

for 5 /11 meeting at Snape

good afternoon

my name is David Gordon. I am a resident of Aldeburgh

The big question to ask the applicant is “where is the electricity coming from that you plan to transmit from Friston to the coast at Aldeburgh and then offshore down to Kent?”

the Friston facility is being built for Scottish Power to receive electricity from their wind farms that is being brought ashore at Thorpeness. Friston was chosen so that the electricity can move on south over the existing overhead power lines that pass near Friston. At a recent Scottish Power community meeting it was confirmed that this is still the plan

nobody else has permission, or has even applied for planning consent, to bring offshore generated power to Friston.

so if Sealink was given the go ahead it has no electricity to transmit

Sealink's project description talks about the significant growth in wind generation and so if the question is put to Sealink “where is your electricity coming from?” they are likely to reply “from the many windfarms being developed off the coast”. but if that is indeed the plan, then more planning enquiries will be required for each one. and that takes years.

and, importantly, the Planning Inspector in granting permission for Scottish Power counselled against any more windfarms bringing their power to Friston because of the huge damage to the environment and to the community

all of the power being generated offshore by the windfarms is not required here in rural Suffolk. It is required down south. so the obvious way forward is to bring all of this power onshore to a hub on the coast, or better still an offshore structure, from where it can go by Sealink mark 2 under the sea to where it is needed

purely from a financial viewpoint this would appear to be the sensible strategy. it saves the very considerable cost of the multiple huge trenches across the

countryside that would otherwise be needed to bring the power from each of the windfarms.

and that saving would reduce the burden on the taxpayer and contribute to the Chancellor's aim of cutting out wasteful public expenditure that we heard about in her speech yesterday.

this solution has been put forward for years now by local organisations but strangely it has fallen on deaf ears. very strange as it would be much cheaper and also much quicker as it is a multi year project to gain the planning permissions and then dig all the way to Friston

i have concentrated this morning on the financial aspects. The cumulative impact rally this morning and I am sure many speakers will emphasise the disastrous environmental and social consequences of proceeding with Sealink

so the Sealink application has absolutely no merit. indeed it could be described as madness. It should be emphatically refused.

In my 3 minute contribution on 5 November, I said that Sealink had no electricity to transmit, based on the information that Scottish Powers electricity would be transmitted south on the existing overhead power lines. Now it is being suggested that NG has stated that it does not have the capacity for this to happen. This may or may not be true but I think it important that you ask NG the direct question 'is Scottish Power electricity being connected to the existing overhead lines at Friston'.

If their answer confirms that Scottish Power will connect to the overhead lines, then this confirms my statement that Sealink has no electricity to transmit south. If their answer confirms that Scottish Power will not be allowed to connect to the overhead lines that is a very serious matter. The only reason that Scottish Power were given permission for the works they are now carrying out from Thorpeness to Friston and at Friston was because NG had specified that the connection was to be made there. If NG has now changed its mind then the whole Scottish Power works become redundant and should cease while a new connection point is established.

The other thing that has happened since 5 November is that NG have circulated a 'community update' to local residents. It is very defensive and has probably been triggered by observations made at the open floor hearings but some of the statements in the 'community update' are misleading.

- it says that sealink will supply power to 2 million homes. as I have stated there is no available power at Friston for Sealink to transmit so where is this power for 2 million homes coming from? this NG statement suggests that there must be undisclosed plans to bring vast amounts of offshore generated power to Friston. NG must be challenged to disclose these plans

- it says that Sealink is expected to lower energy bills. Difficult to believe when the huge cost of Sealink is picked up either by taxpayers or energy users

- then in point 2 of the community update it says that NG needs to reinforce the network in the Sizewell area, due to the amount of new generation that will be connected there. What new generation? And if it is connected at Sizewell, why then take it to Friston. Obvious way forward would be to start Sealink at Sizewell

- then in point 4, the astonishing statement that in order to connect to the electricity transmission network we need to come onshore somewhere. Yes, but surely at the shore or by means of an offshore platform. All the electricity is being generated offshore and the whole purpose of Sealink is to take it south offshore so what on earth is the point of taking it all the way to Friston and back again.

I think that you need to interrogate NG on these statements

The more we hear about Sealink the more it seems that it has been developed with no logic. The sooner NG start again and develop a credible strategy to get all of this offshore electricity down south where it is needed the better. So much time is being wasted pursuing a Sealink proposal that has no merit. Please put it out of its misery asap.