

EN20026 Sea Link Examination, Deadline 4, 19th February 2026

Representation by Susan Bridges, registration identification number [REDACTED]

(Please withdraw submission reference number SF03AC709 and replace with this copy.)

1. Introduction

This submission summarises remaining concerns about National Grid Electricity Transmission's (NGET) Sea Link application. The main concern is why and how NGET is pursuing this application, when the ExA included in its East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) report *"The effects of the cumulative delivery of the Proposed Development with the other East Anglia development on the transmission connection site near Friston are so substantially adverse that utmost care will be required in the consideration of any amendments or additions to those elements of the Proposed Development in this location."*

2. Cumulative harm: how can the ExA accurately assess Sea Link's cumulative harm if the origin of the harm is not fully addressed? The following details cumulative harm before the EA1N and EA2 DCOs were consented.
3. June 2014 Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) East Anglia ONE received DCO consent for a coordinated "Energy Motorway" to send 3.6GW of power to Bramford along a new 37km cable route from Bawdsey to Bramford: of major long-lasting benefit for all SPR's offshore electrical power projects.
4. March 2016 SPR submitted a non-material change order to change the transmission technology from HVDC to HVAC, despite it resulting in a changed trench configuration and an entirely different design of the onshore substation at Bramford. I.e., SPR's submission was a material change. NGET, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and local authorities did not challenge the non-material change category including SPR's lawyers arguing on the basis that there was no legal definition of what represents a non-material change.¹
5. January 2017 SPR submitted a second non-material change to reduce SPR's DCO obligation to construct six cable trenches to three trenches. [Also noted was a change in HVDC technology from Symmetric Monopole HVDC to Bipole HVDC was not included or approved.] Potentially if all six trenches originally mandated by the EA1 DCO Consent had been fully utilised using Bipole HVDC, at the same level as East Anglia THREE, as much as 8.4GW (6 x 1.4GW) could have been routed from Bawdsey to Bramford against the originally consented 3.6GW. Instead, the non-material change resulted in EA1's power being

¹ Changing or revoking a development consent order for nationally significant infrastructure (Planning Act 2008) Consultation stage impact assessment. www.communities.gov.uk November 2010 ISBN 978 1 4098 2605 7 & Planning Act 2008, Guidance on Changes to Development Consent Orders, Department of Communities and Local Government, December 2015

reduced to 2.1GW. I.e., it was a material change. Again, there were no objections from NGET, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and the local authorities to the non-material change category. Ironically, in 2016/17, SPR had considered reopening the cable route to connect their EA1N and EA2 projects through the Bawdsey to Bramford route, as evidenced by Minutes of meetings with PINS.

6. July 2017 NGET revised their agreement for SPR to connect at Bramford and required SPR to connect EA1N and EA2 to an unspecified site in the Leiston area, where NGET did not have a network connection and where there were known constraints: proximity to Sizewell C and the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths ANOB National Landscape designation. The EA1N and EA2 DCO Consents require NGET to provide a network connection for SPR's windfarm projects and DCO consent was granted in 2022 including NGET's new substation at Friston.
7. It is clear that NGET's decision to not oppose the downgrading of the Bawdsey to Bramford route from HVDC to HVAC and reducing the number of trenches from six to three were harmful and inadequately justified decisions. As was changing the EA1N and EA2 grid connection from Bramford to the Leiston area. Both the non-material changes were accepted by the Secretary of State without proper assessment, including not understanding the changes were material changes and the resulting in significant harm a new landfall at Thorpeness, cable trenching through an ANOB National Landscape to Friston and three substations within sight of St Mary the Virgin, a Grade 2 early 14th century church within the setting of the Suffolk and Coasts ANOB National Landscape. The significant harm caused could have been avoided if the 2014 EA1 DCO had been protected by NGET and monitored by the Secretary of State.
8. The above failures of process were brought to the attention of Rachel Reeves MP, chair of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee and Neil Parish MP, Chair of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee in a letter dated 2 January 2019 from Michael Mahony on behalf of SASES (Substation Action Save East Suffolk), see copy attached. Why wasn't the Bawdsey to Bramford route's 8.4GW potential capacity protected and maximised? What is its potential today and how much capacity is still available? Given the rural landscape and Listed heritage assets at Saxmundham, Sternfield and Benhall, the Sea Link application should be refused. The EA1N and EA2 wind farms have not started construction in the North Sea. It seems possible their electricity could still landfall at Bawdsey as HVDC Bipole or HVAC, saving Friston and the surrounding landscape at Saxmundham, Sternfield and Benhall from substantial environmental harm.
9. Protecting National Parks and ANOB National Landscapes

Attached is a copy of a letter sent to the Prime Minister last year requesting the Government not to weaken laws protecting National Parks and National

Landscapes. Every National Park and ANOB National Landscape is watching the outcome of the Sea Link DCO application because of the very harmful precedent it could set for other projects earmarked for the Saxmundham area. National Parks and ANOB National Landscapes, Listed heritage assets and their settings should not be harmed for renewable energy infrastructure on the scale proposed Saxmundham, Sternfield and Benhall.

