



By email to: SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The Sea Link Examining Authority
The Planning Inspectorate
QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough SL1 4PN

Date: 13 April, 2026
Your ref: Sea Link EN020026
Our ref: [REDACTED]

Dear Sarah Holmes and the Examining Authority Team,

RE: Deadline 6 – SEAS responses to Applicants D5 responses, ISH3, Action Points and ExQ3

1. Introduction

Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) wishes to place on record its profound disappointment that, despite the passage of this examination and the volume of detailed submissions made by local authorities, parish councils, expert groups and residents, **many of the most fundamental issues raised at the outset remain unresolved or insufficiently addressed by National Grid.**

Across these hearings, a consistent and deeply concerning picture has emerged. Participants from both Kent and Suffolk have articulated, with clarity and evidence, a series of interrelated risks: the cumulative burden of multiple major infrastructure projects on a single locality; the unsuitability of proposed sites, particularly in relation to marshland conditions and flood risk; the inadequacy of traffic and access proposals; and the potentially severe impacts on landscape, tourism, biodiversity and community wellbeing.

What is striking is not simply the number of these concerns, but their **consistency across different locations and stakeholder groups**, and the extent to which they remain live issues at this stage of the examination.

SEAS is particularly concerned that:

- **Cumulative impacts** continue to be treated in a fragmented way, without a convincing assessment of the real-world combined effects of concurrent major developments in East Suffolk and beyond;
- **Need** - SEAS contends that the need for Sea Link is overstated, not robustly evidenced, and can be met more economically through alternative network solutions.
- **Alternatives**, including materially different access routes and site strategies, do not appear to have been robustly or transparently evaluated against the current proposals;
- **Traffic and construction impacts** - especially on junction modelling, narrow rural roads - remain inadequately resolved, despite credible alternative solutions being put forward by statutory bodies;
- **Noise and vibration impacts**, particularly during prolonged construction phases and night-time operations, have not been satisfactorily assessed or mitigated, giving rise to significant concern regarding disturbance to nearby residents and the longer-term effects on health and wellbeing;
- And critically, there remains a **perceived gap between the Applicant's assessments and the lived experience of affected communities**, particularly in relation to health, wellbeing and the cumulative stress of prolonged, overlapping construction activity.

SEAS also notes a broader concern regarding **engagement and responsiveness**. Many contributors have highlighted the difficulty of navigating the process and a sense that their evidence—whether technical or experiential—has not been meaningfully reflected in the evolution of the scheme.

At this stage in the examination, the expectation must be that the Applicant demonstrates not only compliance with minimum policy requirements, but that it has **actively and transparently responded to the substantive concerns raised**. On the evidence before us, that threshold has not yet been met.

In conclusion, SEAS considers that the current proposals still give rise to **significant and unresolved questions** in relation to cumulative impact, site suitability, environmental risk, and community harm. These are not minor or peripheral matters;

they go to the heart of whether this scheme can be considered acceptable in planning terms.

We therefore submit further evidence for Deadline 6 as follows:

1. SEAS D6 - NEED on D5, ISH3, Action Points & ExQ3
2. SEAS D6 - TRAFFIC on D5 ISH3, Action Points and ExQ3
3. SEAS D6 - NOISE on D5, ISH3, Action Points & ExQ3- v1
4. SEAS D6 - LANDSCAPE/HERITAGE
5. SEAS D6 - TOURISM on D5, ISH3, Action Points & ExQ3
6. SEAS D6 - ECOLOGY on D5, ISH3, Action Points & ExQ3
7. SEAS D6 - CUMULATIVE IMPACT on D5, ISH3, Action Points & ExQ3
8. SEAS D6 - Counter Response to Applicants D5 Cover Letter [REP5-001](#)

Taken together, these submissions demonstrate that key elements of the proposed development remain insufficiently justified, inadequately assessed, or unresolved. In SEAS's view, these are material issues that go to the core requirements of the relevant National Policy Statements and the Planning Act 2008.

SEAS therefore asks the Examining Authority to consider carefully whether the Applicant has demonstrated that adverse impacts can be made acceptable, particularly in relation to cumulative effects, site suitability, and community impacts. Where this has not been established, these concerns should carry significant weight in the planning balance.

On the evidence currently available, SEAS maintains that the case for development consent has not yet been made.

Yours sincerely



Suffolk Energy Action Solutions Ltd

AI Disclosure & Responsibility Statement: This submission is human-authored and human-verified. In preparing its evidence, SEAS in some instances utilises AI tools (ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Co-Pilot) for the summarisation of Examination Library documents and for organisational assistance. SEAS maintains full responsibility for the factual accuracy of this content