

From: Suffolk Energy Action Solutions - SEAS [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 November 2025 21:03
To: South East Anglia Link <SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Subject: Procedural Complaint – Late and Deficient Submissions by the Applicant (NGET)

Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

Subject: Procedural Complaint – Late and Deficient Submissions by the Applicant (NGET)

Dear Sea Link Case Team,

On behalf of Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS), we wish to lodge a formal complaint regarding the Applicant's repeated failure to comply with the Examination timetable and the serious prejudice this causes to Interested Parties.

At Deadline 1 (18 November), the Applicant failed to submit 97 documents on time, with five further documents only appearing belatedly on 26 November. We note that the Cultural Heritage Appendix, which is essential for reviewing the Applicant's response to SEAS's Relevant Representation, was only confirmed as received by PINS on 27 November, but not yet published at the time of writing.

This means that Interested Parties have been deprived of the opportunity to review this material in good time, despite having submitted their own Relevant Representations back in June.

It is difficult to comprehend why a national company with extensive resources should be late in supplying key responses, while communities with limited capacity have met every deadline.

The situation is compounded by errors in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response document EN020026-001321-9.34.1. It mis-cites Application Document 8.1 Corridor Preliminary Routing and Substation Siting Study as [APP-367] instead of the correct [APP-368], and repeatedly refers to Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, neither of which has been submitted or uploaded. These errors prevent Interested Parties from tracing the evidence relied upon and compromise the reliability of the Applicant's submissions.

Taken together, the late submissions, missing appendices, and incorrect references obstruct Interested Parties' ability to participate fully and fairly in the Examination. They reveal a pattern of behaviour that suggests the Applicant does not take this process seriously. Communities are left with the impression that this is already a "done deal" and that the Applicant is merely paying lip service to the Examination. Such conduct erodes trust in the process and shows the same disregard for local authorities and affected people that has characterised the Applicant's approach throughout.

SEAS therefore urges the Examining Authority to require the Applicant to immediately correct mis-referencing errors and re-submit documents in proper form, and to consider whether late or deficient submissions should be disregarded.

In addition, SEAS requests that Deadline 2 be moved back to allow Interested Parties a fair and reasonable period to review the Applicant's responses once the Cultural Heritage Appendix and other missing documents have been supplied. Without such an adjustment, communities

are forced into an impossible position of responding to incomplete or defective submissions under unreasonable time pressure.

Deadlines exist to safeguard fairness and transparency. Communities and individuals have worked diligently to meet them; the Applicant must be held to the same standard.

Yours faithfully,

The SEAS Team

Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS)