

Further to the applicants response to the open hearings I would like to comment as follows:

The applicant has failed to address specific issues raised in particular areas along the route and has instead chosen to "lump" responses together.

The applicant has failed to properly address the risk to the endangered white clawed crayfish in the River Tas and how they propose to protect them from pollution from run off in Forncett.

The applicant has failed to properly address the concerns raised by Pylons East Anglia in relation to the risk to human health from potential exposure to the harm caused by acid sulphate soils.

The applicant has chosen to just repeat the answers to all valid queries raised at the oral hearings by saying that they have considered alternatives but not giving any justification as to why these considerations have not resulted in any changes.

The applicant has failed to address the question that I raised in my submission at the oral hearing in relation to the difference in costings of the Norwich to Tilbury project and the Bramford to Twinstead project. My comment in the submission was "We are told that costings for this project are about 5 million pounds per kilometre yet costings for Bramford to Twinstead appear to be about 24 million pounds per kilometre. How can Norwich to Tilbury be 5 times cheaper? What have National Grid NOT included in its costings of this project?"

The applicant has not responded to the question raised in my oral submission asking why the computer generated visualisations of the proposed route through Forncett provided at the consultations did not include the existing pylon line to show the true cumulative effect.

The applicant has failed to answer the question raised in my oral submission as to why a route was not chosen that ran alongside major A roads. The specific question raised was "Why has a route through unspoiled countryside been chosen when it could have run alongside major A roads with easy access which would have caused only short term disruption whereas the inaccessible routes through our villages will cause permanent destruction of areas of natural beauty and critically important ecosystems and adversely affect communities, homes, livelihoods and the mental health and wellbeing of so many people. Why have cheaper, better and faster alternatives not been properly considered? Is it that pylons give easy opportunities for the industrialisation of East Anglia with a proliferation of solar and BESS site applications, including a solar proposal that would engulf our village? " This is an incredibly important question as this application needs to be considered as a stand alone project and not as the potential conduit for other NSIPs.