

Q1 - NO as usual Energyco quotes from its' prepared PR - as far as "scope" and "timeline" they profess to know as they head into the unknown

As far as "impacts" this is what the inquiry was mostly about and yet the Energyco colleagues didn't bother to stick around and hear submissions or be available for questions.

Q2 Consistency of communication was often lacking;

Q3 Examples; excerpt from my diary during my relationship with Eneergyco;

5/3/24 Garth & Shanti meeting, 10.30 – noon.

They say on leaving that we will have the signed ACCESS agreement by email this afternoon. Garth telephones later, no one at office to sign agreement, Remains unsigned 3 weeks until they want access - we remind them we don't have their signed copies

—
15/5/24

Energyco meet Barrys at Millfield/ Acquisitions, John, Erica & Liaison: Emily, +G & S. Ian asks if he can record meeting. NO. We are shown map of position proposed towers, can they email us a copy of that map. NO. Corridor width contradiction now 140m not initial 70 m...

20/6/24

We attend meeting 5pm – 7pm David Kitto exhibits a new map of HTP corridor./ a SUDDEN change WITHOUT NOTIFICATION

27/6/24

MEET ENERGYCO James Hay, Mark Westbrook, Andrew Power & Jesslyn Ireland attend. ITEM 1 ; Shock Kitto map revelation of new route revealed on 20/6/24 James says it was a "mistake" we saw the map on 20/6, does not say what sort of mistake. The engineers preferred path, not take into consideration our dwelling.

More details are available

Q4

REF ABOVE 15/5 - I am disabled - i need aids to make sense later of a meeting and so my refused request is BULLYING/CORCIVE

Distortions of truth/lies;

Initially we are told 'no visual impact' of towers - then Mark Westbrook: There will be visual impact on our land no matter what.

To conclude Q4 - it must also be considered that TONE, ATTITUDE and BEARING can carry a message to the recipient - this last year was common - I detect a slight moderating of this, particularly in their PR events.

Q5 This is a tough question because it needs to be backed understandably with EVIDENCE - for that you are asking the landowner to conduct an investigation - HOWEVER; E.G., Subsequent to our meeting with HAY on 27/6/24 when we took him at his word - "mistake" you would've thought the mistake would be buried never to see the light of day again HOWEVER i received a text from my neighbour TWO DAYS AFTER James Hay's "mistake" edict telling me he had just had "a meeting with Kitto and Power" with a map showing the same route as Hay told me was "a mistake." TO ME THAT SUGGESTS A POSSIBLE LACK OF "transparency and or honesty."
