

Counter-Response to NGET's Thematic Responses (REP1-116)

Having reviewed the Applicant's Thematic Responses (REP1-116), I must highlight several important omissions and inaccuracies in how my Relevant Representation (RR) has been identified and addressed. These issues raise concern about the reliability of the Applicant's response process.

1. My RR has not been fully identified across the themes it covers.

My representation raised multiple distinct issues, including:

- Health & wellbeing impacts;
- Cultural heritage impacts (Hurts Hall, St John the Baptist Church, and protected views);
- Flood risk;
- Fire safety and emergency resilience;
- Working hours and community disruption;
- Traffic constraints, including AIL risks at the Benhall railway bridge.

However, the Applicant appears to record only a subset of these under limited themes. This results in several of my concerns being **misclassified or omitted entirely**, meaning they have received no direct or adequate response.

2. Heritage concerns appear to have been under-identified.

My RR raised clear impacts on designated heritage assets and the historic Saxmundham landscape setting. These are not merely "visual effects." If my RR was not listed under Cultural Heritage, this is a procedural error and must be corrected.

3. Health and wellbeing issues have not been recognised.

I raised concerns about the loss of tranquillity, long construction periods, proximity to a 26m industrial structure, and cumulative stress from major projects. These should fall under "Health & Wellbeing" but appear instead to be treated only as general construction impacts.

4. Fire safety and emergency risk appear to have no thematic category at all.

My RR included detailed concerns about national substation fire incidents and emergency response limitations. These risks must be acknowledged and cannot be absorbed into generic "design" themes.

5. Flood risk raised in my RR is not fully addressed.

Recent flooding affecting Saxmundham and my own property highlights real hydrological risks, yet these seem to have been oversimplified or overlooked in the thematic responses.

6. Working hours and community disruption have been inadequately categorised.

My strong objection to 7-day and bank-holiday construction working appears not to have been identified as a separate issue, despite its major implications for wellbeing and policy compliance.

Conclusion

Because not all issues I raised have been correctly identified within the Applicant's thematic tables, several concerns have not received any substantive response. I ask the Examining Authority to require the Applicant to:

- Correctly categorise my RR across all relevant themes;
- Provide direct responses to each issue I have raised; and
- Treat my RR as covering Health & Wellbeing, Cultural Heritage, Flood Risk, Security/Fire Safety, Traffic & AIL Routing, and Working Hours.

Until these corrections are made, the Applicant's thematic responses should be afforded limited weight.