3 January 2019

Rachel Reeves MP
Chair of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee
[REDACTED]@parliament.uk)
&
Neil Parish MP
Chair of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee
[REDACTED]@parliament.uk)
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Dear Ms Reeves and Mr Parish

EAST SUFFOLK UNDER THREAT FROM UNPLANNED MULTIPLE ENERGY PROJECTS

We are one of a number of community groups who are deeply concerned about the threat to East Suffolk, its landscape, ecology and way of life from multiple large scale energy projects.

Rural East Suffolk including the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (map attached) is facing an unprecedented number of energy projects in the next 10 years. No other part of rural England is facing such an onslaught of industrialisation in the name of so called "renewable energy". These include the following projects in several different locations within East Suffolk:

1. Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station (which will have two reactors) being developed by EDF;
2. East Anglia One and East Anglia Three offshore windfarms (currently under construction) being developed by Scottish Power. The wind turbines may be offshore but very large and permanent industrial infrastructure is required **onshore** to enable connection to the National Grid;
3. East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two offshore windfarms, again being developed by Scottish Power and requiring yet further very large and permanent **onshore** infrastructure;
4. The major expansion of existing windfarms known as Greater Gabbard and Galloper requiring even more permanent **onshore** infrastructure;
5. The National Grid's Nautilus and Eurolink interconnector projects which will connect the electricity grids of the Netherlands and Belgium to the UK. These require very large and permanent industrial infrastructure **onshore** in East Suffolk;
6. The Crown Estate is planning yet another round of windfarm developments off the East Suffolk Coast which require yet further very large and permanent **onshore** infrastructure.

Aside from the permanent impact of these developments, there is also the massive disruption caused by the construction process itself which will take place over many years and which includes the digging of several 50m wide cable trenches over many miles of open countryside (including through an AONB) in an area with very constrained road and rail infrastructure.

There has been a total lack of strategic, long term planning by central government, local government and the energy sector (particularly the National Grid). Had there been it would have been readily apparent that this sensitive and deeply rural area of East Suffolk simply cannot cope with this type and scale of industrial development without destroying its character and severely damaging its tourism dependent economy.

Given the magnitude of the failure we respectfully request that your select committees investigate these matters.

The remainder of this letter focuses on the wind farm developments as it is these that highlight both the overall failure to properly plan and the serious mismanagement of existing and planned windfarm projects.

Everyone appreciates the need to invest in renewable energy and the role that offshore wind power has to play in this. However what is **not** appreciated is the huge scale of the associated highly disruptive **onshore** development. Clear examples are the latest offshore wind farm projects which Scottish Power Renewables (SPR), with the support of the National Grid and the Crown Estate, are promoting in the North Sea off the Suffolk coast. The proposed **onshore** substation complex covers at least **30 acres** and includes industrial structures **18 metres high**. SPR plans to build these in open countryside of high landscape value close to a thriving village community.

These plans are for just two wind farms generating up to 1.7 Gigawatts of power. The aspiration to generate 25 Gigawatts of power from the Crown Estate's current Round 3 offshore windfarm developments could result in potentially **500 acres** (160ha)* of land that has to be industrialised, not including all the land required for the construction of 50 metre wide underground cable routes from the coast to National Grid dictated inland connection points.

All this poses a huge threat to East Suffolk and its Heritage Coast, its rural landscape, its ecology, its archaeology and its communities.

Further, it seriously threatens a local economy dependent on tourism attracted by its landscape and quintessentially "English" towns and villages such as Aldeburgh, the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB, and the surrounding coastal and inland rural landscape. It is estimated that tourism contributes £210million and around 5000 jobs to the local economy. In the case of East Suffolk there is yet another major factor. There are already two nuclear power stations (Sizewell A and Sizewell B) just five miles north of Aldeburgh on the coast at Sizewell and EDF is proposing to build yet another nuclear power station close by on the AONB (Sizewell C).

