

My name is Geoffrey Dunn.

It's obvious to conclude from the quality of NGETs SeaLink Application that they consider this DCO to have a foregone outcome and that the Secretary of State will simply consent, regardless of how poor is their case or evidence.

Lazy "cut & pastes" of evidence relating to Kent, being inserted into Suffolk are somewhat trivial.

Much less trivial, when the Applicant ignores guidance from the Department of Transport as to when traffic surveys should be done. Ditto their response to Environmental & Ecological surveys.

These examples of poor rigour by the Applicant give rise to a cumulative unreasonable & unfair burden being placed on groups & individuals, as the "goalposts" are routinely moved.

When we consider the impact of the most recently advised change, the Benhall Rail Bridge, it becomes an even greater concern.

Initially, the Applicant stated there were 5 suitable sites subject to detailed review. The Saxmundham site was never mentioned. All those 5 sites were dismissed, some without *any explanation* as to why they were considered unsuitable.

The former RAF airfield near Leiston, was dismissed without *any substantive evidence* to sustain that decision.

Why is this relevant - particularly in relation to the Benhall Rail Bridge?

The Benhall Rail Bridge has always been the only practical access route to the proposed Saxmundham site. It's a problematic physical location. It's always had a weight limit of 46 tonnes, and it has always been over the only rail line in East Suffolk, which connects Lowestoft to Ipswich & London. A million people use this rail line each year, so if that bridge needs strengthening or even repair, it would have a material adverse economic impact on the major part of East Anglia. A rail replacement service is totally unrealistic, especially given the existing cumulative increase in traffic due to Sizewell C.

Yet, the major structural risks to the bridge of a few dozen AILs needing to pass-over, and which will require extensive (& expensive) modifications, were ignored until the start of this DCO, despite warnings for over a year from SCC. Affected residents of Benhall have been effectively disenfranchised.

This is stunningly negligent. It raises serious questions about the adequacy of the Application and the Applicants seriousness with this Application.

The Leiston airfield satisfies all the key challenges that the Applicants preferred Saxmundham site fails:

- It's not near a market town of 5000 people & will not cause the same construction & operating noise impact
- The new Sizewell Link Road passes within 200m of the airfield, so construction access is much easier,
- It doesn't require an expensive bridge to be built over a river & flood plain, nor reinforcement/special protection of a critical rail bridge

So, why was it ignored and why is it unsuitable?

Thank you