

FRISTON PARISH COUNCIL



NATIONAL GRID ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION - SEA LINK PROJECT

FRISTON PARISH COUNCIL - IP NO [REDACTED] & SASES - IP [REDACTED]

Date: 29 April 2026

DEADLINE 7 - INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE EXA UNDER RULE 17

Findings of the Examining Authorities for the EA2, EA1N and National Grid Connection Hub

“28.4.4 The local harm that the ExA has identified is substantial and should not be underestimated in effect. Its mitigation has in certain key respects been found to be only just sufficient on balance.” (emphasis added)

“28.4.5the ExA observes that the effects of the cumulative delivery of the proposed development with 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” (emphasis added)

1. This document is Friston Parish Council's and SASES's (together referred to as FPC below) combined response.
2. For ease FPC has used the term “National Grid substation” even though that infrastructure is a hub or node (as acknowledged by NESO in its TEC register) and NGV in their Lionlink PEIR - page 10 of Non-Technical Summary.
3. References to EA2 means both EA2 and EA1N unless the context otherwise requires.
4. Information is provided by reference to the paragraph numbers in the Rule 17 letter dated 21 April 2026.

1. The Development Consent Order

1.1 Article 10 – FPC strongly endorses SCC's concerns with regard to Article 10 and in particular that

“Article 10 does not become a mechanism to sidestep the controls of the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 (SI 2022/432) and the East Anglia TWO Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 (SI 2022/433)”

National Grid clearly wishes to do that given the way it is seeking to apply the inferior terms of the draft Sealink DCO to the substations site at Friston.

FPC is concerned that the use of the word “materially” in paragraph 4(a) will in practice create uncertainty and a debate as to what “materially” means. It is inevitable that what SCC, ESC and FPC consider material will be different from what National Grid considers to be material. The use of the word “materially” brings with it similar issues to the word “substantially” which the ExA has quite rightly sought to remove from the DCO with regard to compliance with plans. Accordingly the word “materially” should be deleted.

1.6 Requirement 15 – FPC welcomes the ExA’s consideration of changes to this requirement. It goes to the heart of one of FPC’s key concerns. It should be remembered that National Grid’s initial reasoning during the consultation process for the inclusion of an additional consent for the substations site, was if neither of the SPR projects went ahead. This is not National Grid’s motivation. It wants to have ownership and control of the entirety of the substations site (given it is a strategic connection point for a multiplicity of projects) with the exception of the footprints of the EA2 and EA1N substations. Arguably that of itself is not objectionable had National Grid been transparent as to its motivations. What is objectionable is using this as a means to resile from the existing mitigation and requirements at the substations site.

10. Health and well-being

10.2 Health and well-being monitoring – FPC refers to its Deadline 6 submission (REP6-164) at section 5. Using a radius addresses the issues which National Grid has raised. The mitigation which National Grid has suggested (community liaison etc) will not provide real evidence as to the existence and scale of the problem. National Grid clearly understands the need for such evidence given its written response to the mental health and well-being issues raised in OFH3 (REP6-114). In its response on page 15 it states:

“Nor has any robust evidence being presented by interested parties that would suggest that Sealink alone or in combination with other projects would result in significant adverse effects”

This is precisely why such monitoring is necessary. Interested parties in Suffolk know how they feel and they know how their neighbours feel. They have lived with the prospect of multiple offshore (i.e. not SZC) projects connecting at Friston for eight years now and have had to go through multiple consultations and three application and examination processes so far, with the prospect of Lionlink and more to come. Why should they have to bear the burden of seeking “robust evidence” when they lack sufficient resources to do so given all the other environmental impacts which need to be addressed? Most of FPC’s limited resources have had to be spent on seeking to maintain the mitigation which it already has under the Scottish Power DCOs.

National Grid on page 14 of the same document describes Sealink as a “*predominantly an undersea and underground cable*”. This is an extraordinary statement. Sealink requires major infrastructure onshore in two separate and sensitive rural locations.

Further National Grid is trying to rely on the smaller size of the projects at Friston and Saxmundham relative to SZC. Admittedly SZC is a significantly larger project but it is destined to be the largest infrastructure project in Europe. Leaving SZC to one side there is no doubt that Sealink, EA2, EA1N and the other projects proposed to connect to Friston are major

infrastructure projects with very significant environmental impacts and with a combined capital expenditure running into tens of billions of pounds.

END