

Written Summary of Oral submission at PM hearing

As requested by the Examining Authority at the Preliminary Meeting, I summarise below the two areas which are of particular concern to me and which the ExA may wish to pursue further The Alternatives and Cumulative Impact.

1. The Alternative

Lack of appraisal of an Offshore Grid

I believe the failure of the Offshore Coordination Support Scheme (OCSS) is a huge step backwards for the UK and a shocking affirmation that National Grid (NG) do not have the UK's best interests at heart. The lack of transparency around the OCSS's choice of Sea Link and National Grid's Sea Link findings has led many to think it was an exercise to appease communities call for an Offshore Grid and say, 'look we are doing something'.

It is public knowledge that National Grid's connection system is oversubscribed and not fit for purpose. Instead of using outdated methods of radial connections to the Grid and imposing unnecessary onshore infrastructure there should be two grids: the existing and further upgraded grid for onshore energy production and a second for offshore wind power using the North Seas as a corridor to pool wind energy to brownfield sites closer to demand/urban centres.

Had National Grid gone down the Modular Offshore Grid (MOG) route in 2021 as Belgium's TO Elia had already done. and when campaign group Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) proposed that offshore wind farms [North Falls/Five Estuaries and EAN1/EA2 should be pilots](#)¹ connecting to LionLink and Nautilus Interconnectors respectively to create the bases of a UK MOG, there would not be this vast and growing opposition from East Anglia and other regional consumers against the unnecessary destruction and industrialisation of our countryside – we would, by now, be well on the way to Net Zero 2030. Please see Annex A, my original Relevant Representation below, which lays out SEAS proposed Pilot Schemes.

It is debatable that Sea Link meets the OCSS criteria. National Grid is not a Developer but a Transmission Owner and should never have qualified for the OCSS. Using Sea Link (a boot strap from Suffolk to Kent) would negate Sea Link's 'needs case' as a 2GW transmission line. It would lose up to 1GW of capacity to energy producers North Falls and Five Estuaries and instead be acting as a Multi-Purpose Interconnector (MPI). Even so, National Grid decided to present their scenario to the Offshore Coordination Support Scheme (OCSS) thereby to my mind utilising National Grid's monopoly and pushing out other competitors such as Nautilus or LionLink Interconnectors, MPI's suited for the purpose of the OCSS.

When at consultation open days, I asked NF and FE engineers whether it was engineeringly possible for the Offshore Wind Farm to connect to an offshore platform, the reply was: yes, but government regulations stopped them from doing so. The OCSS has stopped them even further. I believe that it would have been more cost effective and quicker for NF and FE to connect offshore, but there is no way of publicly assessing this due to the Cost Benefit Analysis

¹ [REDACTED]

figures being redacted in the Arup OCSS report - [Independent Review of OCSS Qualifying Coordinated Project: OCSS 01 North Falls, Five Estuaries & Sea Link](#)²

Even National Grid believe the way forward is an Offshore Grid. Based on a previous [National Grid ESO's analysis](#)³, an integrated offshore grid for East Anglia could offer cost savings of more than £2bn and £6bn nationwide. Further proof of National Grid's belief in an offshore Grid was a [recently removed animated video](#)⁴ of 2024 illustrating the benefits of Offshore Wind Farms connecting to Multipurpose Interconnectors (now called [Offshore Hybrid Assets](#)⁵) to create an Offshore Grid as the way forward to Net Zero.

East Anglia has been severely over looked by National Grid and been thrown under the bus. Why, we don't understand, when they have had five years to plan a strategic Offshore Grid that would be quicker, cheaper, and better for the environment and communities.

As we have never publicly received a full and transparent Cost Benefit Analysis from National Grid or NF/FE, I therefore suggest to the Examining Authorities that they request full transparency from all three to ascertain whether onshoring North Falls to a non-existent substation is comparable, or not, to an Offshore connection to a third party.

2. Cumulative Impact

To our detriment in Suffolk Coastal we are finding National Grid's continued and out-dated use of point-to-point radial connections is proving very destructive and we continue to believe that Offshore options are more environmentally friendly and more sustainable.

In 2020 our community went through 9 months of gruelling examinations for two DCO's - Scottish Power's East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two. At that time there were a number of other energy projects which had not yet been listed on the PINS website and were therefore not allowed to be considered in the Cumulative Impact deliberations. These were Nautilus, LionLink (ex Eurolink) and Sea Link. Along with EA1N & EA2, a new National Grid Substation and Sizewell C twin nuclear reactor, this totalled 6 NSIP projects in 5 square miles.

