

RR2801

I am a Saxmundham resident, directly affected by National Grid's Sea Link project. I am responding to the Applicant's Thematic response.

National Grid has taken five months to respond to these representations. [REDACTED] leaves just two weeks to respond back. Further, their 185-page document lacks an index, and the lumping together of both Kent and Suffolk responses provides us with a vivid example of the [REDACTED] of their approach.

I have significant concerns about this project, those particularly related to the cumulative effect of so many NSIPs being conducted in such a small geographic area; in particular - air pollution, road safety and disruption, ecological devastation, and the effects on the tourist industry.

The project in its current form will permanently alter the environment, character, and wellbeing of East Suffolk, with no attempt whatsoever to anticipate and mitigate what these changes will be, and does not adequately avoid, minimise, or justify the level of harm proposed.

Given the constraints of time, here are my comments on a small representative selection of specific thematic responses, though my objections run much further than these points:

7.26.1 The applicant asserts that their choice of locations represent the most suitable/least harmful options. But where is the evidence that persuaded them of this? Where is the transparency? Have them show us what they have, And show us how they have taken into account the environment, the community and the cumulative impact - then we won't feel like we're being [REDACTED] for the benefit of National Grid shareholders.

7.26.4 National Grid seem to treat the proximity of Sizewell C as a feature rather than a bug. But they need to do much to persuade me that $1 + 1 =$ simply 2 in this case, rather than 3,4, or 5. For example, analysis provided by the historic impact on tourism for Sizewell B does NOT translate into a simple extrapolation when a string of additional NSIPs are added to the mix.

7.26.5 Reasons for rejection of offshore alternatives are self-serving. No transparency is offered in terms of the environment or engineering. Where is the cost/benefit?

7.28.1 The applicant needs to do much more to reassure me that the extra stress on our health and the NHS that this project will bring is going to be acknowledged and satisfactorily mitigated by them. Sizewell C is already seriously affecting ambulance response times and this will only get worse, for a decade or more.

7.35.6 Compounded stress over decades - in the absence of any long-term vision or oversight from Central Government on this matter (so typical of the slipshod approach that characterises the UK when compared with its European competitors), only we, the inhabitants of East Suffolk, can stand up and stand witness to the [REDACTED] we are about to receive.

It has already begun, even at the early stages of Sizewell C. Driving from central Leiston to the Kenton Hills today (1.3 miles) it took me 13 mins and involved three sets of temporary traffic lights. And the infrastructure we have is not up to the job as it is - the B119 was flooded again today despite remedial work earlier this year that was meant to fix it. My heart sinks at the prospect of yet more disruption, more dust, more anxiety about missing appointments, more stress of our environment and our wildlife, more tourists turning their back on us (the "evidence" provided in the response that this will not happen [REDACTED]).

I am very much opposed to the plans as they stand.

[REDACTED]
It is vague about mitigation and compensation.

It is in denial about the cumulative impacts that will befall the area for decades - [REDACTED]
They offer zero reassurance that they will do the right thing.