

As far as I can tell from the large volume of documents published, the applicant has failed to address key concerns raised in my submission for deadline1.

The applicant has failed to adequately address alternative solutions in specific locations where the residual impact is classified as 'significant harm', as well as for the project as a whole.

Innovation is a key requirement of its license to operate under Ofgem's RIIO regime (Revenue = Incentives + Innovation + Outputs). To satisfy both the licence and the mitigation hierarchy embedded in the NPS, full and thorough consideration should have been given to proven modern technologies. These include new types of conductor and simplified undergrounding techniques. Lower height towers (pylons) such as the L9 series used north of Bath - installed to maintain safe aircraft clearance and accommodate local topography - should also have been considered in visualisations and scoping for sensitive locations.

There has been no response with regard to the benefits of micro-siting as a form of mitigation for the maximum number of residential visual receptors. The applicant's inability to agree terms with many landowners makes this issue effectively impossible to agree at this stage.

There has been no response to concerns raised at the outset about the practicalities of establishing access for work near the A1071 in the vicinity of Hurdlemakers Hill, south of the Bramford substation.

Coupled with many other shortcomings in other areas, such omissions means the DCO should not be approved in its current form.