

My name is Glynis Robertson and I am a resident of Aldeburgh.

Over the past three years, I have followed this project closely, and I wish to register a clear, calm, and reasoned objection to the proposal. However, maintaining that position is becoming increasingly difficult for me—and for many others—when National Grid continues to [REDACTED] the robust, transparent, and policy-compliant evidence required to substantiate its case.

While I support the transition to net zero, the Sea Link proposal is poorly planned, misleadingly presented, and places an unfair and excessive burden on Suffolk communities.

I share widespread concerns that the application was premature and supported by insufficient evidence to justify the examination of a Development Consent Order. In particular, the Applicant has failed to produce a [REDACTED] cumulative impact assessment, despite clear requirements under the EIA Regulations, National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-5, and established good practice.

The failure to properly assess cumulative effects is fundamental. Suffolk is not facing a single project, but a concentration of multiple major infrastructure schemes—offshore wind connections, substations, converters, grid reinforcements, and other NSIPs—many of which are co-located or sequential. Yet these have not been meaningfully assessed together. The result is a significant underestimation of the true scale, duration, and intensity of impacts.

This is not an abstract concern. The reality for residents is one of overlapping construction periods, prolonged disruption, and what has been described as a “generational” timescale of impact. Even where individual impacts might appear acceptable in isolation, their combined and continuous effect is not.

NGET has not adequately demonstrated how it will protect the Suffolk Coast and Heaths National Landscape, nor how it will meet its statutory duties under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. The cumulative industrialisation of the landscape—through multiple substations, pylons, access routes, and associated infrastructure—has not been properly assessed and risks fundamentally altering its character.

The ecological evidence underpinning the proposal is also weak. Baseline survey data is incomplete, and the cumulative ecological assessment excludes or underplays the combined effects of multiple projects on habitats, species, and ecological networks. This includes potential fragmentation, repeated disturbance, and long-term degradation, none of which have been robustly quantified.

There are also serious concerns regarding transport impacts. Evidence suggests that traffic assessments underestimate peak HGV movements and fail to account for the cumulative effects of multiple concurrent projects, as well as other planned developments and roadworks. This risks masking the true burden on rural roads that are already unsuitable for sustained heavy use.

In addition, there has been no meaningful assessment of the cumulative impact on tourism and the local economy. The Applicant has failed to establish a proper baseline or undertake quantitative analysis, despite the clear dependence of the area on its natural landscape and heritage. This landscape, designated as a Heritage Coast in the 1970s, has taken over 50 years to develop into one of the UK's most valued National Landscapes. It risks being significantly damaged within a decade, with recovery taking far longer—if it is possible at all.

There is also a growing and justified concern about the impact on health and mental wellbeing being overlooked. The prolonged uncertainty, stress, and cumulative burden of multiple large-scale developments are already affecting members of the community, yet these effects have not been properly assessed or acknowledged.

Crucially, there has been no meaningful, joined-up strategic planning that considers the totality of these impacts. Alternatives that could reduce cumulative harm—such as offshore coordination, alternative routing, or different connection strategies—have not been properly or transparently evaluated.

Plus, there is a fundamental issue of fairness. Suffolk communities are being asked to shoulder a disproportionate share of nationally significant infrastructure, with limited corresponding local benefit. The balance between national need and local impact is not just strained—it is inequitable.

Finally, the Sea Link needs case seems to have fallen away, which NGET continually deny. I support SEAS, ESC and SCC in their 'needs' submissions which I hope the ExA will seriously consider, especially if there are cheaper alternatives.

With only a few weeks remaining in the examination period, I urge the Examining Authority to require National Grid to provide clear, robust, and policy-compliant evidence addressing these outstanding concerns. Failing that, I ask that these unresolved and fundamental deficiencies are fully and transparently reflected in your report to the Secretary of State.

Thank you.

Glynis Robertson

IP Ref: [REDACTED]  
13 April 2026