

Summary of Written Representation of Wraxall and Failand Parish Council

Submitted prior to deadline of 26 February 2015

* We believe that National Grid (NG) knew in 2007 and confirmed in 2009 prior to the commencement of consultation, the route for the overhead 400KV transmission lines and proceeded to effect a "consultation" by offering an alternative route, effectively a "straw man" to be knocked down. By this means NG avoided the critical thinking required of a genuine consultation offering real alternatives.

* NG's approach did not serve the public interest, only NG's self interest.

* Since 2009 to date, despite the public opposition to overhead lines, NG have remained fixed in 19th Century thinking with their predetermined position for overhead lines.

* Despite the consistent strength of opposition NG have been impervious to the public's preference for a subsea or under ground route. Their monopoly position provides them with the confidence to ignore all protestations.

* We believe there is a better solution and that the alternatives should have been properly and fully considered in technical, financial, environmental terms and including a detailed assessment of the welfare and wellbeing of the general public.

* This requires each solution to be designed to the same level such that sufficient information is available to demonstrate that all factors have been considered and to enable reliable costs to be provided. These costs to include the works for construction, operating and maintenance, and replacement costs over 40 or 50 years and the full range of costs associated with of the socio economic impacts.

* Hinkley C is still delayed. There is time and a range of fully proposed solutions allows for the making of a decision at the last most responsible moment.

* Our presentation majors on the alternative of the M5 tunnel solution with GIL or Cables as this route lends it self to satisfying the needs of NG, the environment and the public.

* By this means the Planning inspectorate will be better informed before making a decision.

* By this means the Secretary of State when reviewing the decision will also be fully informed.

* To achieve that secure position we would ask the Planning Inspectorate to request the Secretary of State to require of NG, the further and better information outlined above and as covered in more detail in our presentation.