So one might have expected that a thoughtful and long term strategic approach would have been taken to minimise the damaging impacts of the major industrial scale onshore infrastructure required to deliver so called "offshore" wind-power to the National Grid. This is very far from what is happening

Instead, an *ad hoc* and opportunistic approach is being pursued, taking no account of the combined effect of multiple large scale developments including:

1. The latest two of several wind-farm projects resulting from the Crown Estate's Round 3 allocation of large tracts of the sea bed to wind-farm developers

2. National Grid's plans to interconnect the UK National Grid with those of Belgium and the Netherlands, requiring a further 20 acre substation complex; and
3. A further massive nuclear complex being proposed for Sizewell by EDF (two nuclear power plants: Sizewell C1 and C2)
4. The major expansion of existing windfarms known as Greater Gabbard and Galloper

What is worse is that on top of all of this the Crown Estate is planning a further allocation of wind-farm developments known as Round 4 for release in the Spring of 2019. This is not just a case of trying to force a quart into a pint pot – it is more like squeezing multiple gallons into a pint pot. **How can this chaotic state of affairs have come about? Just what have National Grid amongst others been doing or rather failed to do?**

In large part this is due to both the failure of National Grid to plan strategically rather than tactically and invest for the long term, and the Crown Estate in taking no substantive responsibility for the onshore impacts of its decisions.**

National Grid's failures, dating back to at least 2008, if not before, have led inevitably to a total lack of awareness by both Government and Planning Authorities at Central and Local level of the onshore impact of the offshore projects that were initiated by Round 3 (and soon Round 4). No forward land allocation planning has been carried out, at least in East Anglia, and allocation of network connections has been taking place on an *ad hoc* basis. National Grid now has the nerve to indicate that it has insufficient time to provide alternative and better solutions through extending their transmission network.

The consequences of the National Grid's, Scottish Power's and the Crown Estate's failure

A shocking example of this failure is a Scottish Power wind-farm project which is currently under construction in East Suffolk. The depressing story is as follows.

Back in 2008 the Crown Estate launched what is known as Round 3 of potential wind-farm projects off the East Anglian coast whereby developers would bid for rights to build wind-farms. Amongst others SPR bid and was successful and planned to build a number of wind-farms which were then known as East Anglia One ("EA1"), East Anglia Two ("EA2"), East Anglia Three ("EA3") and East Anglia Four ("EA4").

SPR initially decided to bring forward three of these projects which could produce up to 3.6 Gigawatts of power. As described above, these projects must be supported by large scale onshore infrastructure in order to connect to the National Grid. Through a less than transparent process known as CION, National Grid looked at a number of locations in East Anglia (including in the Sizewell/Leiston area) and offered Scottish Power a connection point at a location called Bramford where there is an existing large scale substation complex. One might think this would be close to the coast, but no. The Bramford site required a 22 mile, 50 metre wide underground cable route to be carved from the coast at Bawdsey through the countryside, including the AONB. The very fact that the National Grid thought this was the best location, notwithstanding the cost and disruption of such a route (the "Bawdsey to Bramford cable route"), shows the difficulty in making a connection elsewhere in East Suffolk. It is important to note that at that time, National Grid had considered and discounted a connection in the Sizewell/Leiston area. National Grid has not disclosed the reasons why, but it demonstrates what a sensitive and constrained area this part of East Suffolk is. No doubt part of the rationale was that the very large substations required could be accommodated at the existing substation location at Bramford and thereby minimising the impact on the East Suffolk landscape.

SPR decided to bring forward its projects in a phased manner reflecting the Government's approach to the auction process for "Contracts for Difference". The Contracts for Difference (CfD) scheme is the Government's main mechanism for supporting low-carbon electricity

generation. CfDs are intended to incentivise investment in renewable energy by providing developers of projects with direct protection from volatile wholesale electricity prices by guaranteeing a fixed (but indexed) rate for the electricity generated over a 15-year period. Developers bid for CfDs through a “sealed bid” auction process

The first project SPR brought forward was EA1, for which it applied to the Planning Inspectorate for a Development Consent Order (“DCO”) in November 2012. That order was duly granted in 2014. It is clear from the DCO that PINS was understandably concerned to minimise disruption caused by the construction of the cable route. Therefore consent was given on condition that cable route would be built once and would accommodate 3.6 Gigawatts of power i.e. this cable route would accommodate all SPR’s contemplated future wind-farm projects. So far so good.

Following the Contract for Difference auction, SPR was successful to the extent it was awarded a contract for 714 Megawatts (0.7GigaWatts) of power for EA1. This was consistent with the DCO which permitted development up to 1.2 Gigawatts of power. A consequence of CfD in this case (and perhaps unforeseen by the Government) was that for commercial reasons SPR then modified its plans by reducing the planned output of its EA1 project.

Then things started to go wrong.

For questionable reasons SPR made an application to Planning Inspectorate for two changes to the DCO. These changes were said by SPR to be needed because it had decided to change the design of the onshore technology from Direct Current (“DC”) to Alternating Current (“AC”). The problem with such a change was that although the output from the EA1 wind farm was now to be 714 megawatts (rather than the maximum of 1.2 Gigawatts), more of the capacity of the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route would be needed as more cables are required for AC technology notwithstanding the almost 50% reduction in power. The overall effect of these changes was that the cable route would no longer be able to accommodate 3.6 Gigawatts of power as originally planned but only a maximum of 1.9 Gigawatts. SPR justified this with the argument that it no longer needed so much capacity since it was no longer going to develop EA4. However SPR was clearly contemplating two new offshore wind farm projects to be known as East Anglia One North (“EA1N”) and East Anglia 2 (“EA2”). PINS and BEIS were both aware of this and asked SPR to clarify the position, being quite rightly concerned about the disruption that would ensue if the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route was not employed for these new projects. SPR appears to have assured PINS in some manner that these projects were too uncertain in a number of respects to require consideration at that time i.e. there was no prospect of disruption.