These exclusions led to an extremely unfair and ill-informed DCO whereby the Inspectors, in many people's eyes, could not perform their job properly. In their report to the Secretary of State, they did however allude to the fact that should any further energy projects come forth that great care should be taken due to the fragility of the Suffolk Coast environment. This caveat has been largely ignored. Apart from Nautilus all the aforementioned projects are either consented to or in the pre-examination period, making Suffolk Coastal into a Super Energy Hub by stealth and deceit.

²

[REDACTED]

I particularly wanted to bring this to the Executive Authority because the panel is fortunate enough to have the advantage of knowing most of the NSIP projects being proposed making Ardleigh and environs into another Super Energy Hub:

- North Falls
- Five Estuaries
- Tarchon Interconnector
- And, of course, the unbuilt National Grid Substation EACN

This is too much for the community to bear. Communities are neither Spurious, Cynical, nor are they Nimbys or Blockers. We are, however, truly concerned that a great wrong is being done to our Country by profit-led developers, including National Grid, a publicly listed international conglomerate. Please visit Suffolk Coastal to see for yourselves the devastation that 6 NSIP energy projects are inflicting on the environment, the tourist economy and the mental health of the community in the East. We in Suffolk Coastal and Tendring District are not “hosting” energy projects but are being invaded and have become ‘host-age’ to National Grid’s fortune and ambition.

With this in mind, I urge the Panel to take time to seriously consider the Cumulative Impact and whether the loss of prized natural and protected landscapes, loss of A grade agricultural land, loss of a tourist economy and loss of the health and mental wellbeing of many local communities are worth it when there is a practical alternative in a Modular Offshore Grid.

I thank you for your attention.

Glynis Robertson
IP: 20051080
28 February 2025

ANNEX A

GLYNIS ROBERTSON North Falls RR

Dear North Falls Planning Inspectors,

I **STRONGLY OBJECT** to North Falls landfall at Frinton cabling to a non-existent substation near Ardleigh in Tendring, Essex. My objection also applies to Five Estuaries offshore wind farm and Tarchon Interconnector.

I am, however, in support offshore wind and an INTEGRATED OFFSHORE GRID using the North Sea as a corridor taking the power via subsea cables to brownfield landfall sites closer to where the power is need eg London and the South East.

The failure of the OCSS (Offshore Coordination Support Scheme) is a huge step back for the UK and a shocking affirmation that National Grid do not have the UK's best interests at heart.

National Grid's connection system is not fit for purpose. Instead of using outdated methods of radial connections to the Grid, North Falls should have been part of a UK Offshore Grid Pilot Scheme looking to the future of an INTEGRATED OFFSHORE GRID.

- PILOT 1: Nautilus Interconnector

North Falls and Five Estuaries windfarms can combine with the Nautilus Interconnector and pool the power to West Grain.

- PILOT 2: LionLink interconnector

ScottishPower's windfarms East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) and LionLink can combine energy offshore and pool power to the brownfield site of Bradwell-on-Sea.

- PILOT 3: Whilst it makes sense geographically for the German Tarchon Interconnector to combine energy with two Norfolk Offshore Windfarms thereby reducing their footprint onshore

Pooling offshore windfarms power to Offshore Platforms using interconnectors would avoid the desecration of the UK countryside from badly located substations, which act as a magnet for mega energy hub infrastructure in rural areas destroying agriculture, ecology and local economies.

This potential Energy Mega Hubs will destroy the countries already depleted biodiversity, our food security and coastal tourism-based economies.

Based on a previous [National Grid ESO's analysis](#), an integrated offshore grid for East Anglia could offer cost savings of more than £2bn and £6bn nationwide.

<https://www.neso.energy/document/182936/download>

National Grid need to urgently invest now for the long term and to quicken the road to UK's Net Zero goals by sanctioning the better alternative an INTEGRATED OFFSHORE GRID.

I therefore ask the planning inspectors to take into account the above, seriously assess the cumulative impact of North Falls, Five Estuaries, National Grids Substation EACN, Tarchon and all the Solar and BESS infrastructure that will follow on, and recommend to the Secretary of State to **REJECT** this proposal in favour of an INTEGRATED OFFSHORE GRID.

Thank you for your attention.

Glynis Robertson, [REDACTED]