

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 points raised.

One example in my own representation was about the specific flooding risks to our own land where there is a water course together with the impact of run off on a steep hill prone to heavy water flow and road erosion and the possible impact of both of these on the ability to access to our home. National Grid have merely ticked my concern as "Flood Risk" in their matrix and their response to any issues raised around water and flooding is to refer to the Flood Risk Report already submitted. However, there is no reference to the land around our home or roads or access in this report. In fact, the first pylon referenced in the Flood Report in the area is TB44, the issues I have raised are resulting from the siting of pylons TB38 to TB40, as far as the Flood Risk Report is concerned these raise no concerns at all. How can this be a response to my concern.

Like my husband's submission, a number of points I raised have been ignored, and again, even more when accounting for my written submission.

The points raised in the three minutes given do not cover all my concerns, this would take hours! Many more categories on the matrix would be ticked, therefore this matrix presentation understates the breadth of concerns felt by the parties affected. Some of the concerns raised, even in my 3 minute representation, are not even covered by this matrix.

Again, a typical inadequate and dismissive response by National Grid. They have not attempted at all to address the individual points raised. The response also include as fact some blatant inaccuracies. They claim that ALL the alternatives can only be delivered at substantially higher costs. Some of the reports referred to in the hearings refute that.

Once again, individuals and communities are being disregarded and trampled all over. In the hearings the distrust and feeling of [REDACTED] by National Grid was palpable. This is a clear illustration of what has created that impression.

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