



The Planning Act 2008

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for the Sea Link Project

Summary of East Suffolk Council's Relevant Representation on proposed changes (CR1) to the Sea Link Project

Deadline 3A Change request
(19 January 2026)

Application Ref.: EN020026

East Suffolk Council: [REDACTED]

1. This is a summary of East Suffolk Council's ('ESC's') Relevant Representation on the Applicant's Change Request 1 ('CR1') [[CR1-001](#)] in which it addresses each of the five changes in turn ('the Relevant Representation').
2. ESC has reviewed the Applicant's CR1 (comprising documents [CR1-001] to [CR1-068]). Subject to the detailed comments made in ESC's Relevant Representation, ESC is satisfied, to the extent that environmental topics fall under ESC's remit, that CR1 should not give rise to any new or different likely significant environmental effects compared to those reported in the ES.
3. In particular, however, ESC remains dissatisfied with a number of aspects of the Applicant's approach to assessing and mitigating noise and vibration effects, as set out in Section 7.4 of its LIR [[REP1-128](#)]. The Applicant notes in the Addendum to Volume 6 Environmental Statement [[CR1-055](#)] submitted as part of CR1 that new or different likely significant adverse effects are not predicted as a result of CR1, '*particularly with the implementation of best practicable means*'. This is not a satisfactory response, and ESC continues to request actual detail as to what the Applicant proposes in terms of "best practicable means" mitigation, which is a term too often used as a means to avoid the provision of practical detail. Without this information, ESC cannot be confident that the proposed works can be controlled so as to avoid significant adverse effects.
4. In relation to Change 4, ESC wishes to reiterate its concerns regarding the disruption that the Applicant's options to address the weight limit constraints of Benhall Railway Bridge would cause for the local community. ESC considers this disruption could have been meaningfully reduced had the Applicant sought to address the issue at an earlier stage.
5. ESC also questions where the Applicant is proposing to site the temporary construction compound now that the adjacent land consented for residential use cannot be included in the revised Order Limits. This detail is essential to provide ESC with confidence that Option 2 is deliverable in both practical and environmental terms.
6. Finally, ESC is extremely disappointed that the Applicant has failed to use the opportunity presented by Change 5 to extend and enhance its landscape planting along the B1119 to increase the Order Limits south of the B1119 to accommodate multi-species tree belts along the B1119 and Fristonmoor Lane planting to achieve genuinely effective screening.