

Is there a fully costed plan to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain? (including the purchasing of the land required to achieve this?). Has this cost been fully included in NG's figures? Is this plan based on an independent report by a trusted, qualified, independent body? Would all replacement habitat be in place locally to that being lost and in good time to provide shelter for displaced animals, birds and insects? Has any thought been given to wildlife corridors and their essential role in nature? How would such a plan compensate for the loss of just one fully mature oak tree for instance? (a replacement sapling would be totally inadequate and in no way replace the habitat lost from that one, potentially ancient, tree). How does a project that labels itself as "Green" justify the felling of over a million trees and the scrubbing up, and burning, of hundreds of miles of hedgerows? I'm staggered at what NG plan to do to nature under the disguise of being "Green", it's truly heart-breaking.

On a different theme have all routes, both onshore and off-shore, been fairly and independently costed on a level basis by qualified, unbiased bodies? (not just by NG). Are the sums being paid to compulsorily purchase land fair and in line with current figures? Has any thought been given to lack of amenity stemming from this project and compensation that may arise from this?

Although NG won't openly admit it, It seems the only compelling reason for going on-shore is to open up the countryside to predatory solar installations, (and the immense extra damage these will cause to nature). In summary I fear NG have sadly been somewhat disingenuous and have cherry-picked facts and figures where it suits them to force this project through with scant regard for nature and heritage merely to sacrifice the countryside for ill thought out solar installations, (which themselves are only really viable in Britain by dint of generous subsidies).