Name: Louise Chadwick

IP No: [redacted]

Project: Sea Link EN20026

Deadline 2 – 9 December 2025

I formally protest the Applicant's omission of my Relevant Representation from many tables within the 'Thematic Topics by Interested Party - REP1-117' document. Please refer to my complete Relevant Representation, as it addresses all the following topics, several under multiple categories.

Table A.2	Air Quality
Table A.5	Climate change
Table A.9	Construction
Table A.15	Geology & Hydrogeology
Table A.17	Cumulative impact
Table A.24	Noise
Table A.30	Safety
Table A.35	Onshore Route Location

If these matters were not identified within my Relevant Representation (RR), it indicates a failure by the Applicant to exercise due diligence in its assessment of the RRs. This raises concerns regarding the thoroughness of their evaluation process and whether similar points raised by other Interested Parties may have been overlooked."

The apparent lack of care in reviewing submissions is troubling and suggests a potentially systemic 'sloppy' or superficial approach to the entire application.

The necessity to respond to all of these points and those below within a short period is in itself stressful and damaging to my mental health and undoubtedly other Interested Parties who respond now – and those who do not as they cannot face the enormity of the demanding task.

RE: Response to Applicant's Document 9.34.6 Applicant's Thematic Responses to Relevant Representations– REP1-116

Summary:

This constitutes my Written Response, submitted as a local resident directly impacted by the Sea Link project. It acts as a detailed rebuttal to the Applicant's Thematic Response concerning my Relevant Representation (REP1-166).

I am deeply troubled by the comprehensive impact across numerous areas. My specific concerns include the loss of high-quality agricultural land, unrelentent construction noise

and air pollution, significant ecological and biological disruption, and the disruption of public rights of way. Furthermore, I am worried about road safety and increased traffic risks, the probable damage to local tourism, landscape destruction, and the combined effects of multiple NSIPs compounded by insufficient mitigation measures. The Applicant consistently downplays environmental impacts and relies heavily on assumptions over concrete evidence. The absence of secured community benefits, combined with the project's permanent alteration to the character and well-being of local areas, means the proposed harm is neither adequately avoided, minimised, nor justified.

7.1 Agriculture and Soil

7.1.1 – Loss of Productive Agricultural and Best & Most Versatile (BMV) Land in Suffolk

The Applicant's assessment of impacts as "temporary" is contested. This perspective fails to account for persistent, long-term consequences such as subsoil compaction, altered drainage patterns, and sustained yield reductions, which can endure for years or even decades. Standard restoration plans are insufficient to guarantee the recovery of established, long-term agricultural productivity. Independent, long-term monitoring and guaranteed remediation for affected farmers are essential.

7.2 - Air Quality

7.2.1 Construction Dust, Fumes, Health Impacts

Due to the expansive, windy conditions and lengthy construction schedule, dust and particulate exposure will be persistent. Current safety protocols are insufficient; monitoring is merely reactive and fails to prevent harm. There are no mandatory stop-work thresholds in place, meaning construction would not be halted even if exposure limits are exceeded.

7.2.2 – Impacts on Sensitive Habitats and Plant Communities

Minute increases in airborne dust and deposition present a lethal risk to sensitive coastal and marsh ecosystems. The insufficiency of current generic modeling necessitates the implementation of accurate, site-specific baseline measurements and precautionary limits.

7.3 – Construction Impacts

7.3.1 – Construction Compounds, Haul Roads and General Construction Footprint

The physical footprint of construction compounds, access roads, and haul routes results in permanent changes to the local environment and water systems. The Applicant’s proposed 'standard reinstatement' plan lacks credibility, as there is no binding proof that past projects have successfully maintained pre-construction ecosystem function or farm productivity after

restoration. Siting these compounds near sensitive communities and habitats is unacceptable and must be prevented entirely or significantly modified.

7.3.4 – Work Hours, Weekend & Holiday Work

The inclusion of weekend working hours raises significant concerns regarding increased stress and disruption to the local community and wildlife. The argument that impacts are negligible relies exclusively on 'average' day modeling, a methodology that overlooks the importance of real, cumulative disturbance, necessitating tighter restrictions.

7.3.5 - Pollution to surrounding area, including visual, noise, and air quality/dust, as a result of construction works.

In this flat, dry and sandy environment visual, noise and air pollution are inevitable.

