



9 January 2026

National Grid Electricity Transmission - Sea Link DCO (EN020026)

Aldeburgh Town Council – Interested Party Ref: [REDACTED]

Comments on further information received: 9 January - Deadline 3

1. Aldeburgh Town Council (ATC) responds to two aspects of the Applicant's Detailed Responses, its reissued Chapter 10 and to material received by Deadline 2. As we are a democratic body and the material is voluminous it has not been practicable to respond sooner. We would be grateful if the Inspectorate would consider accepting our submission.
2. ATC regrets that the Applicant has not responded to ATC's Representations at all and, when addressing concerns we share, has simply reiterated its original positions. The Applicant has declined to engage with us and seems to be pretending that Aldeburgh as a town and a community does not exist.
3. Tourism and traffic aspects of the Scheme greatly affect the town. As well as the objections to the substance of the Applicant's position, there is growing concern at its approach in refusing to accept the obvious or to engage with our community. The Applicant's approach is in contrast to that of Sizewell C. We hope that the Application is refused, but if it were not, we have no confidence that the Applicant would give good faith effect to requirements for mitigation of, or compensation for, the damage Aldeburgh would suffer.
4. Despite the flaws in the original Application on the issues of tourism and prosperity pointed out by the Councils, (also members of the public and groups including SEAS), the Applicant's Responses simply reaffirm what it said at the outset on these issues. ATC therefore draws the Inspectors' attention to what it seemed unnecessary to mention in its Relevant Representation.

TOURISM

5. ATC endorses what is said on this subject in the LIRs of the County and District Councils but adds the following about the particular position of the town. The Applicant's persistent refusal to face the obvious means that, if the Scheme were permitted to proceed, and we contend that it should not, requirements for mitigation and compensation would have to be significant and enforceable.

6. The Inspectors will know from common knowledge and their inspections that Aldeburgh is what both Councils call a ‘tourist hotspot’, the centre of tourism in the local area with the features summarised in our RR, and of world renown. The Councils and we understand SEAS have cited detailed evidence to demonstrate what is almost self-evident. In another context it would be simply funny that the Applicant discusses tourism without addressing the existence of the town. We read that SEAS calls it ‘preposterous’. For ATC it is an obvious indication that the Applicant’s approach is misconceived. The town receives no attention in the Applicant’s discussion of tourism apart from reference to a small area on the outskirts divorced from proper context.
7. The Applicant’s approach in Chapter 10 has three central flaws-
 - 7.1. Before applying any model to assessment of a subject the Applicant should first have appraised what its broad outline was likely to be - in this case obviously including Aldeburgh. Before applying a formula, you do a sanity check. If we adopt a method that does not address the main tourist area, is it the right one?
 - 7.2. It is common ground that there is no specific relevant guidance¹ but the Applicant proceeds as though there were-. The Applicant uses [LA 112 revision 1 \(Population and human health-web.pdf\)](#) ‘*This document sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the environmental effects on population and health from construction, operation and maintenance of highways projects.*’ That is not this case.
 - 7.3. The Applicant applies ‘professional judgment’ without describing whose it is. But it is clear from the first two points that this judgement is unreliable.
8. The only ‘evidence’ produced by the Applicant is an undisclosed review described as follows. The ‘*Applicant has undertaken a review of other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and their potential effects on tourism and visitor activity since the DCO submission. p13 of the [EN020026-001736-9.34.1 Applicant's Detailed Responses to the Relevant Representations identified by the ExA.pdf](#). This is said to support the Applicant’s view ‘the evidence suggests that there will be no significant adverse effects on visitors or tourism as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme’s. The Applicant has not produced one relevant witness to support this absurd proposition.*
9. In contrast the inspectors have the data from the Councils, and we understand too from SEAS, ATC’s considered opinion, a petition from over 50 local businesses (like ATC none of these appear to have objected to Sizewell or even Scottish Power) as well as those who have made RRs. ATC is aware of other businesses such as the Aldeburgh Jubilee Hall which are very concerned about the Scheme.

¹ ‘Whilst this guidance is not specific to electricity network infrastructure, this guidance provides some useful context’ Chapter 10, p14.) ‘There is currently no statutory guidance on the methodology for undertaking assessments of socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects’.10.4.25

10. In recent years, the Hall has substantially reduced its losses by promoting events attracting customers from a distance and its board is very concerned that the Scheme would severely damage its recovery.

