

1. The initial periods / lead-times of this timetable have been very short, especially given the holiday period. I request that these are extended to allow people to respond to the points raised in time. I myself have struggled to read and analyse the required information - much of which is newly/recently published – and respond in time on this very serious matter for us. I am aware of many others including interested parties who, as a result, are not responding at this time, or having fully considered information as a result. At the very least consideration should be given to allowing later responses / submissions.

2. Regarding incorporating the proposed 'principle issues' (Annex C) I would ask that the examination process itself allows sufficient time and resource to properly investigate and understand the following, and provide for requests for further detail and analysis (e.g. from National Grid) as required, specifically:

2.1 The background to and rationale, with evidence, for the eventual selection of "Option1" routing around Hintlesham Woods (i.e. new additional line north of Ramsey Wood), despite the arguments and preference for a parallel route of the additional line following consultation last year (as Option2) and as far back as submissions to 2012. I have been through some of the environmental and other reports - they seem to me tenuous at least and arguably incomplete and contradictory in order to make a firm decision in favour of the now planned additional pylon route.

2.2 The background to and rationale, with more considered evidence, for the selection of Pylon routes around Hintlesham Woods, as opposed to Undergrounding, which yet again was preferred by the majority of landowners and resident during consultation. I would suggest this needs to include updated costings and also cost benefit analysis (including regarding humans, landscape, tourism, amenity etc), as well as exploring exactly why some areas 'qualify for undergrounding and others do not.

2.3 That a strong(er) focus is placed on the elements around human wellbeing and health especially (eg section 9 in Annex C) and better balance given – such assessment has generally been underweighted during the consultation process, and even glossed over e.g. in the case of EMF effects on people, in my view. This request can also be applied to sections 10 (landscape), where I believe further inspections are necessary to properly appreciate the impact and potentially to item 12 (vibration and noise - depending on the as yet unclear impact of construction (on which information has been sought directly from NG, with no response so far).

2.4 Examination of the proposed so-called mitigation / offset proposals by National Grid and the way in which they have been determined. I do not see where that is covered in the key issues document. This is especially important when, as far as I can see much of what is proposed, at least in our vicinity seems ill-considered and even damaging, possibly a simple desk exercise, and which was not expressly included or made clear in the consultation (and despite verbal requests). This could also be applied to the way in which construction access and roads have been designed (again not fully included on the consultation or later requests).