessment, when it complete doubles the impact? To fail to give the 2 projects suitable cumulative consideration, just because the developer has not provided adequate information, is surely negligence. We implore the Boreas ExA to give this cumulative effect its due and rightful consideration in their recommendations to the SoS.

Jenny Smedley
NSAG