However, that assurance does not bear examination because according to SPR’s own time line (set out on its website), it was already planning to enter into contracts in respect of the development of EA1N and EA2 in **Spring 2016** and had signed agreements to lease with the Crown Estate in **February 2016** in respect of the sea bed where the turbines were to be located. Further at a series of meetings with PINS in 2016 it was clear that SPR were carrying out detailed work on the EA1N and EA2 projects.

PINS also appears to have been reassured by a number of statements by SPR (seemingly unaware that the proposed changes substantially reduced the capacity of the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route) in respect of SPR’s plans to use that route for EA1N and EA2 at the same series of meetings in 2016. Details of those meetings are set out below.

1. The minutes of a meeting between PINS and SPR on 12 April 2016 to discuss EA1N and EA2 state *“the Applicant informed the Inspectorate that the projects intend to connect at Bramford substation”*. The Applicant being SPR.
2. The minutes of a meeting between PINS and SPR on 6 July 2016 state, in the context of the agreements between SPR and National Grid to connect to the grid using the Bawdsey to

Bramford cable route, *"The grid agreements have now been modified by the Applicant to accommodate EA2 and EA1N"*. The minutes also state *"The Applicant confirmed.....the EA1N and EA2 projects intend....to follow the same offshore and onshore grid connection route and connect to the National Grid at Bramford as per their connection agreements"*. SPR gave no indication that such a connection would not be possible. So clearly SPR were not only planning in detail for EA1N and EA2 and but also stating it would be on the basis that SPR would use the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route.

3. The minutes of a meeting between PINS and SPR on 15 December 2016 also refer to the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route in the context of the EA1N and EA2 projects. It is abundantly clear from those minutes that SPR had been carrying out detailed work on the onshore cable route for EA1N and EA2 and indicated to PINS that the cable route would be the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route.

Regardless of all this, BEIS inexplicably gave its consent to both changes requested by SPR by two letters dated **March 2016 and as late as January 2017** without any requirement that the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route be used for EA1N and EA2. BEIS/PINS seemingly did not realise the disastrous consequences of their decisions and actions. Those consequences were triggered by the National Grid without any prior notice or warning changing the connection location from Bramford, using the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route, to the Sizewell/Leiston area. This is recorded in the minutes of a meeting between PINS and SPR on 7 September 2017 in which it is baldly stated *"National Grid have reviewed the projects connection options and are varying the connection locations; which means that the connection point for both projects will be in the vicinity of Sizewell/Leiston"*. No one appeared to appreciate or recognise the disastrous consequences of that National Grid decision at that meeting. Nor does there appear to have been any challenge to that decision from PINS. How could National Grid unilaterally make that choice when agreements for a Bawdsey/Bramford connection had already been agreed in the first half of 2016 as recorded in the minutes quoted above? National Grid appears to be a law unto itself with no one seemingly being able to hold it to account. Why did neither SPR or PINS challenge National Grid?

Those consequences are that for EA1N and EA2 a whole new onshore cable route is now required with a landfall in a different location carving another swathe through the East Suffolk countryside including through the AONB. Worse still a new 30 acre substation complex 18 metres high is planned to be built in an undeveloped rural location rather than at Bramford as originally consented.

This is the reality which East Suffolk is now facing, with the prospect of yet more so called offshore wind-farms to come aside from all the other energy projects referred to above.

The proposed new cable route will start on the Suffolk Heritage Coast immediately to the north of the attractive holiday village of Thorpeness and then pass through the Suffolk Coasts & Heaths AONB. It will traverse a further 5 miles of countryside, crossing key roads, disturbing woodland and archaeological sites and finally arriving next to the peaceful village of Friston in the middle of the East Suffolk countryside where a brand new 30 acre 18 metre high substation complex will be constructed close to a number of listed buildings. All reasons no doubt for National Grid not originally offering a connection point in this area, plus of course the knowledge that EDF planned to develop Sizewell C nuclear power station in the same area.

It is incomprehensible how such a situation has been allowed to develop. Remember the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route could have accommodated and may even now accommodate all the power from these Scottish Power wind farms. This was the original intention. So, how did PINS/BEIS not realise the consequences of its decisions? Why did the statutory bodies consulted as part of the decision making process raise no objections to the onshore impacts of these changes? Those bodies included Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Natural England and **unbelievably the National Grid, who are a source of technical**

expertise of national importance but said nothing. Had PINS, BEIS and the local authorities and Natural England been aware of the consequences, it is hard to believe they would have agreed to the changes requested by SPR. In fact, it is unbelievable.

