

Deadline 7 Submission

Fiona Cramb [REDACTED]

Dear Inspectors

I want to say, as I have done in all my previous submissions, that I object in the strongest terms to this project. It is the wrong project in the wrong place and is now unnecessary. The needs case is based on out of date data. I endorse all the submissions made by Friston Parish Council and Suffolk Energy Action Solutions and therefore do not propose to repeat their submissions.

In my previous submissions, I have written at length about the impact of the successive projects planned to connect at the Friston (Kiln Lane ) substation are having not only on us but our community.

Today I want to give you an example as to how that is affecting us directly.

In your letter dated the 21st of April under para 3 Landscape and visual 3.2, you flag changes that have been made to the SPR Landscape mitigation plan and you refer to the planting to the south of High House Farm and say "it has changed from being Native Woodland and Tree planting to just tree planting". You have asked for clarification as to whether the proposed planting has been reduced and whether the visualisation for viewpoint 6A is still accurate. You also ask Sealink to clarify whether the accommodation of Lionlink cables would affect the proposed Landscape planting to the south west of High House Farm as the drawing is not clear.

We would like to know this too.

SPR had not notified us that the arrangements we thought were fully agreed and in place were under review.

During the latter half of 2025 we attended a number of consultations with SPR with other neighbours whose properties surround the substation site, to discuss and, as we understood, be involved in agreeing mitigation and design together with the timetable for phased planting . The "final" plans were submitted to the council for agreement and I mentioned in my last submission at the last deadline that Sealink had intervened to object to some of these arrangements, which I understand were rejected by the council.

Looking at the material that we received when discussing the mitigation on the southern side of our boundary, the final design presented by SPR at a November meeting and those presented to you by Sealink now make clear that the mitigation has been downgraded from Native Woodland to just a line of Tree Planting.

I have attached below three landscape design illustrations. The first was the plan that we had agreed with SPR for mitigation on our southern boundary, the second is the design shown at the final SPR meeting I was unable to attend, and the third is the design Sealink have submitted to this planning enquiry. The second is not very clear but the third shows only “tree planting”

After I was shown your letter, I contacted the community team at SPR to clarify whether the arrangements that we understood had been agreed were now being varied.

This was the response I received:

“Below is what is in the public domain about Sea Link (and Lionlink) and the interaction with the EA1N/2 landscape design:

An EA1N/EA2 landscape masterplan has been prepared on the basis of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) submitted and certified as part of the examination process for the EA1N and EA2 DCOs. The masterplan has been refined as part of detailed design in key areas, site visits post consent, further modelling of views, and landowner engagement. The landscaping masterplan was discharged, under Requirements 14 and 15 of the EA1N/EA2 DCOs, in late February 2026.

It is anticipated that the EA1N/EA2 landscape masterplan will be amended where the Sea Link or Lionlink cables come through (under requirement 40 of the EA2/EA1N DCOs). SPR has been working with both Sea Link and Lionlink on revised mitigation plans that address the effects of their cables on our discharged landscape masterplan. SPR’s engagement with NGET and NGV to-date indicates that the cables for Sea Link and Lionlink could affect limited sections of trees to the north east and north west, with changes primarily relating to the species of vegetation that can be planted over the cables and how planting in these areas is phased.

The aim is to develop a Coordinated Landscape Masterplan to ensure that the impact of the Sea Link and LionLink cable routes is minimised and the intended mitigation is maintained. Based on our knowledge, and engagement with NGET and NGV, it is considered that the functionality of our landscape framework can be maintained. SPR will work with the other parties to ensure local landowners are effectively engaged on the Coordinated Landscape Masterplan.

SPR is currently working with Sea Link and Lionlink on finalising the Coordinated Landscape Masterplan and will be in touch in the coming months to discuss the landscape changes with you”

To find that, having been invited to participate in the consultation process to agree these plans, changes are now being made without any proper recourse to us and to be told that once SPR, Sea Link and Lionlink have finalised the Coordinated Landscape Masterplan SPR “will be in touch in the coming months to discuss the landscape changes with you” is unacceptable and very disappointing.

Obviously, this is all of deep concern to us particularly given construction is now underway of the SPR substations and the National Grid substation. The disruption and noise is already significant and we are still without any of the promised screening along our southern boundary.

The other point that I want to make is that while Sealink is intervening to alter already agreed mitigation there is no Sealink proposal for mitigating the effects of the proposed Sealink and Lionlink cable routes and accompanying disruption at the western side of our garden along the public footpath where currently we have a post and rail fence and farm hedge inter-dispersed with deciduous oak trees.

The reality of this is that despite all the meetings that we attended and despite all the discussions that we have had, we are still at the mercy of more projects planned to connect at Friston. We are absolutely in the eye of this storm and SPR and National Grid have little care for the impact that it is having on us. We are at least surely entitled to the mitigation that was agreed to.

And finally, I would like to object, again, in the strongest terms to the last-minute attempt by National grid (AS167) to alter their draft DCO by seeking to move post consent discharge of the DCO's requirements to an as yet unestablished DESNZ body. This will have the effect of further reducing checks and balances to the developer's plans by sidelining Suffolk local authorities.

We are already in a situation where any decision made by you can be overruled by the Secretary of State at DESNZ. So if a body established under the auspices of DESNZ has jurisdiction over the discharge of DCO requirements we will be in an even worse situation with no independent recourse to challenge decisions made which are currently the responsibility of local authorities. This seems profoundly unfair and undemocratic.

We have already seen the effect of this when as I described earlier Sealink attempted to challenge aspects of the SPR's "final" Landscape plans when being examined by the local authorities. It seems though that they are still able to make alterations through discussions with other developers, but not with those of us directly concerned.

I will look forward to an urgent response to the points made above.

Yours sincerely

Fiona Cramb

Landscape designs

Agreed SPR planting

SPR master plan - east anglia TWO public information day- 26th February 2026, Friston Village Hall.

Sealink REP4-086 Appendix D