

Dear Sir/Madam,

As an interested party, I would like to submit the following comments as part of the deadline 1 submission date:

- I continue to fully support the action and comments of Pylons East Anglia with regard to the proposed N2T scheme.
- It is clear National Grid have not consulted or properly appraised alternative options which are clearly cheaper, in the long term, and less damaging. Cable ploughing of HVDC underground cables is shown to be a highly preferable method and this should be properly assessed versus the century old, and damaging, pylons/cable scape proposal by NG.
- As tourism small business owners in Fornsett St Mary, the negative impact of the proposed pylons will be horrific on our business, income and lives. We have pointed this out clearly in all our submissions to date and continue to do so. The pylons/wirescape will destroy our business and massively devalue our largest asset which we have worked a lifetime to pay off and develop. This is unacceptable to us and unacceptable on a human level. Without any compensation, NG will destroy us as a business and family. This is akin to the postoffice scandal. At no point have NG ever bothered to respond to our concerns, they simply aren't bothered and just pay lip service to the 'consultation' process.
- The lane we live on, [REDACTED], is proposed as a construction route for the building of the pylons. NG have clearly never even bothered to look at what this lane is like - it is a farm track which is wholly unsuitable for HGV/construction traffic. The lane passes less than 0.5m from our home/business and the traffic will undoubtedly damage the foundations of our property. This is simply unacceptable and NG need to use an alternative road/access should the horrific scheme go ahead. We would like a site visit to show the planning inspectors just how ludicrous it would be to use [REDACTED] as it is often incorrectly referred to).

We continue to object, in the strongest terms, to the poorly thought out scheme by NG. Alternatives have not been properly assessed and the 'deadline' of 2030 is unrealistic and alternative methods are cheaper if the target is rolled back as per the Hiorn's report.

Regards,
John Bell