We are a community group set up under the auspices of Friston Parish Council that is trying to challenge Scottish Power Renewables' current plans. We have support from the neighbouring Parish Councils and other community groups. **We respectfully request that the BEIS and/or the DEFRA Select Committees:**

- 1. investigate and determine how such a disastrous failure in planning and coordination of so called offshore wind farm development has arisen and in particular (a) the role and accountability of National Grid, (b) the transparency of SPR in its dealings with PINS and (c) the failure of PINS to ensure the DCO for the EA1 project was properly administered;**
- 2. recommend corrective measures to address the immediate issues with current projects and prevent unnecessary environmental destruction, for example the reinstatement of the Bawdsey to Bramford cable route as the route for all Scottish Power offshore wind farms;**
- 3. recommend actions to ensure effective long-term planning for all energy projects that may impact East Anglia so that offshore wind power and renewable energy generally is not developed at the cost of the onshore environment.**

This is a complex and sorry tale and this letter is a summary of what we believe has happened. A timeline is attached which sets out the sequence of key events. We would be very pleased to meet with you and any members of the committee to discuss this subject in greater detail and answer any questions you may have.

Given the magnitude of the failings exposed, we have issued the attached press release to national and local print and broadcast media.

Yours faithfully

Michael Mahony

[Redacted signature]

Enc. East Suffolk map, Media Release, Timeline

Letter circulation list attached

* A simple metric based on the designs currently being proposed is that for every Gigawatt of off-shore power to be landed onshore, up to 20 acres (8ha) of flat, flood-free land, and close to a National Grid 400kV transmission network is required for the substations. Given the Crown Estates aspiration for landing 25 Gigawatts of power from its current Round 3 wind-farm leases, that amounts to potentially **500 acres** (160ha) of suitable land that has to be allocated, not including all the land required for the construction of 50 metre wide underground cable routes from the coast to the agreed National Grid connection points.

** From 2008 onwards, the National Grid, sponsored variously by the Crown Estate, DECC and OFGEM, carried out studies on the implications of connecting large quantities of Round 3 off-shore energy to the transmission network. This culminated in the ENSG report 'Our Electrical Transmission Network: A Vision for 2020' published in 2012. **However, NONE of these reports in any way adequately explained the onshore land allocation implications of**

either the proposed wind farms destined to be constructed in response to Round 3, or of the anticipated Interconnectors to other countries.

And the main thrust of all those reports has been that it is for the offshore energy companies to find ways of bringing their power to the existing National Grid network, rather than taking the surely obvious strategic approach of proposing brown-field coastal sites suitable for substation construction and extending the existing 400kV Super-Grid to these coastal locations. Whatever solution was chosen, planning consents and expenditure would have been required. To have proposed that multiple competing energy companies each burrow their own way from the coast to inland National Grid sites, the latter mostly lacking sufficient land for gigantic substations, was clearly madness of the highest order.

All this is emphasised in a report prepared for the Crown Estate in 2008 which states *“Extending the onshore transmission out to the coast to minimise the amount of onshore cabling from the East Coast wind farms was not considered in detail. This solution would necessitate a new 400kV double circuit line from a new coastal substation to Norwich”*.

And of course, that would have meant National Grid taking an initiative to make the case for a strategic investment, something they seem to strive very hard to avoid.

The Rt Hon Sir Keir Starmer KCB KC MP
Prime Minister
10 Downing Street
London
SW1A 2AA

CC: Darren Jones MP, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Steve Reed OBE MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government
Emma Reynolds MP, Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Mary Creagh CBE MP, Minister for Nature

7th October 2025

Dear Prime Minister,

Do not weaken the laws protecting National Parks and National Landscapes

The British public loves our National Parks and National Landscapes. Like you, millions have beloved memories of family holidays and days out enjoying their natural beauty and wildlife. Alongside the NHS, National Parks and National Landscapes are among the most successful and popular British institutions. They were established after the Second World War as part of national renewal, driven by a Labour Government who understood the value of such places for the nation and that the simple joy of beautiful landscapes was part of what makes a good life which should be the right of every citizen, whether they live in a town, city or the countryside.

Now, we understand some in your government intend to significantly weaken protections by amending or removing the protected landscapes duty (s.245 Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023) a move at odds with this proud history and values. Considering such a significant change to the law at the very end of the Planning and Infrastructure Bill process, without any consultation, would undermine parliamentary conventions and public trust, creating serious uncertainty for businesses and public authorities.

Such a change would betray those values and constitute a serious backward step environmentally, socially and economically. National Parks and National Landscapes are enjoyed by 245 million visitors per year, generating at least £36bn in visitor spend. Time spent in these landscapes is scientifically proven to boost physical and mental health (annual savings to the NHS from outdoor exercise is an estimated £8bn). Their natural beauty supports thriving businesses, from local food producers to outdoor recreation, tourism, and green finance.

