

I am a local resident directly affected by the Sea Link project. I am writing in response to the Applicant's Thematic response to my Relevant Representation - REP1-166. I have huge concerns across many topics; loss of farmland, ecological disturbance, increased flooding risk, traffic and road safety impacts, harm to the tourism economy, landscape damage, cumulative effects from multiple NSIPs, and insufficient mitigation. The Applicant repeatedly downplays impacts, relies on assumptions rather than evidence, and provides no secured community benefits. The project in its current form will permanently alter the area as we know it, disturb the landscape, farmland, nature and the people who live here and does not justify why this is necessary.

Landscape and Visual Impacts

Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB

-The Project lies partly in the AONB. The Applicant's conclusion of "no significant adverse effects" is hard to reconcile with the large-scale, permanent converter infrastructure and access routes. AONB status requires exceptional caution and avoidance.

-Saxmundham Converter Station Visual Effects on Local Residences

Such development represents an irreversible loss of setting, where the scale and permanence of converter stations, Substations and pylons fundamentally alter the character of rural tranquillity. Once imposed, these structures cannot be meaningfully mitigated, and the Applicant's reliance on planting schemes ignores the reality that no screening can restore the integrity of landscapes of national importance such as the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB or the historic marshes near Richborough Fort. Residents will live with partial industrial views for decades. That is a serious local amenity loss.

-Landscape Character Change (From Rural to Industrial)

The cumulative effect of converter stations, substations and overhead lines is to industrialise rural landscapes. This is not just localised visual change but a fundamental alteration of character.

- Effectiveness of Planting as Mitigation

Planting will take many years to provide screening. Planting cannot hide tall buildings or pylons. While welcome, planting is not a substitute for avoiding prominent siting.

Rural roads lack resilience. The Applicant's routing plans must include firm restrictions, HGV size limits, enforced diversion signage, and local traffic calming during construction.

- Saxmundham, Leiston, Friston Impact

Local services (ambulance, fire service, school transport) use the same roads. Even if "statistical" impacts are low, real-world incidents and delays will happen and must be mitigated.

General Health and Wellbeing Impacts

The Applicant's statements that no "significant" impacts are predicted underplay chronic stress, sleep disturbance, and anxiety caused by prolonged construction. Cumulative minor harms become major for vulnerable residents and must be assessed qualitatively as well as quantitatively.

-Mental Health and Social Cohesion

Long-term disruption, uncertainty, and loss of amenity undermine community cohesion and mental health; compensatory measures and community support programmes must be funded and secured.

- Impact of Suffolk and Kent Onshore Scheme on Tourism

Tourism relies on tranquil landscapes and coastal amenity. These qualities will be undermined for years. The Applicant uses non-comparable case studies to downplay impacts.

-Loss of Tourism Jobs & Local Employment Opportunities

The Applicant cannot guarantee local employment for specialist work. There is a need for binding local employment targets, training, Tourism businesses may suffer multi-year downturns, which the assessment ignores. Long-term community investment, and guarantees against tourism business losses are required.

Ecology & Biodiversity

East Suffolk's protected areas AONB, SSSI, SPA etc have already been badly impacted by both Sizewell C and Scottish Power's pre-works

Fisheries & Marine Economy

- Fisheries Disruption

Fishing grounds are limited and heavily used. Short-term displacement can have permanent livelihood impacts. The Applicant's compensation mechanisms must be transparent, timely, and adequate to cover gear loss and displaced effort.

Marine Ecology

- Impact on Fish from Marine Cable Construction

The Applicant's conclusion of "no significant impact" lacks detailed evidence.

Marine noise, vibration, and seabed disturbance will disrupt fish behaviour and spawning and cause changes in benthic habitats.

There is a need for seasonal restrictions and post-construction monitoring.

EMF (Electromagnetic Fields)

- Measures for EMF Exposure

"Within guidance" comments do not address public perception and long-term exposure concerns. The Applicant must provide field measurements at receptor points and publish them, plus set low, precautionary limits and buffers around dwellings and PRoW.

Programme, Timing and Ecological Seasons

-Timeline, Tourism & Workforce Accommodation

IP Guide to rebut NG's response to RRs 10

A prolonged timeline risks peak-season impacts for tourism and housing shortages due to construction

workforce demand. The Applicant must require workforce accommodation plans that do not displace local housing.

- Sequencing and Bird Breeding/Wintering Seasons

Construction must be scheduled to avoid sensitive bird seasons; where not possible, strict avoidance and habitat compensation is required with long-term monitoring.

Residual Effects & Long-Term Community Burden

Permanent Landscape & Character Change

Even after mitigation, the converter stations, substations, trenches, access tracks and overhead lines create a permanent industrial footprint in rural and coastal landscapes. This is a major residual impact that cannot be mitigated fully by planting or bunding.

Conclusion

I am opposed to this project in its current form. The Applicant dismisses and minimises concerns that are real, whilst not committing to real mitigation. The long term effects can never be reversed for this ill-thought through and badly researched project. I urge you to protect our heritage, our landscape and our livelihoods from proposals such as this.

The EA should insist on avoidance of AONBs, enforceable mitigation and design protections, independently audited monitoring, community benefits, and tight sequencing/coordination and contingency plans — or refuse consent until these are secured. best wishes, Victoria Alexander