

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Sea Link Project

Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) on the scope of the development held on Tuesday 11 November 2025. This list also includes questions rolled over from the hearing which could not be asked due to time constraints.

Action	Description	Action by	When
1	Post hearing submission covering all the points made during item 3 of the agenda covering need.	Applicant	D1
2	Written submission covering the points made in relation to need.	Marianne Fellowes	D1A
3	Response to post hearing submission made by Marianne Fellowes in relation to need.	Applicant	D2
4	Provide update of requirement discharges and timetable for potential transfer of powers from Scottish Power Renewables to National Grid relating to Friston substation and likely finalisation of substation design.	Scottish Power Renewables (SPR)	D1A
5	Update on Friston substation and justification for the continuing inclusion of scenario 2 in the examination.	Applicant	D1
6	Update on discharge of requirements for SPR schemes	East Suffolk Council/Suffolk County Council	D1A
7	Update as to when Lionlink Preliminary Environmental Impact Report will be provided and when further detail of the converter station will be available for cumulative visual effects.	Applicant	D1
8	Explanation as to whether significant adverse intra-project cumulative impacts are moderate or major. Please clarify in the absence of this information, how the applicant considers that the Secretary of State (SoS) can reach a reasoned conclusion of the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment.	Applicant	D1
9	Explanation of approach with respect to mitigating identified cumulative intra-project significant effects. Explain all mitigations that are being considered to address those which have been described as 'No mitigation has been confirmed at this stage' in ES Chapter 3 'Summary of Likely	Applicant	D1A

Action	Description	Action by	When
	Significant Effects' [APP-087]. If the applicant considers that no additional mitigation is necessary or possible, the reasons for this should be clearly set out.		
10	Technical note regarding protection of under keel clearance including in relation to cable crossings on bedrock where external protection or backfilling will be required above seabed level.	Applicant	D1
11	The ExA requests a thorough review of the cumulative impact assessment for shipping and navigation, with more information on the possible worst-case scenarios. This should include evidence of how the applicant has concluded that there would be no significant cumulative effects as well as any mitigation needed. A revised version of Part 4 Marine Chapter 11 Inter-Project Cumulative Effects [APP-084] is required.	Applicant	D1A
12	Ports such as Medway, Tilbury and London Gateway Port do not appear to have been consulted on the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-203]. Provide an explanation as to how the necessary additional consultation will be carried out.	Applicant	D1
13	Consideration as to whether there are adequate controls in the draft Development Consent Order/Deemed Marine Licence with regard to under keel clearance during construction and future requirements.	Applicant	D1
14	Response to London Gateway Port's questions about provision of draft cable laying and burial plan, cable protection plan and the cable specification installation plan.	Applicant	D1
15	Addendum to provide additional detailed cumulative traffic assessment for Kent and Suffolk. Focusing particularly on construction phase traffic.	Applicant	D1
16	Provide an explanation as to what is different about Sea Link that means that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) can be used when it was not possible for Nemo Link.	Applicant	D1A
17	Provision of the worst case noise assessment for works in the intertidal area in Pegwell Bay including further justification for the assumed plant and equipment. This should clearly address the cumulative effects of short term activities such as	Applicant	D1

Action	Description	Action by	When
	vehicle movements, as well as 24 hour working effects from lighting and noise on the use of the intertidal area. The implications for Environmental Impact and Habitats Regulations Assessments should be set out.		
18	Provide further justification for the plant selected to inform the worst case noise assessment of HDD. Typical noise outputs from mud pumps, winches or flocculation tanks and any other noisy components should be included for comparison.	Applicant	D1A
19	Provide details of the additional ground investigation survey requirements for HDD (e.g. boreholes), including timing of surveys and their duration. Signpost to where the effects of these works are covered in the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment.	Applicant	D1A
20	<p>In relation to significance of effect, construction and operational ecology and biodiversity effects are reported in both the construction and operational stage summary tables. Can the applicant explain why this approach does not result in double counting of the effects.</p> <p>For example in [PDA-017]: page 101 habitats - moderate adverse medium term and moderate beneficial long term habitat loss effects are reported. page 112 ornithology - moderate adverse, medium term effects are reported alongside moderate beneficial longer term effects.</p> <p>For clarity and ease of understanding and reporting, would it be possible to remove operational effects from the construction table and construction effects from the operational table?</p> <p>In addition, on page 99 [PDA-017], loss of functionally linked land at Sandlings Special Protection Area is minor adverse (taking account of enhancement of 6 ha of grassland). Does this mean that the original effect was actually greater than minor adverse but effectively offset by the</p>	Applicant	D1A

Action	Description	Action by	When
	<p>grassland enhancement? Could this result in construction losses being undervalued?</p> <p>Finally, if features are fully removed during construction should this be reported and assessed as a permanent impact at the stage it occurs (i.e. construction)?</p>		
21	Explain the rationale behind which elements of the proposed development are included within the work numbers. Include an explanation of why works proposed such as ecological mitigation, landscaping, drainage and works to public rights of way do not have specific works numbers.	Applicant	D1
22	There are several areas across the order limits where there are large areas of 'white' land on the work plans. In these areas it is unclear the extent of any works that are happening or the arrangement of any works within that particular area. It is important for the ExA to fulfil its duties with regards to compulsory acquisition that it is clear why the full extent of all land is required. Revise the works plans to provide clarity on the full extent of all works proposed.	Applicant	D1