

Relevant Representation RR- 4116: Written Response to Applicant's Thematic Responses (REP1 116)

I would like to begin by drawing attention to a serious omission in the Applicant's Thematic Responses (REP1 116). My Relevant Representation (RR 4116) was listed by the Applicant in twelve thematic groups, yet it was not included in Table 7.4, which claims to address representations raising Cultural Heritage. This is despite the fact that my submission clearly raised cultural heritage concerns.

In section 2.1 of my representation I stated: "I strongly object to the construction of a permanent access road and new bridge over the River Fromus, as it will negatively impact Hurts Hall, a Grade II listed building and its surroundings." The Examining Authority's Rule 6 Letter of 19 September (PD 010) required the Applicant to identify all parties and references to demonstrate that every representation had been answered. By failing to include RR 4116 in the Cultural Heritage theme, the Applicant has not complied with this requirement. Because of this omission, I must question the legitimacy of the Applicant's thematic responses as a whole.

I must also highlight the treatment of Saxmundham Town Council's submission (RR 4896). The Council produced a detailed, thirty five page representation on behalf of more than 5,000 residents. As a statutory body, its views carry significant weight. Yet the Applicant has reduced this work to generic thematic responses, offering no substantive engagement. This approach effectively silences the collective voice of Saxmundham and disregards the statutory role of Town and Parish councils. It is unacceptable that under resourced councils, who understand the lived impacts of these proposals, should be dismissed in this way. The Examining Authority must insist that such councils receive direct, substantive responses.

I am deeply concerned by the Applicant's reliance on screening, topography, and planting schemes as supposed mitigation. In section 7.4 they claim that impacts to views and sense of place have been considered, and that cultural heritage effects have been "minimised within assessments." They point repeatedly to Application Document 6.2.2.3 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage [APP 050] and to their response to SEAS (RR 5210) as if these references alone suffice. This is not engagement; it is deflection.

My representation made clear the scale of harm: "The proposed 26 metre tall converter stations will have a severe visual impact, adversely affecting open views to the south of Saxmundham, particularly adjacent to Hurts Hall. These views have been officially identified as important within the Saxmundham Neighbourhood Plan, underscoring their significance to the town's character and heritage."

I further noted: "Due to the scale and industrial appearance of the converter stations, they will visibly dominate the surrounding rural environment, drastically altering the area's landscape."

And: "The proximity to Hurts Hall and St John the Baptist Church (Grade II\*) further exacerbates concerns, as the development will detract from the historical setting, diminishing views that contribute to Saxmundham's cultural identity." These are not minor points that can be brushed aside with references to planting schemes. They are substantive heritage and community impacts that remain unanswered.

I therefore submit that the Applicant's thematic method is flawed. Grouping representations for convenience cannot substitute for direct, substantive responses. Heritage impacts are cumulative and interconnected, not isolated points to be brushed aside. By avoiding engagement and relying on superficial mitigation, the Applicant risks misleading the Examination into believing concerns have been addressed when they have not.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Examining Authority direct the Applicant to re issue corrected thematic responses that properly include RR 4116 and provide substantive engagement with Saxmundham Town Council's RR 4896. Only by addressing these omissions can the Examination proceed with fairness, transparency, and credibility.