

NG talk about Alternatives (pg 5 of AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0279); starting presumption is strong preference for OH cables due to cost and technical capability. This is sheer rubbish. The cost hasn't factored in the cost to our landscape, loss of housing value, mental health impacts, and the fact this has no benefit AT ALL to the area it ruins. NG have already established undersea electricity cables, by their own flipping admission, so they should invest in this technology PROPERLY.

Landscape - as they say, NO MITIGATION TO SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPE IMPACTS.

Property and compensation - sorry, [REDACTED]. Put these in front of [REDACTED] houses...see what happens then.

The Waltham Gap - how can you justify splitting these two historic villages, with infrastructure that will stand and degrade the landscape and character for 100+ years? you can't.

In summary, this is not a wise use of resources; and is a really awful solution to a problem. Undersea cables have - very low environmental impact; no-one lives under the sea so safeguards public health, public mental health, and the environment. Undersea is more secure by virtue of it being under the sea (look at how Russia targets Ukrainian infrastructure). It's also the RIGHT option, ethically.

National Grid are morally bankrupt.