

Dear Planning Inspectors,

When I spoke at the Open Hearing at Snape, I began by saying that things done in haste are often repented at leisure.

Once again NGV in their haste to bulldoze SeaLink through have made more ill-considered decisions.

NGET's denial that the bridge at Benhall over the railway line can withstand loads of up 300 tonnes is in complete opposition to the more considered opinion that it can only take 46 tonnes. This cannot go unchallenged and I hope that you will make a proper survey of the bridge a requirement.

This particular example is symptomatic of an attitude by NGV that it is entitled to do whatever it likes.

However it was made emphatically clear at the OH at Snape by Rex Griffiths and subsequently by SEAS that NGV have not in any way demonstrated the NEEDS case for Sea Link. It has been shown that any shortfall of electricity that might arise can be carried from Suffolk to Kent by more investment in pylons at a fraction of the cost of Sea Link. Investment incidentally which NGV has to do sooner or later given the age of the existing cables.

Moreover the cumulative impact of this and all the other existing and proposed projects still fails to be properly considered by inadequate impact assessments by NGV. I am particularly concerned by the effects on wildlife for which no amount of mitigation can compensate, but there is also the impact on transport, tourism, business, emergency services and people's mental health.

NGV simply cannot reasonably justify the case for Sea Link. Were it to go ahead it would obviously open the door to LionLink which must be a

consideration. And since Lionlink promises good profit (the primary *raison d'être* of NGV and its associates) by profiting from the differentials in electricity prices between here and the continent, we understand why NGV is really doing this. Profit cannot be allowed to be the only justification.

Though it may seem far-fetched might you be persuaded to think a little about the difference between this project and what goes on in say the Amazon or Indonesia. International capitalists appear from nowhere with

the power to intimidate local communities, destroy the environment to extract oil or timber, take their profit and leave the land and the communities devastated. Only you the Inspectorate stand between them and such rapacious behaviour.

Were you to reject SeaLink, it would not be on your consciences. The Minister will have to take that decision.

Please subject SeaLink to continued rigorous scrutiny. This project has not proved itself feasible. Things done in haste are often repented at leisure.

Yours faithfully

Robert Jellicoe