7.3.6 - Construction methods impacting landscape and wildlife

Wildlife has already been significantly disrupted in the Sizewell area since work began, likely due to constant human presence, machinery operation, lighting, noise, and vibrations. This disruption is supported by an increase in roadkill, red deer damaging temporary fencing around Scottish Power Renewables' archaeological work in Aldringham as they seek new paths.

The wildlife populations are under increasing pressure and are being pushed into new territories to the south and west of the site. These new areas place them directly in the path of the proposed new project, which is bound to cause similar detrimental effects

Any work at North Warren cannot fail to disturb birds and other wildlife.

7.3.7 Construction traffic will lead to congestion and deter tourism to the area.

Current work on Sizewell C has already led to severe A12 congestion. The resulting displacement of traffic onto alternate routes, like the B1069 in Snape, has created hazardous conditions and frequent bottlenecks at the A1094 junction. This increased traffic has already prompted tourists to seek holidays elsewhere. Any additional development will only intensify these problems, further damaging the local tourism sector.

7.4 - Cultural Heritage

7.4 - Impact on The Heritage Coast of Suffolk including Saxmundham, Sternfield, Friston, Aldeburgh & Thorpeness

The project will have significant negative impacts on the views, sense of place, rural character, and heritage assets of the Suffolk Heritage Coast and the wider Suffolk and Essex Natural Landscape (previously AONB). These impacts include:

- **Industrialisation of Rural Landscape**: The proposed converter stations near Saxmundham will introduce "vast industrial structures" into a prominent,

undeveloped rural setting, fundamentally changing its character from agricultural to industrial.

- **Visual Intrusion**: The converter stations and associated infrastructure (such as a proposed 6-metre high River Fromus bridge and permanent access roads) are expected to be eyesores, disrupting key views for local residents, the public using footpaths (like the Sandlings Walk), and visitors to the area. Landscaping mitigation is proposed but acknowledged to take decades to mature.
- **Harm to Heritage Assets**: The development is anticipated to cause "less than substantial but nonetheless material harm" to the setting of several nationally designated heritage assets, including the Grade II listed St John the Baptist Church and the Grade II listed Hurts Hall.
- **Loss of Tranquility**: The construction phase, potentially running seven days a week, will involve significant traffic (HGV movements), noise, air, and light pollution, degrading the current tranquility of the area.
- **Cumulative Impacts**: The Sea Link project is one of several major energy infrastructure projects (including Sizewell C, LionLink, and others) planned for the same area. The combined, or cumulative, effect of these concurrent projects is a major concern as it will overwhelm the natural and built environment and destroy the historic landscape character of the East Suffolk region.

7.5 – Geology & Hydrogeology

7.5.3 – Trenchless Drilling Risks at Landfall

HDDs have a record of failures (fluid breakout). The applicant must establish strong contingency plans, secure third-party insurance, and arrange for independent oversight regarding all HDD operations

7.6 – Landfall Location

7.6.2 – Suffolk Landfall and Nearby Protected Sites (Sandlings SPA, Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI, RSPB North Warren)

The Applicant must submit enforceable guarantees that all trenchless commitments will be met and verified by an independent audit.

7.7 – Landscape and Visual Impacts

7.7.1 – Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB – now Suffolk & Essex Natural Landscape

Part of the project is within the Suffolk & Essex Natural Landscape.

It’s impossible to see how no “significant adverse effects” is reconcilable with the huge, permanent converter infrastructure and access routes proposed. The status of the Natural Landscape requires exceptional caution and avoidance.

7.7.2 – Saxmundham Converter Station Visual Effects on Local Residences

The proposed development would cause permanent, irreversible damage to the character of rural tranquility. The construction of substantial infrastructure, including converter stations, substations, and pylons, constitutes a significant and lasting transformation. The applicant's proposed planting schemes are insufficient to mitigate this harm, as no amount of screening can restore the original integrity of nationally important landscapes like the Suffolk & Essex Natural Landscape.

Residents face a substantial and long-term degradation of their local environment due to ongoing industrial views.

7.7.3 – Landscape Character Change (from Rural to Industrial)

The cumulative effect is a pervasive industrialisation of the countryside, a deep alteration of its fundamental identity, not just superficial changes.

7.7.4 – Effectiveness of Planting as Mitigation

Screening with planting will take many years to be anywhere near effective. Planting won’t hide tall buildings or pylons. Of course it’s better than nothing but planting is not a substitute for not building.

