

I oppose Sealink.

It's the wrong solution in the wrong place. It will cause irreversible damage to protected habitat, both immediately and for generations to come.

Sealink is being advanced in the absence of any coherent, national, offshore, transmission strategy. It proposed vast onshore infrastructure - convertor stations, substations, cable corridors - through some of the most sensitive landscapes in Suffolk, while options for offshore coordination, the favoured approach of our European neighbours, remain unexplored or sidelined. This is not grid modernisation it is grid fragmentation. It risks locking us into a piecemeal approach that ignores the efficiencies and environmental benefits of an integrated offshore grid.

The proposed development cuts through the Suffolk Coastal and Heaths AONB, a legally protected landscape of national importance. It threatens rare habitats including ancient woodland, marshland and coastal ecosystems that support species found nowhere else. It drives a coach and horses through the Treasury supported 2021 Dasgupta report and the Environment Act of the same year. The construction phase alone would bring years of destruction, noise and light pollution, traffic and ecological stress, not to mention the catastrophic long term effect of the area's vital tourist industry.

But the real tragedy is permanent industrialisation of a cherished rural corridor with concrete and steel replacing biodiversity and tranquillity.

The incoherence of the whole East Suffolk farrago is demonstrated by the fact that multiple projects are under way already, whilst the supporting infrastructure construction has hardly begun. No wonder the hundreds of HGVs cause such delay and disruption.

This isn't just about East Suffolk, though I speak as someone who was born here and knows and loves the area. It's about the principle of stewardship. Once we allow protected land to be blithely sacrificed to expedience we set a precedent that risks fatally undermining every future designation.

Sealink is not a strategic necessity -it's a strategic failure.

It's not a green solution- it's greenwash.

I urge the examining authority to reject this application and call for a pause until a national offshore transmission strategy is in place, one that respects both energy needs and environmental duty.

In addition;

I wish to strongly endorse those points so clearly made and factually supported by the many, many other speakers, but in particular:-

- that National Grid's assertions, that they are closely cooperating with other developers to minimise disruption and duplication and that they are responding openly, positively and sensitively to the many concerns of those likely to be affected by SeaLink, appear to be disingenuous at best;
- that whatever may have been the initial allegedly evidence-based need for SeaLink (in terms of transmission capacity, at least) has now been overtaken by events, and that there is therefore no need for SeaLink in Suffolk at all;

- that the Cumulative Impact of the other electricity supply projects in this small corner of Suffolk will already be devastating for the very viability of the area, and for generations to come – to add to it in any way, and especially via Sea Link the need for which is very far from proven, would not only be foolish but in the eyes of many, criminal.
- that concentrating so much electricity infrastructure in one Eastern area of the country – planned to supply, according to one estimate, some 30% of the entire country's needs - is a massive strategic error, given the ease with which an enemy – and the country demonstrably has ever more active enemies – could potentially destroy, and certainly massively weaken, the nation's civilised survival.

Thank you.