National Parks and National Landscapes are essential to delivering the UK's international commitment to protect and manage 30% of land for nature by 2030 and England's legally binding biodiversity targets. Removing or weakening the legal duty on public bodies to help

make these landscapes deliver more for people and for nature will erode what makes them special and undermine their economic and environmental potential.

The health of our environment underpins the health of our economy. Clement Attlee's post-war Government understood this: it is why they created National Parks and National Landscapes as part of post-war economic renewal, protecting landscapes alongside rapid housebuilding. They understood that people need places to live, and we also need places to thrive, to enjoy, to immerse ourselves in the wonders of nature.

Just ten months ago, your government celebrated 75 years of National Parks and National Landscapes, championing the protected landscapes duty. Reversing course now would set back nature recovery, economic growth, and your government's historic relationship with these special areas.

We urge you to reconsider.

Yours sincerely

Rose O'Neill, Chief Executive, Campaign for National Parks
Hilary McGrady, Director General, National Trust
Beccy Speight, Chief Executive, RSPB
Richard Benwell, Chief Executive, Wildlife and Countryside Link
Craig Bennett, Chief Executive, The Wildlife Trusts
Roger Mortlock, Chief Executive, CPRE, the Countryside Charity
Vanessa Rowlands, Chair, National Parks England
John Watkins, Chief Executive, National Landscapes Association
Paul Ratcliffe, Chief Executive, British Mountaineering Council
Kate Ashbrook, General Secretary, Open Spaces Society
Ross Maloney, Chief Executive, Ramblers
James Blake, Chief Executive, Youth Hostel Association
Julia Aglionby, Executive Director, Foundation for Common Land
Judy Ling Wong CBE, Honorary President, Black Environment Network
Rebecca Wrigley, Chief Executive, Rewilding Britain
Tom Usher, Chief Executive, Dartmoor Preservation Association
Jonathan Riley, Chair, Friends of the Dales
Kate O'Sullivan, Chair, Exmoor Society
Michael Hill, Chief Executive, Friends of the Lake District
Sarah Nield, Chair, New Forest Association
George Winn-Darley, Chair, North Yorkshire Moors Association
Dr Mark Collins, Chair, The Broads Society
David Green, Chair, Friends of the South Downs
Julian Glover OBE, Chair of the Independent Review of Protected Landscapes
Professor Sir John Lawton, Chair of Making Space For Nature.
Chris Smith, Lord Smith of Finsbury, Former Labour Secretary of State
Chris Mullin, Former Labour Secretary of State
Guy Shrubsole, campaigner, author of The Lie of the Land and The Lost Rainforests of Britain
Mike Bevens, Managing Director, Sawday's Canopy & Stars

Alex Beasley, Regional Manager – Northern Europe, Patagonia
 Richard Leedham, Chief Executive Officer, Rab
 Daniel Szor, Founder, Cotswold Distillery
 Dan Yates, Executive Director, European Outdoor Conservation Association
 Clare Brook, Chief Executive, Blue Marine Foundation
 Peter Brooke, Chief Executive, British Orienteering
 Kit Stoner, Chief Executive, Bat Conservation Trust
 Julie Williams, Chief Executive, Butterfly Conservation
 Hendrikus van Hensbergen, Chief Executive, Action for Conservation
 Gill Perkins, Chief Executive, Bumblebee Conservation Trust
 Paula Brunt, Trustee, Disabled Ramblers
 Hazel Norman, Chief Executive, British Ecological Society
 Mark Castle OBE, Chief Executive, Field Studies Council
 Charles Clover, Chair, Dedham Vale Society
 James Wallace, Chief Executive, River Action UK
 Mark Lloyd, Chief Executive, The Rivers Trust
 Bob Elliot, Chief Executive, Wild Justice
 Craig Macadam, Co-Leader and Director of Conservation, Buglife
 Professor Alastair Driver, Senior Advisor, Global Rewilding Alliance
 Dani Jordan, Director of Campaigns and Communities, Surfers Against Sewage
 Liz Webster, Founder, Save British Farming
 Richard Hebditch, Coordinator, Better Planning Coalition
 Professor Jeremy Biggs, Chief Executive, Freshwater Habitats Trust
 Nida Al-Fulaij, Chief Executive, People's Trust for Endangered Species
 Matt Larsen-Dew, Chief Executive, The Mammal Society
 Jason Reeves, Head of Policy, Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
 Nadia Shaikh and Jon Moses, co-director of the Right to Roam campaign
 Lizzie Glithero-West, Chief Executive, The Heritage Alliance
 Mary-Ann Ochota, Broadcaster and author, President CPRE the countryside charity and Patron, the Ridgeway Trail.
 Kate Jennings, Co-chair, IUCN-UK Protected Areas Working Group
 Neil Heseltine, Hill Top Farm and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority board member
 Howard Davies, Independent Environmental Advisor and member of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas
 Professor Kevin J. Gaston, Professor of Biodiversity and Conservation, University of Exeter
 Professor Michael Winter OBE, University of Exeter
 David Stroud MBE, Former Chair of Ramsar Convention Science Panel
 Dr Joseph J. Bailey, Senior Lecturer in Ecology & Conservation, Anglia Ruskin University
 Charlotte A Roberts, Emeritus Professor, Durham University
 Adrian Phillips, Formerly Director General of the Countryside Commission and Chair of the World Commission of Protected Areas (IUCN), vice-president of Campaign for National Parks.
 Chris Baines, vice-president, The Wildlife Trusts
 Lisa Norton, Senior Scientist, UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
 Professor Dame EJ Milner-Gulland, Tasso Leventis Professor of Biodiversity, Department of Biology, Oxford University