7.7.10 – Light Pollution

Light for safety is necessary, but temporary and operational lighting needs rigorous controls to minimise light pollution and disturbance to wildlife. All lighting designs should be agreed upon with local authorities and conservation organisations.

7.9 – Onshore Mitigation

Mitigation efforts should prioritise avoidance and minimisation before resorting to compensation. The Applicant’s responses predominantly rely on compensation, which does not sufficiently address these higher-priority steps.

7.10 – Traffic and Transport

7.10.1 – Local Road Suitability (Suffolk)

To mitigate the inherent vulnerability of rural roads, the Applicant must ensure their routing plans include explicit restrictions, limitations on HGV size, clear enforced diversion signage, and the implementation of local traffic calming during all phases of construction.

7.10.2 – Saxmundham, Leiston, Friston Impact

Local services (ambulance, fire and police services, school runs) use these roads too, increasingly the road through my village of Snape, B1069 since Sizewell C commenced. Since incidents and delays are unavoidable in practice, effective management and mitigation strategies must be implemented irrespective of statistical predictions.

7.11 – Noise & Vibration

7.11.1 – Construction Noise Suffolk

Noise modelling fails to capture the reality of sound propagation in open environments. For instance, strong winds carry industrial noise from the Sizewell construction, five miles away, to the fields surrounding Snape. Friston, by comparison, is only two miles from here. Given this discrepancy, strict, enforceable noise limits and a formal mechanism for complaints and penalties are essential.

7.13 – Socio-Economics / Tourism / Jobs / Housing

7.13.1 & 7.13.2 – Impact of Suffolk Onshore Scheme on Tourism

The local tourism industry, which depends on tranquil scenery and coastal amenities, faces prolonged destabilization. The Applicant's impact case studies are deemed irrelevant and fail to accurately represent the severity of the potential disruption.

7.13.3 – Loss of Tourism Jobs & Local Employment Opportunities

To better safeguard the local economy, the assessment must mandate binding local employment targets for all specialist positions, supported by essential training initiatives. The current proposal fails to adequately address the vulnerability of tourism businesses to protracted, multi-year downturns. Effectively mitigating this risk requires the implementation of robust, long-term community investment strategies and explicit guarantees to shield these businesses from extended financial losses.

7.14 – Ecology & Biodiversity

Surveys over three months are insufficient to cover such an important topic. The negative impact of this project on the environment and biodiversity in statutory designated areas in Suffolk such as the Sandlings SPA, Leiston to Aldeburgh SSSI and the RSPB North Warren Nature Reserve is inevitable. East Suffolk’s protected areas – the Suffolk & Essex Natural Landscape, SSSI, SPA etc have already been badly impacted by both Sizewell C and Scottish Power’s pre-works.

7.15 – PRoW / Walking & Cycling

7.15.1 – PRoW Impacts

Temporary closures are significant interruptions that diminish both accessibility and local amenity. Any alternative provisions must be fully operational and equivalent in distance, safety, and overall experience prior to implementation of closures.

7.23 – Alternative Sites & Assessment of Options

7.23.1 – Inadequate Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives

While the Applicant asserts that the selected locations are the most suitable or least harmful options, the accompanying evidence fails to convincingly demonstrate a proper assessment of all reasonable alternatives.

A review suggests the chosen alternatives were primarily driven by the applicant's operational requirements, rather than a comprehensive evaluation of environmental, social, or cumulative consequences. An effective alternatives assessment requires an independent, transparent, and environmentally-sound process, rather than a rubber-stamp for pre-selected locations.

7.23.2 – Avoidance Hierarchy Not Properly Applied

National Policy emphasises the first principle should be avoidance of harm but in many topics (eg landscape, tourism locations, bird and other wildlife habitats) the Applicant seems to have placed a greater emphasis on minimising project impacts rather than completely avoiding sensitive areas.

Avoidance, rather than minimisation, must be the primary approach, particularly within designated sensitive regions like the Natural Landscape, Heritage Coast, Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), and tourism hotspots.

7.23.3 – Lack of Transparent Comparative Analysis

The Applicant provides narrative statements that other alignments or locations were “less feasible”, but no structured scoring matrix, weighting system, or transparent cost-benefit method is provided. Without comparative scoring, the Examining Authority cannot be confident that alternatives were assessed consistently or objectively.

