



## **SEAS DEADLINE 7**

### **SUMMARY of OUTSTANDING and UNRESOLVED ISSUES**

**PINS Ref:** EN020026

**SEAS IP:** [REDACTED]

**DEADLINE 7:** 29 APRIL 2026

**Date:** 29 APRIL 2026

This document sets out Suffolk Energy Action Solutions' (SEAS') summary of matters previously raised during the Examination which remain unresolved at the close of Examination.

The summary issues identified below should be read alongside SEAS' previous written representations and submissions, upon which SEAS continues to rely, including SEAS' Deadline 7 submissions submitted on 29 April 2026.

No	Topic	Outstanding Issue	Relevant SEAS Submissions
1	Need	<p>Need case robustness: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the specific network constraints relied upon in the Need Case require the proposed development in its current form, nor that the identified deficits cannot be addressed through less harmful and more proportionate alternatives.</p> <p>Shifting basis of the Need Case: The Applicant's Need Case has materially changed during the Examination, including the reduction of the claimed Sizewell Generation Group deficit from approximately 2,000MW to 352MW, without a corresponding reassessment of whether the proposed 2GW HVDC project remains proportionate or justified.</p>	<p><a href="#">REP6-256A</a> <a href="#">REP5-206</a> <a href="#">REP5-147</a> <a href="#">REP4-238</a> <a href="#">REP4-156</a> <a href="#">REP3-144</a> <a href="#">REP3-125</a> <a href="#">REP2-112</a> <a href="#">REP1-281</a> <a href="#">RR-5210</a></p>

Reliance on outdated assumptions: The Applicant has continued to rely on modelling assumptions and transmission scenarios which included Nautilus, despite Nautilus having been removed from the relevant connection assumptions prior to submission of the Application.

Residual Sizewell deficit: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the residual 352MW Sizewell Generation Group deficit represents a present or near-term operational requirement, given that the scenario depends upon multiple contingencies including LionLink, Sizewell C operation and extended operation of Sizewell B.

LionLink dependency: The Applicant has not demonstrated that LionLink must connect at Friston, nor assessed the implications for the claimed Need Case if LionLink were coordinated through alternative connection arrangements.

Locational need: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the claimed locational need at Sizewell remains valid following the reduction in the underlying transmission deficit and changes to assumed generation and interconnector connections.

EC5 boundary modelling: The Applicant has not resolved concerns regarding the EC5 boundary calculations, including the treatment of Nautilus and omission of known network reinforcements and consented upgrades from post-fault transfer capability calculations.

LE1 boundary modelling: The Applicant has not resolved concerns regarding the LE1 boundary calculations, including omission of planned reinforcement capacity and continued reliance on assumptions associated with Nautilus.

SC2 compliance: The Applicant has not demonstrated that Sea Link would itself fully resolve the forecast SC2 transfer deficit or achieve NETS SQSS compliance without further reinforcement works.

Alternatives assessment: The Applicant has not demonstrated why lower-cost and lower-impact reinforcement alternatives identified by SEAS would not adequately address the identified transmission requirements and boundary constraints.

Economic and efficient design: The Applicant has not demonstrated that a 2GW HVDC reinforcement remains an “efficient and economical” solution to the residual deficits now relied upon in the Need Case.

Proportionality of the proposed development: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the scale of the proposed development is proportionate to the residual transmission requirements now identified.

Clean Power 2030 reliance: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the Clean Power 2030 Report or Clean Power 2030 Action Plan establish that Sea Link is “critical” or required for the connection of Five Estuaries or Rampion Extension offshore wind projects.

Consistency with recent DCO decision-making: The Applicant has not explained the inconsistency between its reliance on Clean Power 2030 to justify Sea Link and the absence of any corresponding reliance on Sea Link within the Five Estuaries and Rampion Extension DCO recommendation reports and Secretary of State decisions.

