

On reviewing the Applicant's Response to the Relevant representations, I was immediately struck by the rather arrogant designation of a "Thematic Response." It further displays the dismissive and condescending approach that has been typical of the Applicant stance from the beginning. Their answers do not assuage my concerns, and I am still implacably opposed to the Project in this region. In many of the Applicant responses, from Table 7.1 right through to Table 7.35, they appear in self-denial and delusional as to the "non-significant " impact on the local communities of the various NSIP projects proposed. The Applicant repeatedly minimises impacts, seems to depend on unproven assumptions, and relies on non-binding mitigation and compensation. The Project, as proposed, will cause long-lasting harm to local agriculture, ecology, heritage, landscape and tourism. And communities here are now increasingly under siege. The assertion by the Applicant that there are "no likely significant cumulative effects" is absurd. You only have to drive around the region now on the A12 or the B1094 to experience the SZC impact on, and potential danger to, communities and visitors that the ongoing construction work has brought to us. Including recent fatalities on the A12 and increased Wildlife predation throughout the area. And this is just with SZC in play! This region and its roads are not suitable for such an invasion of large vehicles and extensive industrialisation. The Ex A should demand that they avoid sensitive areas, define enforceable mitigation and design protections, provide independently audited monitoring, binding community benefits, and much tighter coordination and contingency plans — or refuse consent until these issues are seriously addressed, committed to and secured .