TRAFFIC

11. ATC adopts the submissions of the County Council and emphasises three points.
12. The A1094 is the town's lifeline not only for up to 15,000 visitors a day in the summer. It is the route for emergency services - the nearest A and E hospital for an elderly population is 24 miles away in Ipswich. Further the reputational damage would be devastating - when potential day visitors ask 'where shall we go today' the answer would be 'not Aldeburgh with that traffic.' As one example, Aldeburgh receives substantial numbers of coach trips² and local businesses like the Summer Theatre advertise to the companies running them.
13. Aldeburgh Roundabout serves all traffic in and out of the town (except that from Thorpe Road where the landfall is proposed) has to go through Aldeburgh roundabout which the Applicant identifies as *S-RJ11: A1094/B1122 Leiston Road/Church Farm Road roundabout* in [EN020026-000239-6.2.2.7 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport.pdf](#). The Applicant proposes to use the roundabout for HGV routes to Accesses 5 and 6 and to the landfall within the town. [8.9 EA1N Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan](#). Currently ATC does not believe that the Applicant would keep to the suggested 10 vehicle a day limit and this would anyway be too much.
14. 'The Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route, which runs from Felixstowe to Lowestoft, passing through charming towns such as Aldeburgh and Southwold' uses this roundabout. <https://www.thesuffolkcoast.co.uk/articles/road-cycling-on-the-suffolk-coast>. British Cycling's 2025 Tour of Britain (men's) race came through Aldeburgh. <https://www.britishcycling.org.uk/tourofbritain/men/route>, and Classic car rallies regularly come to Aldeburgh. <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/25491588.classic-car-display-coming-moot-hall-aldeburgh/>
15. Shortly, as part of the consented SPR application, the B1353 road (Thorpeness – Aldringham) will be closed for 25 days. <https://aldringham.onesuffolk.net/news-events-and-items-of-interest/news/view/343> All vehicular access to Thorpeness from north and south will be via Aldeburgh, utilising the roundabout junction. That the Thorpe Road according to the Applicant '*...does not connect with any other key routes within the study area*' is due in part to the Applicant failing to consider a sufficiently wide area as being impacted by this application; ATC supports SCC's opinion that 2km should be considered the right zone to be assessed.

² Eg [Aldeburgh for the Day, Suffolk](#)

16. As the A1094 reaches the roundabout and its four exits, there is a pedestrian crossing as people, particularly children, from the town's less affluent roads cross to reach the Primary School, Community Centre, Hospital, playground and open spaces, Library and, immediately opposite, Tesco and the Coop. The road also has to be crossed to reach the town Surgery. Due to the pavement layout, the route also forms part of the walk for Ramblers and general walkers using the Coastal Path from Snape direction, crossing from the north to the south side of the A1094 at this point, before following the Coastal Path south past the OGS towards the river.
17. The Applicant assesses the problems at the roundabout, when the Scheme is in place as largely 'negligible' even though the Scottish Power Decision (which the town considered greatly underestimated the dangers) found that its scheme alone, before any Sea Link vehicle might arrive *'will have adverse transport and traffic impacts during construction, particularly during transport of AIL and in respect of HGV on the A1094 and at Aldeburgh,'*³.
18. Traffic data: ATC reiterates that it takes general issue with the period chosen to obtain the Baseline Traffic Data by the Applicant: *'7.7.6 Baseline traffic data has been obtained for the surrounding highway network within the study area based on ATC and MCC surveys carried out in **January and February 2024**...'* This was gathered at what is always the very quietest period of the commercial year for Aldeburgh, in common with many tourist destination towns. In 2024, February was the wettest month on record for East Anglia, with frequent weather warnings and flooding and as a result was additionally quiet. There were also several warnings to refrain from travel unless necessary. As one example: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-68253098>
19. **Response to ExQ1 1GEN49:** Should this badly conceived Project be approved, ATC would request considerable care should be taken to condition severely curtail or cease works in daily working hours and peak periods, including for example the Aldeburgh Carnival when numbers swell dramatically. ATC would also question whether this Application (if successful) could ever justifiably be permitted working hours that are longer than those of the current Scottish Power Renewables project.
20. As presented by ESC, the mental wellbeing of residents is already being negatively affected, and this situation would be exacerbated by the potential damage to commercial wellbeing caused by the current construction plans for this project.