Reliance on Early Construction Funding: The Applicant has not demonstrated that Ofgem’s grant of Early Construction Funding constitutes evidence of project

		<p>need, urgency or policy compliance, particularly given Ofgem’s express statement that ECF does not predetermine the DCO process.</p> <p>Boundary contribution claims: The Applicant has not quantified or evidenced the extent to which Sea Link is specifically required to resolve the EC5 and LE1 boundary constraints, as distinct from contributing generally to wider network reinforcement.</p> <p>Network strategy justification: The Applicant has not demonstrated why the claimed network benefits could not be achieved through coordinated conventional reinforcement works already planned or consented elsewhere on the network.</p> <p>Cost transparency: The Applicant has not responded substantively to SEAS’ evidence regarding the likely increase in project cost arising from changes to the project and wider market conditions, nor updated the economic assessment accordingly.</p> <p>Deliverability and timing: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development is required within the timescales claimed, given the timing and contingency of the residual deficits now relied upon.</p>	
2	Traffic & Transport	<p>Junction modelling: Detailed junction modelling for Suffolk remained outstanding for most of the Examination and, although limited modelling was eventually produced at Deadline 6, the scope remains restricted and fundamental concerns regarding methodology, baseline data and conclusions remain unresolved.</p> <p>Scope of junction modelling: The Applicant has continued to limit detailed junction modelling to a small subset of junctions despite a wider range of junctions being identified by Suffolk County Council and SEAS/PJA as requiring assessment. Eleven of the fourteen junctions identified by SCC remain unmodelled in detail.</p>	<p><a href="#">REP6-256B</a>  <a href="#">REP5-150</a>  <a href="#">REP4-159</a>  <a href="#">REP3-138</a>  <a href="#">REP2-120</a>  <a href="#">REP1-276</a>  <a href="#">RR-5210</a></p>

Existing junction performance and sensitivity: The Applicant has not adequately assessed the existing operational performance and sensitivity of affected junctions. Reliance continues to be placed on relative percentage traffic increases rather than understanding the absolute operational consequences of additional traffic at already constrained or over-capacity junctions.

Non-neutral baseline traffic surveys: Fundamental concerns remain unresolved regarding the use of January and February baseline survey data, which do not reflect neutral or peak seasonal traffic conditions and risk materially understating traffic impacts. The Applicant's subsequent "sensitivity test" does not resolve this issue and instead appears to confirm that materially higher baseline traffic conditions should have been used.

Seasonal tourism traffic: The Applicant has not robustly assessed peak seasonal traffic conditions associated with tourism activity, despite evidence that seasonal adjustment data exists and despite concerns raised through ISH3 and Action Point 24.

Peak spreading assumptions: The Applicant's modelling relies heavily on assumptions that construction traffic can be displaced outside network peak periods through CTMP controls, with approximately 90% of Sea Link trips assumed to occur outside wider network peak hours. The realism, enforceability and robustness of these assumptions remain unresolved.

Enforceability of traffic controls: Caps and controls on HGV and worker traffic movements remain dependent on outline management plans and are not secured through robust enforceable mechanisms within the DCO framework.

Cumulative traffic impacts: The Applicant has not explicitly modelled cumulative traffic impacts across the wider Suffolk highway network and continues largely to rely on percentage flow increases to discount further assessment.

Cumulative traffic assessment methodology: The Applicant's cumulative traffic assessment continues largely to identify changes in traffic flows rather than undertaking detailed modelling and operational assessment of cumulative impacts across the wider Suffolk highway network.

Journey time analysis: The Applicant has not undertaken journey time analysis for the affected highway network, despite this being discussed through ISH3 and associated Action Points.

A12/B1121 modelling reliability: Significant concerns remain regarding the reliability of base traffic flows used in the modelling for the A12/B1121 junction, with modelled peak-hour flows appearing materially inconsistent with Suffolk County Council ATC data and observed A12 traffic volumes.

A1094/B1069 severe congestion impacts: The Applicant's own modelling indicates severe congestion, queueing and delay at the A1094/B1069 junction under cumulative scenarios, including queue lengths exceeding 150 vehicles and delays of approximately 25 minutes, increasing further under sensitivity testing. Despite this, no physical mitigation has been secured and the Applicant continues primarily to rely on assumptions regarding traffic management and trip staggering.

Need for physical mitigation: Despite modelling outputs indicating severe operational impacts at key junctions, the Applicant has not demonstrated that appropriate physical mitigation measures have been identified, assessed, secured or deliverable.

Reliance on outline management plans: Key aspects of traffic mitigation and operational control remain dependent on outline plans and future refinement rather than fixed mitigation assessed and secured at the point of decision.

