

**Response of Walberswick Parish Council to the Sealink DCO  
at Deadline 7 Regarding REP6-004 (29 April 2026)**

**IP Number:** [REDACTED]

I am responding on behalf of Walberswick Parish Council as the Councillor delegated to deal with NSIP projects including Sealink. I am writing in response to ExA's recommended amendments to the applicant's dDCO submitted at deadline 6 [REP6-004].

We thank ExA for the comprehensive list of amendments. I have commented on a number of items of particular interest below. I would also like to draw ExA's attention to a particularly cynical submission by NGET (AS-167) which proposes that NGET 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 as its purpose (and outcome) would be to undo a great many of the dDCO changes that ExA inserted to strengthen the ability of local authorities to consider unresolved or changing project design issues. This undemocratic and pernicious proposal from NGET must be rejected.

Assuming ExA does not let AS-167 stand, we would like to particularly support the following amendments proposed by ExA. I have also included a proposed additional amendment.

**Art. 1:** Agree that it must be 56 days given the huge burden of NSIPs in this area.

**Art 6:** Firm local authority controls must be in place to limit harm/removal of trees. We have seen extraordinary damage caused by other NSIPs in the area and lessons learnt from this are that local authorities must have the ability to protect against developers and over-zealous contractors who find it quicker and easier to destroy everything in their path.

**Art 8.** We believe that it is critical that maximum limitations are on the developer in terms of Above Ground works as set out by ExA particularly given how little is currently known about the plans of NGET with regard to the converter station. Given that NGET's sister, NGV, will try to piggy-back on SeaLink should that project go ahead, it is doubly important that nothing be built without the approval of the local planning authority and with due consideration for its impact.

**Article 9.** We are supportive of ExA's amendments as we believe that the same principles set out by ExA in relation to the substation apply in the case of the converter station.

**Art.10.** Again, the same principles apply. However, we believe that a better solution in relation to the Bridge is to avoid this issue by mandating the northern route set out by SCC.

**Art 13.** As with Art 1, we agree with ExA and SCC that 28 days, not 7, is more appropriate. We note that NGET continues to make proposals as if SeaLink were the only NSIP in the area. If NGET pursues more projects here, then it must take responsibility for the delays that must be built into the project to allow proper scrutiny and response from local authorities

**Art. 15.** As noted in the Rule 17 letter, there are huge unresolved issues related to landscape and visual impact. Therefore, maximum controls must be on the developer in relation to Landscape and ecological management plans given how poorly prepared NGET is in this area.

**Art. 16.** This is a critical area and we are very supportive of ExA demands that NGET be prohibited from the egregious proposal for 365 days a year working. We believe, however, that ExA needs also to look at the 24-7 drilling associated with HDD particularly where this must last

for multiple days. If the impact on ecological or human receptors of this requirement cannot be mitigated, then different solutions must be found.

**Art 20.** As with working hours, NGET's attempt to avoid committing to meaningful noise restrictions are wholly unreasonable and show a contempt for the impact Sealink will have on local people and ecology. We welcome ExA's demand that NGET must, at least, respect the limits already set in the area by other projects. This is absolutely essential. If noise levels cannot be met, then this is further evidence that the project should not proceed in this location.

**Art. 21.** This is an important amendment and we are supportive of ExA in this regard. We believe that ExA may want to require other unresolved areas and key commitments to be incorporated into the DCO rather than the REAC given the need to ensure enforceability.

**Suggestion for an Additional ExA change to the dDCO. Converter Site: Better Access from the North**

We have commented at Deadline 6 in support of the submission of Suffolk County Council for the alternative access route to the Saxmundham Converter Station site. We would like to request that ExA require this change in the dDCO in order to help address the very substantive unresolved and/or unmitigated issues related to the Benhall Railway Bridge and the Bridge over the River Fromus.

*Cllr J. Bassinette, 29 April 2026 on behalf of Walberswick Parish Co*