

Fiona Cramb

Deadline 4 submission February 10th 2026

Dear Planning Inspectors.

Firstly I'd like to endorse submissions made to you by the community action groups, including SEAS and others.

I will try not to repeat points that others have made.

I wasn't able to attend the issue specific hearings, but I did look at some of the coverage and would like to raise the following points:

Cumulative impact.

This is the issue that affects myself, my family, our home and our neighbours most directly.

As I said at the open floor hearings this matter was not sufficiently well considered by the planning inspectors examining the Scottish power renewables EA1 North and EA2 development consent orders.

The inspectors failed to use the powers that they had to compel the developers and indeed National Grid to come forward with information that was already in the public domain about the additional projects that were planned to connect at the Friston substation. These included this project and the project now called Lion Link.

In my submissions to the Scottish Power Renewables DCO examination I made the point that should all these projects be given permission to connect at the proposed National Grid substation we would be encircled by Cable routes and overwhelmed by industrial scale infrastructure. This is indeed coming to pass and is already incredibly disruptive and distressing for us and our neighbours this without the impact of the Sizewell C construction programme. The cumulative impact of these projects going ahead often with overlapping construction timetables means that we and our neighbours are facing huge levels of disruption blighting our lives, the area we love to say nothing of the value of our homes. I still find it disgraceful and unfathomable that the developers and National Grid are able to blight our homes by drawing the boundaries of their construction site, in this case three construction sites, along our garden fence making our property unsaleable and yet we are entitled to no compensation for this.

We are grateful to SEAS for documenting with expert assistance the cumulative impact. We all recall the clear signal given by the inspectors in the SPR EA1N and EA2 examinations when they made what they described as a finely balanced recommendation. I hope you will give this due consideration.

The need for this project

I support the argument made by SEAS and other others that there is no need for this project. I believe SEAS has provided you with detailed arguments around how the justification for this project has been superseded by the opportunities for much less environmentally damaging alternatives .

I believe you indicated that after deadline 4 you would give renewed consideration to SEAS's request for an ISH on the question of need. I support this request.

Yours sincerely

Fiona Cramb