

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Comments to Secretary of State Letter
Date: 07 December 2019 09:00:28

We know that NSAG were not asked for an opinion on this:

18. The Secretary of State is considering whether to amend Requirement 16(9) of the Applicant's proposed DCO in the following terms:

"The external electrical equipment comprised in Work No. 10A (the external appearance of which shall have been approved in writing by the relevant planning authority prior to commencement of its construction) must not exceed a height of 15 metres above existing ground level."

However, we would like to give one.

The SoS is proposing that none of the NG extension will exceed 15m.

Does this include the extra pylon then, which will presumably be approx 150 feet? (approx 45.72m)

Everyone is ignoring the extra pylon, but it will make a massive impact on the landscape.

Also, whilst we are grateful that the Secretary of State is considering limiting the height of the external electrical equipment to 15m, in consideration of the fact that the substation heights will be up to 25m we would ask for the same conditions to be applied to them, or at least that earth bunds should be constructed to 'lower' the substations height to 15m.

NSAG

From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Additional Representation - information just come to light.
Date: 23 January 2020 16:56:24

Dear Planning Inspectorate

This is a photograph taken from the back of the campsite belonging to Mr Paul King in Ivy Todd.

We have only just realised [REDACTED] that the substations will be seen on a clear day from this campsite. (Lodge Farm trees can be seen on the right with Necton Woods in the (misty) middle)

No wonder then that the applicant has refused to consider the holiday lets in the area as insignificant.

Or could it be that their desk-based assessment is completely inadequate and flawed? We have continuously pressed the applicant to visit the area and see things for real instead of from a desk, but to no avail.

Our fear is that if The Secretary of State is of a mind to pass this application, many, many people will have a clear view of the substations that weren't expected to (by the applicant) and of course by the time they are proved wrong it will be too late.

We would ask that if the Planning Committee visit Necton again, they might use this as a viewpoint?

Regards
NSAG



From: [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Additional Representation Just Come to Light
Date: 23 January 2020 16:53:43

Dear Planning Inspectorate

At the Specific Hearing on 21st January 2019 yet again the applicant was insisting, on record, that no-one in Necton or Ivy Todd will see the substations. When one considers the massive scale of the buildings, this seems very unlikely to be true, and indeed, living here, we know it is not.

Yet again there seems to be serious flaws in the applicant's software and reasoning, causing discrepancies in both their photomontages and even more seriously in their ideas for mitigation. This is a huge danger with a project that is mostly decided by desk-based research only. It is terribly frightening that the applicant has been so unwilling to listen to local knowledge about this or other factors such as flooding. To dismiss the concerns of people who have lived up to 80 years in the area, must be wrong, and indeed foolish.

Mr Colin King's research (which will also be sent to you) has shown to our satisfaction that "the OS 5m DTM software used has an accuracy of +/- 2.5m rural, and less accurate where trees and buildings cover the terrain. The aforementioned mature woodland associated with Lodge Farm, has the capacity to cause a ridgeline great enough to cause the effect we are seeing at viewpoints 2 and 3 Lodge Lane."

Which means that the software is not only giving wrong heights for actual land, but also reading hedges, not as hedges but as land ridges. This would explain the fact that when they showed people the views from their own properties using their postcodes, no hedges appeared on the screen between the properties and the substations, and the ground was featureless as regards hedgerows.

At the time we were told that the software did not recognise trees and hedges, so they were omitted, when in fact the truth appears to be that it was showing them as changes in land height and as ridgelines. It is on these non-existent ridgelines that the applicant plans to plant trees, when in fact they could well be 'invisible' or non-recognised hedges, not ridges, which of course they cannot plant on top of.

This endorses our great fears, that if the applicant's mitigation plans are taken at face value and the project is accepted, once the buildings appear, and the trees and hedges are planted, and the flaws become obvious, it will be too late for Necton and Ivy Todd, as we assume the applicant will not be told to remove the installation, or lower it at this point! Who will be complain to once the construction starts and things become clear.

Regards
NSAG