

**Response of Walberswick Parish Council to the Sealink DCO  
at Deadline 7 (29 April 2026)**

**IP Number:** [REDACTED]

I am responding on behalf of Walberswick Parish Council as the Councillor delegated to deal with NSIP projects in our area including Sealink.

I am writing in response to two issues: (i) a highly contentious late submission from NGET (AS-167) and (ii) comment on the Rule 17 letter. I have submitted under a separate item comment on ExA's recommended amendments to the applicant's dDCO submitted at deadline 6 [REP6-004].

**AS-167 Proposal for change in Approval authority.** We would like to object, in the strongest terms, to the proposal by NGET that it have the option of seeking authorisations from a non-existent and untested "central DESNZ unit" rather than from the appropriate local authority. We would like to ask ExA to reject this proposal in full. Suggesting such a fundamental change at the last moment appears to be a cynical and wholly inappropriate attempt by NGET to undermine democratic and established practices designed to protect and give a voice to local communities who are already at a huge disadvantage to NSIP developers. If NGET wanted such an unconventional and undemocratic approach, this would have had to been suggested at the earliest opportunity in the DCO process so that appropriate consultation, comment and scrutiny could be undertaken. In addition, one can also see how improper this proposal is when one considers the many changes put forward by ExA at Deadline 6 to the dDCO which specifically address the need to strengthen the ability of local authorities to consider unresolved or changing project design issues during project construction. NGET's proposal would directly hollow out any local accountability, leaving it with a free hand to proceed in any way that it feels is to its benefit. If NGET can remove local oversight, it would be incentivised to leave unresolved as many design and construction issues as possible during the Examination process so it can more easily proceed as it wishes after approval is given. What AS-167 seems to be after is making it easier to dump the negative externalities of their project on local people, the environment, and the health and well-being of the communities whilst NG reaps the profits. We ask that this pernicious proposal be refused.

Rule 17 Letter

We are dismayed that there are so many critical issues that remain unresolved so late in the process. We believe that the applicant has failed to be proactive in responding to areas of major concern with the DCO and that this inability/unwillingness demonstrates the poor quality of the DCO, the inappropriate rush for project approval and the major flaws in the entire SeaLink concept.

We are particularly concerned with the following 3 items raised in the Letter:

**Item 3. Landscape and Visual.** We believe that NGET has been unable/unwilling to address the very serious and outstanding concerns related to the landscape and the visual impacts of the permanent infrastructure. To me, this indicates that the impact of the converter stations in Saxmundham cannot be mitigated and that SeaLink (and Lionlink) are being proposed for an wholly inappropriate location. We believe that no consent should be considered until there is a more satisfactory resolution. If no resolution is possible, then we believe the project must be rejected. This is particularly important given that the Needs case for SeaLink is unproved.

**Item 4.2**      Lighting for the HDD Compound The issues related to lighting at the HDD compound remain unresolved despite their considerable impact on nearby ecology. It is shocking that the assessment of lighting on European sites has not been satisfactorily undertaken and therefore no assurance on the avoidance of disturbance effects on the Sandlings SPA can be given. We believe that it is not possible for HDD to be undertaken in such close proximity to sensitive ecological sites. NGET's failure to assess and mitigate these obvious impacts indicate the project's inappropriateness.

**Item 16.**      Cumulative Impacts. We note that there are significant differences and unresolved issues on cumulative impacts. We are dismayed that NGET continues to deny the significance of the cumulative impacts of SeaLink in an area already under siege by other NSIPs. We believe that this issue is particularly serious given that NGET, and its sister organisation NGV, are planning to bring Lionlink along in the same area. We support ExA in its requests for further information but we feel that the very fact of such substantial differences and lack of information this late in the process is an indicator that the cumulative impacts are too extreme for this project to go forward.

██████████, 29 April 2026 on behalf of Walberswick Parish Co