

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS OF ALDEBURGH TOWN COUNCIL AT OPEN FLOOR HEARINGS -25 AND 26 MARCH 2026

(NB This is a summary of contributions ATC was able to make to a hearing about a range of specialist environmental issues- it is not a list of all the objections which ATC has to the project.)

1. **Meeting.** ATC is grateful to the Inspectors for requiring the Applicant to meet it promptly. ATC had pointed out at the hearing that it had on 26 February 2026 invited the Applicant to meet them before the March hearings. The Applicant had not replied to decline the meeting until the evening before the March hearings. The purpose of meetings, the first of which took place on 1 April was to discuss commitments made by the Applicant to engage with communities including ATC.¹
2. **Project overall.** ATC's primary position is that the whole project is misconceived and should be refused permission. These submissions are made only against the unwelcome possibility of permission being granted.
3. **Town roads and roundabout.** ATC submits that no traffic should pass through Aldeburgh. The Applicant accepts that *During construction it is expected that HGV movements on the access road will be limited to less than 10 HGVs per day.*² . ATC pointed out that in the draft DCO and REAC there is no enforceable commitment to that effect. At the end of the hearing the Applicant accepted this, and that there should be a legally enforceable cap in place.
4. **Tourism Mitigation.** ATC submitted that the Applicant should abandon its absurd claim that the only aspect of Aldeburgh which required consideration was that within '500 m from Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary' thus taking into account the Scallop and the Red House (but not the other 98 per cent of the town a few metres away).

¹ [EN020026-002756-9.86 \(B\) Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadlines 3 and 3A \(Tracked Changes\).pdf](#) and [EN020026-002580-9.89 Applicant's Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 2.pdf](#)

² [EN020026-001611-6.2.2.10 \(B\) Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism \(Clean\).pdf](#)

5. A better description was that of SEAS; *The tourism economy of the Suffolk coast is closely tied to the distinctive qualities of the Aldeburgh area. Aldeburgh in particular combines an unspoilt coastal setting, historic townscape and internationally recognised arts culture centred on the Aldeburgh Festival and Snape Maltings. Visitors are drawn by the experience of tranquility, landscape character and cultural identity of the area rather than by conventional resort infrastructure.*³
6. ATC fully supports and commends to the Inspectors the proposal by SCC in its LIR, that *in collaboration with the Council, the Applicant should identify and characterise the tourism businesses within 2km of the red line boundary of the project. Likely impacts on these businesses should be identified and a package of mitigation measures developed. If accepted this would reduce the risk of any compensation being spread round the county rather than here where it matters.*⁴ This is particularly important given the uncertainties about what future local government in Suffolk will consist of.
7. **Landfall.** During the course of the Inquiry there has been further and very unexpected erosion at Thorpeness. As alarming as the erosion, is that not even the most eminent experts expected it to happen so fast. Given this new and additional uncertainty the Inspectors are urged to take a most cautious approach to all aspects of the landfall.
8. **Emergency Services.** Neither SCC nor the Applicant appear to have addressed a serious concern raised by Aldeburgh residents in Relevant Representations. Aldeburgh has an elderly permanent population and vulnerable visitors, especially children, in the summer. Aldeburgh Hospital does not take emergencies. The nearest A and E hospital is 24 miles away in Ipswich, compared with what seems a national average of just over 6 miles.⁵ A hold up on the A1094 can mean unnecessary death. Why, for example, does the Applicant not provide an additional helicopter for [East Anglian Air Ambulance - Saving lives across East Anglia?](#)

³ [EN020026-002979-6.SEAS D5 Rebuttal of REP4-236 Socio-Economics and Tourism - FINAL.pdf](#)

⁴ [EN020026-001238-SCC Sea Link Local Impact Report.pdf](#)

⁵ [Research reveals true picture of distances between home and urgent care | Nuffield Trust](#)

9. **Community Benefit.** The Applicant claims publicly *‘We welcome the Government’s guidance on community benefits, which supports our view that communities should be rewarded for hosting new transmission infrastructure’* (See-Frequently asked questions | National Grid)⁶. Yet the Applicant has, as yet, made no offer of any kind to Aldeburgh.

10. **ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION-VEHICLE STICKERS.** At its 1st April meeting with the Applicant ATC asked about the number of identification stickers to be used on vehicles, if the Scheme proceeded. The Applicant responded that unlike Sizewell and Scottish Power⁷, its vehicles would not carry stickers. This measure is crucial as the other companies recognise. Stickers provide visible monitoring and reassurance to the public. They deter drivers from using unpermitted routes. They are also an essential protection against sexual safeguarding risks. The projects will vastly increase the presence of men in vehicles and the obvious risks will be exacerbated if vehicles are unmarked. Please require the Applicant to observe the standards of other contractors and adopt vehicle stickers.

David Mackie. 6 April 2026

⁶ [Community benefits guidance for onshore wind in England \(accessible webpage\) - GOV.UK](#)

⁷ E.g. *Issue of SZC HGV & LGV numbered identification stickers – due to commence August 2024* [\[REDACTED\]](#)

If you observe an SPR-signed vehicle in your area not on these routes, please contact [REDACTED] sharing the unique identifier sticker, number plates, and type/make/model of vehicle wherever possible. [REDACTED]