7.23.4 – Failure to Fully Consider Cumulative Infrastructure Burdens

Alternative locations, which could alleviate the collective pressure on communities, seem not to have received serious consideration; both Suffolk and Kent are currently managing numerous NSIPs. Basing the selection of a route or site solely on electrical efficiency overlooks the practical reality that some areas may already be disproportionately burdened.

7.23.5 – Insufficient Explanation for Rejection of Offshore Alternatives

The applicant should provide transparent engineering and environmental evidence to justify why potential offshore solutions were dismissed, especially where such alternatives could have reduced community impacts. Currently, it appears that these offshore routing and landing alternatives may have been prematurely discounted.

7.24 –Climate Change

The site selection process failed to sufficiently account for future climate scenarios, particularly in relation to flood risk, coastal erosion, and high-risk hydrology zones.

7.26 – Coordination with Other Projects

Beyond basic meetings and document sharing, a strategic approach is necessary. Residents need a plan that coordinates construction timelines and site usage to minimise disruption, a comprehensive strategy that has yet to be demonstrated.

Evaluating projects in isolation ignores the collective harm; the sheer concentration of multiple developments in one area intensifies the loss of the landscape's tranquility and character.

7.31 – Timescale, Programme and Ecological Seasons

7.31.6 - Tourism & Workforce Accommodation

Delays in the project timeline could severely impact peak tourist seasons and strain local housing availability. To prevent the displacement of local residents, the Applicant must ensure their workforce housing strategy relies exclusively on non-local housing options.

7.31.7 – Sequencing and Bird Breeding/Wintering Seasons

Construction activities must be planned to bypass sensitive bird seasons entirely; if scheduling around them is unfeasible, strict avoidance, habitat compensation, and enduring monitoring are necessitated.

7.34 – Interproject Cumulative Effects

Overall, the Applicant's failure to conduct a holistic assessment masks the true, compounded loss of tranquility and character resulting from multiple projects within a single landscape. Residents will suffer from lack of amenity, mental health issues. Visitors will be deterred from visiting the area, local businesses will suffer. Cumulative impacts will be substantial.

7.34.2 – Friston and Surrounds Cumulative Effects

Friston will become a major industrial hub when combined with other substation and converter projects, but the cumulative effects on the landscape, traffic, ecology, and socio-economics are inadequately assessed and mitigated.

7.34.4 - Cumulative Effects on roads

The project is likely to significantly increase road congestion and traffic impacts adding to the existing disruption caused by Sizewell C and other projects like EA1N/EA2. The cumulative impact is critically underplayed and will severely strain the already unsuitable local road network.

7.35 – Combined Effects

The Environmental Statement's conclusion that residual impacts are "not significant" after mitigation is fundamentally flawed. This assessment downplays the severe, permanent loss and degradation experienced by local residents, particularly those near converter stations, substations, haul routes, or compound locations. True impact must be measured from the perspective of the affected community's lived experience, not solely through abstract technical thresholds.

The introduction of permanent industrial infrastructure—such as converter stations, substations, trenches, access tracks, and overhead lines—results in a significant, lasting impact on rural and coastal landscapes. This major residual effect is unavoidable and cannot be completely mitigated through planting or bunding.

Ongoing Biodiversity Impacts

Certain habitats, when disturbed, cannot fully recover. Functionally mature ecosystems—such as ancient hedgerows, coastal grasslands, and saltmarsh edges—require decades or longer to return, and sometimes never do. The Applicant must acknowledge these as permanent residual losses rather than temporary inconveniences.

Compounded Stress Over Decades

When multiple NSIPs converge in communities like Friston and Saxmundham, the long-term stress and burden far exceed the Applicant's acknowledgment. The constant accumulation of residual economic, psychological, social, and environmental impacts demands a holistic evaluation of the genuine, lived experience of these communities.

Conclusion

I continue to be firmly against the Project in its present state. The Applicant consistently downplays impacts, makes unsubstantiated claims, and uses unenforceable mitigation and compensation measures. The proposed Project will likely inflict permanent or long-term damage on various aspects, including agriculture, ecology, heritage, landscape, tourism, local well-being, and community character. The Examining Authority must mandate strict avoidance of sensitive regions, binding mitigation and design safeguards, independent

monitoring, guaranteed community advantages, and improved sequencing, coordination, and backup plans. Alternatively, consent should be withheld until these conditions are satisfied.