Absence of robust evidence base: The Applicant has not provided sufficient

		<p>evidence or assessment to exclude the potential for significant adverse traffic and transport effects, including cumulative effects. Significant uncertainty therefore remains in relation to likely impacts. In these circumstances, a precautionary approach should therefore be applied and the potential for significant adverse traffic and transport effects cannot be excluded.</p> <p>Benhall Railway Bridge feasibility and routing assumptions: Significant uncertainty remains regarding the feasibility of the Applicant's preferred Benhall Railway Bridge access strategy, including unresolved structural uncertainty, untested mitigation measures, programme risk and potential environmental impacts. If the route proves unfeasible, traffic may be displaced onto alternative routes which have not been adequately assessed.</p>	
3	Noise & Vibration	<p>Operational noise controls: Although the ExA has proposed operational noise requirements within the dDCO, the proposed drafting does not fully secure assessment and control of cumulative tonal noise effects arising from multiple operational sources, including the potential for constructive interference effects in exceptionally low background noise environments. SEAS maintains that the more specific drafting proposed by its acoustic expert, Mr Rupert Thornely-Taylor, should be incorporated for clarity, robustness and enforceability.</p> <p>Cumulative operational noise assessment: The proposed operational noise requirements do not explicitly secure assessment and control of cumulative operational noise from multiple developments operating together.</p> <p>Tonal noise and constructive interference: The risk of tonal noise and constructive interference effects between multiple operational noise sources remains insufficiently resolved, particularly in relation to exceptionally low background noise levels and the potential interaction of tonal transformer sources.</p> <p>Low frequency noise: Although the ExA has proposed additional controls relating to dBC/dBA differentials, uncertainty remains regarding whether low frequency</p>	<p><a href="#">REP6-256C</a>  <a href="#">REP4-157</a>  <a href="#">REP2-122</a>  <a href="#">RR-5210</a></p>

operational noise effects have been properly characterised and assessed.

Methodology for low frequency noise assessment: The Applicant's assessment methodology did not address the issue identified by SEAS regarding the significance of the dBC-dBA differential as an indicator of low frequency noise requiring further investigation.

Background noise characterisation: Significant uncertainty remains regarding assessment of operational noise in an area with exceptionally low background noise levels, where small methodological differences may materially affect conclusions.

Reliance on BS4142 interpretation: The proposed controls continue to rely heavily on BS4142 methodology despite acknowledged scope for differing professional interpretation in areas with exceptionally low ambient noise conditions.

Construction noise mitigation practicability: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the assumed 10dB construction noise mitigation reduction is practicable in all cases or capable of ensuring that significant adverse effects will be avoided.

Reliance on Best Practicable Means: Construction noise mitigation continues to rely on "Best Practicable Means", meaning that if mitigation proves impracticable, the predicted reductions may not be achieved and significant effects may occur.

Lack of detailed construction mitigation assessment: The Applicant has not undertaken a sufficiently detailed assessment of construction mitigation measures to demonstrate that significant construction noise effects can in practice be avoided.

Reliance on post-consent refinement: Important operational and construction noise controls remain dependent on future detailed assessment, detailed design,

		<p>contractor-led refinement and post-consent approval processes rather than fixed mitigation secured at the point of decision.</p> <p>Absence of robust evidence base: Significant uncertainty remains regarding the potential for adverse operational and construction noise effects, including tonal, low-frequency and cumulative effects, within this exceptionally quiet environment.</p>	
4	Landscape, Visual and Heritage	<p>SEAS remains concerned that the Applicant has not provided a reliable or complete basis on which the impacts of the scheme can be properly understood. Across landscape, visual and heritage matters, there is a consistent pattern of understatement of harm, reliance on optimistic mitigation, and key gaps in the evidence.</p> <p>A central issue is that there is still no fixed or credible design for the converter station buildings. The Applicant’s own response confirms that what has been assessed is based on a “typical” or generic solution, with important aspects of layout, scale and appearance left to be resolved after consent. For a development of this size and sensitivity, so close to Saxmundham, its residential edges and its historic setting, that level of uncertainty is not acceptable. Without a defined design, it is simply not possible to understand what is actually being proposed, or to judge whether the impacts can be made acceptable.</p> <p>The same problem arises with the River Fromus bridge. There are still no realistic visualisations or final design details showing how this structure would sit within the valley. Given its proximity to Hurts Hall and its role within a highly sensitive landscape and heritage setting, this absence of information is striking. It leaves a clear gap in the evidence and prevents a proper understanding of the scale of change that would occur.</p> <p>More broadly, the assessments continue to rely heavily on planting and long-term mitigation to reduce impacts. However, the scale and industrial character of the development mean that these measures cannot realistically address the harm,</p>	<p><a href="#">REP6-256D</a>  <a href="#">REP4-240</a>  <a href="#">REP3-141</a>  <a href="#">REP3-137</a>  <a href="#">REP2-116</a>  <a href="#">REP2-114</a>  <a href="#">REP1-274</a>  <a href="#">REP1-272</a>  <a href="#">RR-5210</a></p>

particularly in an open landscape where structures of this height will remain visible. Even the Applicant's own material accepts that significant adverse effects would remain from key viewpoints.

There is also a continuing failure to properly assess cumulative effects. The approach taken risks treating each new piece of infrastructure as part of a new baseline, rather than recognising the combined effect of multiple large-scale projects on the same landscape and historic setting. The result is that the true extent of change, both visual and experiential is not being captured.

Taken together, these issues point to a scheme that has not been resolved through a landscape-led or heritage-led design process, and where the evidence presented does not provide a clear or reliable picture of the impacts. The Examination is therefore being asked to consider a proposal where key elements remain undefined and where the full extent of harm has not been properly assessed.

The Applicant has not provided a sufficiently robust, detailed or reliable evidence base to enable a lawful and policy-compliant assessment of landscape, visual and cultural heritage effects. The absence of a fixed or credible design for the converter station, together with the lack of adequate visualisations for the River Fromus bridge, creates fundamental uncertainty as to the true scale, massing and impact of the proposed development. The LVIA and heritage assessments are further undermined by methodological flaws, understatement of harm, and a failure to assess cumulative effects in a coherent and realistic manner. As a result, the Proposed Development would give rise to major adverse, permanent and irreversible harm to landscape character, the National Landscape and the setting of designated heritage assets, without clear and convincing justification. In these circumstances, and applying the relevant provisions of EN-1, EN-5 and the NPPF, the Examining Authority cannot be satisfied that the impacts have been properly understood or that harm has been avoided or minimised, and development consent should therefore be refused.

5	Socio-Economic, Recreation and Tourism	<p>Tourism assessment: No updated, location-specific or behaviourally informed tourism assessment has been provided. The Applicant still relies on the original Environmental Statement assessment rather than revising it in light of SEAS submissions, ExQ3 or the Rule 17 request for further information.</p> <p>Visitor behaviour and tourism demand: No visitor behaviour, attitudinal, destination-sensitivity or tourism demand analysis has been undertaken. In the absence of such evidence, it is not possible to conclude that tourism demand will remain unaffected or that effects will be negligible.</p> <p>Accommodation and workforce effects: No secured accommodation strategy has been provided within the DCO or supporting documents. The Applicant continues to rely on outline plans and reactive monitoring rather than secured controls.</p> <p>Accommodation affordability and displacement: The Applicant has not assessed accommodation affordability, displacement into the private rental sector, or impacts on tourism-dependent businesses arising from workforce accommodation demand.</p> <p>Inter-project cumulative tourism effects: No cumulative tourism assessment has been provided addressing concurrent construction activity across multiple NSIPs, peak overlap scenarios, or combined effects on the same tourism economy.</p> <p>Intra-project cumulative effects (tourism and traffic interaction): The Applicant has not assessed how congestion, journey reliability or network performance may influence visitor behaviour, destination choice or tourism demand. Intra-project cumulative effects arising from the interaction between tourism and traffic conditions therefore remain unassessed.</p> <p>Mitigation hierarchy: The Applicant continues to rely on the mitigation hierarchy but has not demonstrated how residual tourism impacts have been avoided,</p>	<a href="#">REP6-256E</a> <a href="#">REP5-149</a> <a href="#">REP4-158</a> <a href="#">REP3-139</a> <a href="#">REP2-123</a> <a href="#">REP1-280</a> <a href="#">RR-5210</a>
---	----------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

reduced or mitigated.

Secured mitigation: Mitigation remains process-based and unsecured, relying on outline plans, REAC commitments and post-consent approvals rather than defined tourism-related outcomes secured through the DCO.

Tourism monitoring framework: No robust tourism monitoring framework has been secured. There are no defined tourism indicators, baseline datasets, trigger mechanisms or secured response measures linked to tourism impacts.

Reliance on monitoring instead of mitigation: Monitoring and liaison are relied upon in place of mitigation and do not prevent impacts or resolve uncertainty prior to construction.

Core working hours: Key construction-impact parameters remain unsettled at the close of Examination, including proposed revisions to core construction working hours relevant to tourism receptors, disturbance and amenity, to ensure coordination with other NSIP projects, in order to give programmed respite to local residents and visitors.

Outline plans and post-consent refinement: Key tourism-related controls remain dependent on outline plans and post-consent refinement by contractors rather than fixed mitigation assessed at the point of decision.

Absence of robust evidence base: The Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence or assessment to exclude the potential for significant adverse tourism and socio-economic effects, including cumulative effects. Significant uncertainty therefore remains in relation to likely impacts. In these circumstances, a precautionary approach should be applied and significant adverse tourism and socio-economic effects cannot be excluded.

6	Ecology and Biodiversity	<p>The ecological evidence base continues to remain incomplete, with major gaps in surveys for bats, marsh harrier, nightjar, reptiles, and invertebrates. Key methods such as bat radio-tracking and nightjar acoustic surveys have not been used, and some sites lack basic habitat data. This undermines confidence in the baseline and impact assessments.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has not been properly followed, with the Applicant moving too quickly to mitigation rather than prioritising avoidance and reduction. The Kiln Lane substation and potential barbastelle bat roost is a key example of this failure. This weakens compliance with policy and justification for Critical National Priority status.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment is not robust enough to rule out adverse effects on European sites beyond reasonable scientific doubt. There are gaps in data, particularly on functionally linked land, and insufficient consideration of alternatives. As a result, legal requirements have not yet been met.</p> <p>There is significant uncertainty regarding impacts on the Outer Thames Estuary SPA, especially for red-throated diver. Emergency cable repair scenarios lack evidence, assessment, and mitigation planning. Without this, significant adverse effects on site integrity cannot be excluded, the derogation tests will need to be met, and a derogation notice submitted.</p> <p>Mitigation and habitat creation plans lack sufficient detail and contingency. For example, there is no clear fallback if acid grassland creation fails, and limited evidence that proposed locations are suitable. This raises doubts about deliverability.</p> <p>There are concerns about habitat assessments and biodiversity evaluation methods. Some habitat classifications are unclear or non-standard, and bat</p>	<a href="#">REP6-256F</a> <a href="#">REP5-146</a> <a href="#">REP4-154</a> <a href="#">REP2-115</a> <a href="#">REP1-273</a> <a href="#">RR-5210</a>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>assemblage importance may have been incorrectly downgraded. This affects the reliability of conclusions.</p> <p>Site-specific issues and cumulative effects remain inadequately assessed. Locations like Pegwell Bay lack sufficient baseline data, and in-combination impacts on European sites are only superficially addressed. This leaves overall impacts uncertain.</p> <p>Time constraints pose a procedural risk, with limited opportunity to resolve fundamental evidence gaps before the Examination closes. Decisions may therefore be made on an incomplete basis. Overall, compliance with policy and legal tests has not yet been demonstrated.</p>	
7	Mental Health & Well-being	<p>Cumulative mental health and well-being effects: The Applicant continues to assess Sea Link largely in isolation and has not adequately assessed cumulative mental health and well-being effects arising from the concentration, duration and overlap of multiple NSIPs in East Suffolk.</p> <p>Treatment of qualitative evidence: The Applicant has not adequately considered qualitative evidence and lived experience evidence presented by local authorities and communities regarding cumulative psychological and well-being effects.</p> <p>Human health cumulative assessment: The Applicant has not demonstrated that cumulative human health and well-being impacts have been adequately assessed in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and EN-1, including consideration of qualitative evidence relating to community well-being and lived experience. In the absence of such assessment, uncertainty remains regarding the potential effects of prolonged and overlapping infrastructure impacts on affected communities, including matters relevant to private and family life (including Article 8 rights under the Human Rights Act 1998).</p>	<p><a href="#">REP4-155</a>  <a href="#">REP2-124</a>  <a href="#">REP1-279</a>  <a href="#">RR-5210</a></p>