Professor Rosie Hails MBE, Nature & Science Director, National Trust and University of Exeter
 Professor Dave Goulson, Professor of Life Sciences, University of Sussex
 Jim Dixon, member of the Independent Review of Protected Landscapes
 Dr Elaine King, Chief Executive, Chilterns National Landscape
 Adam King, CEO, Harvey Maps
 Kerry Humphreys, Editor, Countryside Jobs Service
 Ance Bentjen, Corporate Officer, Unterwegs
 Jørge Bartling, Managing Director, Gear Aid Europe and Gear Aid UK
 Hannah Worthington, Legal and Managing Director, Astraia Collective
 David Ekelund, Co-founder and Co-CEO, Icebug AB
 Christian Schneidermeier, Director, European Outdoor Group
 Massimo Malavasi, Co-CEO, Aquapac
 Ricky Green, Director, Sealskinz
 Jo Dawson, Chief Executive, HDWool Ltd, H Dawson Wool and Woolkeepers Ltd
 Eddy Codega, Chief Executive, C.A.M.P.
 Sophie Mather, Director, Biov8tion
 Martin Esslinger, Chief Executive, OTLIEB
 Jake Tindall, Head of Marketing, RE ZRO®
 Mathew Wilkinson, Marketing Manager, Pyranha / P&H / Venture Canoes & Kayaks
 Paul Robertson, Marketing Manager, Palm Equipment
 Andrew Wyborn, Director, Hampton Court Paddle Sports
 Chris Brain, Chris Brain Kayak Coaching
 Sam Starkie, Director, Vertical Descents Cornwall
 Sara Jones, Centre Owner/Manager, Rhos y Gwalia Outdoor Education Centre
 Nick Liley, Centre Director, Bendrigg Trust
 Tom Beeston, Chief Officer, The Chiltern Society
 Laura Burrows, Chief Executive, Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust
 Estelle Bailey MBE, Chief Executive, Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust
 Brian Eversham, Chief Executive Officer, The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire
 Julian Woolford, Chief Executive, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
 Jason Reeves, Head of Policy, Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
 Paul Coulson, Chief Executive, Institute of Fisheries Management
 Kathy Wormald, Chief Executive, Froglife
 Nicola Hutchinson, Director of Conservation/Deputy Chief Executive, Plantlife
 David Fleetwood, Director of Land and Policy, John Muir Trust
 Nick Collinson, Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Partnership Chair
 Cllr Andrew Reid, Chair, Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee
 Cllr Chris McFarling, Chair, Wye Valley National Landscape Partnership
 Cllr Richard Jefferies, Chair, East Devon National Landscape Management Partnership
 Matthew Arnold, Trust Operations Manager, East Yorkshire Rivers Trust
 Stuart Fraser, Director, Leicester Outdoor Pursuits Centre
 Sarah Carr, Chief Executive, Nature Watch Foundation
 Claire Bass, Senior director of campaigns and public affairs, Humane World for Animals UK

