

The applicant has not responded to my comments made at the Open Hearing or the subsequent Deadline 1 submission (which added to and gave background references to my oral submission).

Whilst a paragraph labelled 'security and resilience of electrical infrastructure' has been listed in the Applicant's Response document (Volume 8: Examination Submissions), it fails to cover any of the items/ topics raised by myself and Burstall Parish Council.

The applicant's response covers some issues related to overhead lines, however this was not an item we raised. The applicant's response needs to be much broader to cover all the items we raised and not limited to: the concentration of infrastructure at planned and existing sub stations; the ability to restore service in line with regulatory requirements in the event of a large scale outage; and, worst case planning scenarios and suitable mitigation. Specifically, Bramford Substation as a key node, which has become a hub responsible for a substantial percentage of the UK's power, and is rapidly becoming surrounded by the UK's greatest concentration of lithium batteries, merits its own resilience discussion/ response.

I would also like to highlight issues raised in my original objection submission to which I have received no response.

Specifically:

1. South of the Bramford Substation, the applicant's plan is to bury 2/3 LV lines and erect a HV line. Our request is an analysis/ costing, in line with the mitigation hierarchy, of retaining the lower profile LV lines and burying the larger profile HV line. It seems to us, both in terms of cost and mitigation, burying one line rather than 3, makes sense.
2. The applicant's plan is for an exit south from the west of the Bramford Substation. We have proposed an exit east, by utilising GIL, which would reduce the number of pylons by 5/6 as they wouldn't need to traverse the entire frontage of the substation, with substantial cost savings. Has this option been costed and what are the results?
3. An exit east would negate the requirement for a right angle turn south, therefore allowing a straight line of lower profile pylons to be used all the way beyond the A1071. Given this is the highest ground in the area visible for many miles, contrary to Holford and Horlock Rules, the use of lower profile pylons should be prioritised.