

**From:** [NectonSubstationAction Messenger](#)  
**To:** [Norfolk Boreas](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 4 False Ridgelines  
**Date:** 23 January 2020 14:39:40

---

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 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