Anna Hughes, Director, Flight Free UK
Hugh Warmington, Chair, Quantock Hills National Landscape Partnership
Tony Gent, Chief Executive, Amphibian & Reptile Conservation
Connie Duxbury, Chief Executive, Croydon Community Energy
Robin Stamp, Chair, Friends of the Quantocks
Chris Todd, Founder, Transport Action Network
Bridget McKenzie, Climate Museum UK
Cat Ainsworth, CEO, Protect Our Winters
Sue Sayer MBE, Seal Research Trust
Dom Ferris, Chief Executive, Trash Free Trails
Carrie Cort, Founder, Sussex Green Living
Patrick Norris, Footsteps in Northumberland
Steph Bleach, Outreach and Partnership Lead, Zero Carbon Guildford
Nigel Palmer, Chief Executive, Badger Trust
Nick Bruce-White, Chief Executive, Devon Wildlife Trust
Eleanor Monk, Project Leader, Green Arts Oxfordshire Network
Dr Sarah Eglington, group coordinator, Norwich Friends of the Earth
Hazel Draper, Co-founder, Wild Card
Karine Decorne, National Coordinator, Culture Declares Emergency
Eliot Line, Chief Executive, Norfolk Wildlife Trust
Rosie Pearson, Chairman, Community Planning Alliance
Matt Walpole, Chief Executive, Cornwall Wildlife Trust
Adam Murray, Director of Action for Nature, Somerset Wildlife Trust
Becca Clark, Director, Green Squirrel
Claire Moodie, Chief Executive, Earth Action North Devon
Jon Parkes-Withers, Public Affairs and Advocacy Lead, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
The Viscount Addison, Campaign for National Parks Vice-President
Janet Cochrane, Director, Ride Yorkshire
Graham Burns, Head of Centre, Lledr Outdoor Education Centre
Tim Taylor, Director, Patterdale Hall Residential Adventure Learning Centre
Jonathan Sullivan, Chair, Sussex Area Ramblers
Jo McDonald, Chair, Croyde Area Residents Association
Tom Burditt, Chief Executive, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Mersey
Jo Smith, Chief Executive, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
Debbie Tann, Chief Executive, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Jim Glover, Friends of the Wildbrooks
Steve Crowther, Chairman, Devon CPRE
Jamie Cayzer-Colvin - Chair, North Wessex Downs Landscape Trust
Christopher Musgrave - Chair, Marlborough Downs Nature Enhancement Farming Partnership
Jemma Batten - Founder, Black Sheep Countryside Management
Tony Pratt, Chair, Taw Torridge Estuary Forum
Tina Bath, Chair, Mendip Society
David Turner, Chairman, Mendip Hills National Landscape Partnership
Gillian Taylor, Secretary, Friends of Hollingbury & Burstead Woods
Suzy Russell, Network Coordinator, Community Supported Agriculture

Michael Shaw, Secretary, Association for Rural Marley
Cllr Bob Nelson, Chair, Blackdown Hills National Landscape Management Partnership
Alan Cooke, Secretary, Friends of Craven Wood
Dr Eirene Williams, Chair, North Devon Coast National Landscape Partnership
Paul Steedman, Director, CPRE Sussex
David Gaussen, Birmingham Friends of the Earth
Brian Bleese, Chief Executive, Dorset Wildlife Trust
Giles Watts, Chair, Dorset Climate Action Network
Jill Sutcliffe, Co-founder, Manhood and Wildlife Group
Paula Gardner, Chair, Stanmer Preservation Society
Liesje Birchenough, Chair, Coastwise North Devon
Phil Belden, Vice Chair, South Downs Network
Steve Randles, Head of Delivery, Brathay Trust
Tom Laws, Campaign Manager, Save Our Rivers
Cllr John Barrow, Chair, Dunkeswell Parish Council in Black Down Hills National Landscape
Laura Ward, Chair, EcoDewi
John Ward MBE, former Chair of the New Forest Association
Keith Howe, Senior Research Fellow, Centre for Rural Policy Research, Exter University (former Exmoor Society Vice Chair and board member of the New Forest Association)
Revd Dr Darrell Hannah, Chair, Operation Noah
David McDonald, Chair, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation
Linda Austin, Secretary, The Friends of St Ann's Well Gardens
Robert Cheesman, Secretary, CPRE Lewes District Branch
Ian Crawford, Chair, SERA South West
Richard Yates, Chief Executive, Essex Wildlife Trust
Tina Luxton, Chair, Georgeham Parish Community Land Trust
Margaret Feetham, Secretary, Sustainable Swaledale
Paul Johnson, Chair, Wildflower Conservation Society
Sophie Robinson, Land Use Plus Project Manager, Brighton and Hove Food Partnership
Linden Groves, Director, The Gardens Trust
Cllr Pete Bradbury, Chair, High Weald National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee
Pete Ward, Owner, The Real Adventure Company, Pembrokeshire
Richard Buxton, Partner, Richard Buxton Solicitors
David Williamson, Director, Derwent Water Marina
Jan Van Mossevelde, Global President, Smartwool and icebreaker
Peter Lefort, Chair, Cornwall National Landscape Partnership
Amy McDonnell, Co-Director, Zero Hour
Pamela Keeble, Trustee, The Amberley Society
Rachel Cockett, Chair, Shropshire Hills Landscape Trust
Jessica Townsend, co-founder, MP Watch
Magnus Gallie, Senior Planner, Friends of the Earth
Francis Sealey, Chair, Enfield Climate Action Forum
Sue Alderman, Chair, Hare Preservation Trust
Susan Milington, Coordinator, Newbury Friends of the Earth
Mariano Alonso, Vice President & General Manager, The North Face (EMEA)