³ Full quote *the Proposed Development will have adverse transport and traffic impacts during construction, particularly during transport of AIL and in respect of HGV on the A1094 and at Aldeburgh, but that provided that robust and effective controls are in operation, these adverse impacts are capable of being satisfactorily managed and minimised; however, these impacts will nevertheless cause harm, albeit temporary, and are therefore of medium significance and negative weight in the planning balance.* [EN010078-010060-EA2 Recommendation Report Vol1 Ch1-17.pdf](#)

21. **Response to ExQ1 1SERT2:** ATC has already observed subtle changes in the take-up of hospitality offerings in the town as result of SZC workers take-up of rentals that would otherwise go to holiday visitors. It is of course ridiculous to suggest that the spend of someone who has moved to Aldeburgh in the long to medium term for work rather than pleasure will have the same level of spend or spend patterns as those on holiday. That they will have different budgets, and less available time for recreation would of course affect the High Street, hotels and hospitality offerings if they displace the existing market.
22. **Response to ExQ1 1SERT4:** ATC considers evidence produced from prior to 1995 (commissioning of Sizewell B) would be a very poor indicator of how the tourism sector would react now. For a very basic example according to [the Office for National Statistics](#), in 1987 at the start of SZB's construction the UK population was around 55,222,000, by 2024 this had risen to 67,353,600, a rise of almost 20%.
23. The response regarding the effect on tourism is not based any rigorous examination of the facts.
24. It uses as an example that local tourism was not negatively affected by the development of Sizewell B. This assertion does not take into account the difference in the tourism offering during those works which happened decades ago, between 1987 and 1995, and the ways in which tourism in this area has changed in the intervening years.
25. The nearest tourism centre to the Sea Link development is Aldeburgh, and the evidence given by a local business which operated in Aldeburgh High Street, the commercial hub of the town throughout the Sizewell B build and does to this day, gives a totally different view.
26. Businesses in Aldeburgh High Street who have traded throughout the development of Sizewell B until the present day, have experienced in real time the changes to the town and can testify to its transition from the town it was during that build and the town it has become today.
27. In 1987 Aldeburgh High Street provided a service to residents and second homeowners. It is important to recognise the difference between second homeowners who use the town and its facilities in much the same way as permanent residents, unlike the holiday lets, where visitors are transient and have no long-term interest in the town.
28. The High Street then had 3 greengrocers, 2 butchers, a dedicated fishmonger, a small supermarket, a baker, newsagent, all practical shops used by the residents and second homeowners alike. It had no businesses devoted to the provision of holiday homes, and no national outlet shops.

29. Today, there is one butcher, no greengrocers, and bakers which relies heavily on its cafe which is used by tourists and day trippers. The newsagent has gone and the outer residential areas are now served by two supermarkets in a secondary area away from the High Street.
30. The day-to-day practical shop premises have been taken over by new shops which rely almost entirely on holiday lets and tourism. Aldeburgh now has a range of clothes shops most of which are national chains and are present in all busy holiday locations. Others are independent businesses which rely on the tourist trade.
31. There are delicatessens, restaurants and upmarket gift shops which did not exist during the build of SZB. There has also been an increase in property investment which has led to several holiday let businesses being established in the High Street.
32. The town, over the decades since SZB, has changed beyond recognition into a dedicated holiday resort, with all the associated facilities. The current multiple Energy Projects are affecting this tourism model in a way that will cause immense damage.
33. The conflation the effect that SZB had on tourism in the area with the effect SZC will have has not been robustly researched, and the superficial conclusions do not give much confidence in the rest of responses by the Applicant.
34. **Response to ExQ1 1GEN48:** ATC remains deeply concerned at the potential damage that may be caused by any of these methods.
35. ATC have welcomed Applicants making contact over Projects that stand to affect the town – both Sizewell over many years and Scottish Power Renewables over recent years have made presentations at the Moot Hall and ATC believes it has good relations with both of these project organisers.
36. To emphasise our point 2 above, we are both saddened and appalled that this Applicant has not and is still not engaging with ATC on any level, while we know we are not alone this is still galling and worrying.

Yours sincerely

For and on behalf of Aldeburgh Town Council



Town Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer