

53 Church Street
Orford
Woodbridge
Suffolk
IP12 2NT

29 April 2026

Sea Link Examining Authority
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Sirs

Approaching the final Sea Link examination deadline, the following headlines have not been addressed following previous representations.

1. Changing or revoking a development consent order for nationally significant infrastructure (Planning Act 2008)

As recorded in my Relevant Representation last year, I attended a Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) public consultation in Orford for the EA1N and EA2 wind farm projects in July 2018. When I questioned the additional landfall north of Aldeburgh I was told by the SPR representative it was because the EA1 Bawdsey-Bramford route breached EU competition laws and the treasury insisted on changes, despite the Referendum vote in 2016 to leave the EU.

Having spent the last year going through the changes since the EA1 Offshore Wind Farm Order 2014, SPR's response to my question was a disingenuous excuse for **material** changes which were accepted in the Corrections and Amendments Order 2016. It is now clear the changes were done for commercial reasons rather than regulatory intervention regarding competition law. The Corrections and Amendments Order 2016 was for material changes which should have resulted in the 2014 Order being revoked. If the EA1 Order 2014 had been revoked, it is likely that the transmission connection to the Grid at Friston, now known as the Kiln Lane substation, would not have permission.

The impact of the above means that the sum of all the environmental impact assessments to date, starting from the Corrections and Amendments Order 2016, have not been correctly assessed by successive Examining Authorities.

2. NGET's obligations under the Electricity Act 1989

The design of NGET's Sea Link project cannot be described as "*efficient, coordinated and economical*". Nor does Sea Link's location "*have regard for the preservation of amenity*" to protect the natural beauty of the setting of the S&EC&H. Likewise, Sea Link onshoring at Thorpeness is in an area of high-level nature conservation designations and the fragile and moving East Anglian coastline. Sea Link will harm the settings of multiple listed buildings near

to the proposed converter substation which will dominate the skyline both looking into and looking outwards from the S&EC&H. It will permanently change the rural landscape character of Sternfield and Saxmundham. Nothing can mitigate the environmental impact caused by the scale of the intrusive converter substation. The anticipated 10% net gain in biodiversity is questionable given the heat transmitted by underground cables and vegetation restrictions along each cable's 30m wide corridor. The converter substations will not conserve and enhance the S&EC&H or its setting.

3. NGET's Visual Impact Provision (VIP) Report, 2014

In October 2014, four months after the EA1 Order 2014, NGET published a Visual Impact Provision report, a landscape and visual impact assessment to inform decision making as to which parts of National Grid's electricity infrastructure have the worst impact on AONBs and National Parks in England and Wales. The VIP project's stakeholder advisory group needed a methodology which assessed all the locations against a standard set of criteria. The report identified pylons originating from Sizewell Power Station in the ANOB on the coast and exiting the S&EC&H, past the settlements of Knodishall, Friston and Gromford. It seems likely this report led to NGET and ESO downsizing the EA1 Order 2014 and was processed by SPR lawyers as **non-material** changes in the 2016 Order, despite conflicting with NGET's environmental and heritage obligations.

4. National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949,

Sea Link's converter substation in the setting of S&EC&H will threaten all ANOB National Landscapes resulting in significant renewables infrastructure being seen across sensitive landscape designations. This will destroy the scenic beauty of iconic landscapes protected since the 1949 Act. Such a change will be a serious backward step economically, environmentally and socially. It is incomprehensible why NGET considers Saxmundham and Sternfield as a suitable location for Sea Link's converter substation, particularly as it hasn't maximized the converter capacity originally consented in the EA1 Order 2014.

Finally, NGET's secretive CION agreements are a considerable threat to economic, environment and social assets. This needs to be addressed by Ofgem urgently. The threat leaves elected representatives and the communities affected by the renewables infrastructure inadequately protected and exposed to collective and individual harm unequal to NGET and SPR's operating methods and the NSIP process. If the above Sea Link grievances are not adequately addressed, this Sea Link DCO application should be refused.

Yours faithfully

Susan Bridges