

From: P Lang
Sent: 21 July 2026 14:59
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Submissions 1 & 2 to D7

Attached to this email.

1. In answer to the Applicant's (NG) response re: Colne Valley: Doc 8.5.8 SIH 2, REP5-307

2. In answer to NG Responses.
Doc 84.1.14 page 137. PEA points of disagreement.
Doc 8.5.8. applicant's responses to ISH2 Action Points

Thank you.

Penny Lang.

Submission 1 to Deadline 7, 21 July. [REDACTED]

Regarding the Applicant's (NG) response re: Colne Valley: Doc 8.5.8 SIH 2, REP5-307, I find it inadequate. I will not repeat all that I've said before but will say that just because NG repeats all their earlier comments, does not make them any more right. Which, in effect, is all that they keep doing, repeating that they are right.

I do not wish to continue a kindergarten squabble. But if this "discussion" were to be face to face, NG would be simply repetitive, obdurate and obfuscatory. If they had responded appropriately and thoughtfully, we would obviously not have to waste our time continually pushing for proper answers.

It is absolutely not sufficient for NG "*to disagree with this position*" and note that should the ExA require more information than has been provided, this request can be made of the Applicant. NG should not have to be forced by ExA to give a considered answer to an IP.

The Inspectors have requested substantive answers, not just document references, and I would expect IPs to be accorded the same respect by NG.

I would repeat the core of just one of my objections, which is as follows:

Through flawed judgement, NG has failed to prove that N2T will cause minimum harm to the Colne Valley. As stated before, the considered opinions of three separate, independent landscape reports have made clear that "the project would cause widespread significant adverse effects to the Colne Valley".

Submission 2, to Deadline 7, 21 July, in answer to NG Responses. [REDACTED]

Doc 84.1.14 page 137. PEA points of disagreement.
Doc 8.5.8. applicant's responses to ISH2 Action Points

With its usual economy of information, in response to Bullet Points 1-6, 8 & 10, *"The Applicant stands by the statement made in ..."* and in each reply, a vast number of various document references follow. In other words, it is not responding effectively to the specific questions posed by PEA at ISH2. Some responses, shown below, have very limited answers.

The Inspectors have requested substantive answers, not just repetition and document references, and NG should respond the same way to IPs

At Bullet Point 1, *the Applicant denies saying the route is straight at that point*. Is that correct?

At Bullet Point 6, the Applicant states that: *"Pylons ... will not obstruct views as these lattice structures are designed to be visually permeable"*. That is incorrect, they do obstruct views and settings

At Bullet Point 8 *"The Applicant has sought to minimise the need for vegetation removal and will replace vegetation except in circumstances where there are restrictions to planting trees under overhead lines and over underground cables. Although some woodland loss will occur ..."* *"Will reduce tree removal 'as far as practicable'"* This is far from reassuring. As with many of NG's statements, short on accurate and complete detail, with many unknowns.

At Bullet Point 9, *"the Applicant has assessed the risks of flooding ... Environment Agency flood model outputs confirm that the location is not at risk of routine flooding from the Colne. It is therefore likely that the observed conditions link to poor draining and waterlogged soil conditions"*. Incorrect, as stated by locals who know the area, as the position of pylon TB050 is flooded, on water meadow near the river, every year.