		Precautionary approach: In the absence of robust assessment of cumulative mental health and well-being effects, significant adverse effects cannot be excluded.	
8	Cumulative Impact	<p>Integrated cumulative assessment: The Applicant continues to assess cumulative effects within individual environmental topics and has not provided a single integrated cumulative assessment across receptors, geography and time.</p> <p>Unified cumulative baseline: No unified cumulative baseline has been provided for the assessment of cumulative effects across the Proposed Development and other projects.</p> <p>Consistent cumulative project list: The Applicant has not applied a single consistent cumulative project list across environmental topics, resulting in fragmented cumulative assessment.</p> <p>Integrated receptor assessment: The Application does not assess how cumulative effects combine across receptors, including the interaction of transport, socio-economic, tourism, landscape and other effects.</p> <p>Coherent cumulative scenario: No single cumulative scenario has been defined against which impacts and mitigation can be consistently assessed.</p> <p>Worst-case overlap scenarios: The cumulative assessment relies on assumed overlap scenarios without demonstrating that they represent realistic worst-case conditions.</p> <p>Seasonal and tourism peak assessment: The cumulative assessment does not adequately test seasonal variation, tourism peaks or overlapping construction activity during peak visitor periods.</p>	<a href="#">REP6-256G</a> <a href="#">REP5-148</a> <a href="#">REP4-153</a> <a href="#">REP3-140</a> <a href="#">REP2-125</a> <a href="#">REP1-278</a> <a href="#">AS-038</a>

Sequential and overlapping construction effects: The Applicant has not robustly assessed sequential and overlapping construction phases across multiple projects over time.

Cumulative traffic sensitivity testing: Sensitivity testing of cumulative traffic impacts remains unresolved, including impacts on the A12 and wider road network.

Integrated inter-project and intra-project assessment: Inter-project and intra-project cumulative effects continue to be assessed separately, without a single framework assessing their combined effects on receptors.

Combined receptor effects: The Applicant has not assessed the combined effect of inter-project and intra-project cumulative impacts on individual receptors and communities.

Cumulative tourism assessment: No inter-project cumulative assessment of tourism impacts has been provided.

Cumulative socio-economic mitigation: Cumulative mitigation measures relating to socio-economic and tourism effects remain unresolved and not fully agreed with relevant authorities.

Cumulative mitigation framework: The Applicant continues to rely on outline plans, the REAC and post-consent processes rather than a secured and assessed cumulative mitigation framework.

Assessment of mitigation against cumulative baseline: Proposed mitigation measures have not been assessed against a coherent cumulative baseline.

Reliance on future agreement: Significant elements of cumulative mitigation remain dependent on future agreement, coordination and implementation after consent.

Coordination between projects: The effectiveness of cumulative mitigation continues to depend on coordination between multiple projects without a secured integrated mechanism for delivery.

Monitoring and control mechanisms: Uncertainty remains regarding the effectiveness of cumulative monitoring and control mechanisms.

Late changes to DCO control regime: The Applicant's late proposed amendment to the dDCO (AS-167) would introduce a materially different and unexamined approval regime for the discharge of Requirements, including undertaker discretion regarding the authority responsible for that function.

Cumulative application of mitigation hierarchy: It has not been demonstrated that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, or can be effectively applied, in a cumulative context.

Cumulative coastal processes: The interaction of multiple HDD landfalls, cable installations and other coastal interventions has not been assessed as a cumulative coastal process over the lifetime of the project.

Climate-informed coastal baseline: The Applicant has not demonstrated that the coastal erosion baseline used in the assessment remains valid in light of changing coastal conditions and erosion rates.

Cable exposure risk: The implications of cumulative coastal change for potential cable exposure and long-term mitigation effectiveness remain unresolved.

SEAS' position remains that the issues identified above have not been resolved during the Examination and continue to give rise to substantial uncertainty regarding the likely effects of the Proposed Development.

SEAS therefore maintains that these unresolved matters should be given material weight in the Examining Authority's recommendation and the Secretary of State's decision-making.