

My husband worked hard to try to express his concerns in his own words. I think they were clear to anyone actually trying to understand the concerns. National Grid has marked on their matrix only 3 concerns and one of these is something he did not raise at all. I believe a further 5 categories could have been marked and many more if the subsequent written submission had been responded to.

The response, to broadly categorise concerns and then cross refer to NG existing planning documents submitted is lazy and disrespectful. It does not answer the questions.

It is typical of National Grid's overall approach to this project. Genuine concerns are brushed aside. In their response National Grid seem to claim they have engaged with landowners and residents, but the hearings heard individual after individual stating they had been ignored when they had tried to engage or question.

One of my husband's grave concerns (and mine) is around EMF's and the possible impact on his health, in their response National Grid have invited concerned individuals to contact them. We have done this already, time after time both directly and through their land agent – with just broad-brush responses that EMFs are not an issue.

We also expressed the impact this project is having on our general and mental health – but this category was not ticked for either of our submissions.

A further point is this approach also underestimates the breadth of concerns that are felt by individuals. We were given three minutes to express our views. We were also asked for details which might be particularly pertinent to our situation. Many of the concern categories mapped would have been ticked by every single individual speaking at those hearings, given time. Most have already been set out to National Grid in the consultations – but not responded to.

Despite it being a repeated theme, National Grid have not set out a category of concerns around the arrogant and disingenuous approach overall.

The panel should not find this an acceptable response to the points raised at the hearings.