

GUIDANCE ON HOW TO RESPOND TO SEA LINK'S FEEDBACK FORM

It is important that those who make future decisions are aware of our rejection of current plans. To respond to the Sea Link consultation you can either complete the [Feedback Form](#) or write/email Sea Link at contact@sealink.nationalgrid.com. Please don't respond immediately, but try to visit Sea Link's drop-in events (Saxmundham 24-25 Nov) beforehand, then make your choice. The deadline for submissions is 18 December 2023, so plenty of time to respond

HELP TO WRITE YOUR EMAIL/LETTER and who to copy.

SEAS have found it very effective in the past to write/email rather than fill in the questionnaire. Guidance on this will be available in the form of a template letter. Watch for information in the SEAS newsletters and on the SEAS website www.suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk/sea-link-interconnector/

FILLING OUT THE FORM

Should you wish to fill out the form, here are some suggestions on answering Sea Link's questions. For each question you can select a multiple-choice answer and then complete a box free form. **We would like you to use your own words and only provide the main points below that you may like to consider as a starting point. We also suggest you attend the drop-in events and ask questions before you complete your feedback. Deadline to respond is 18 December 2023**

Q1. Do you support the principle of reinforcing the network in this location? This means do you support the principle of Sea Link with new convertor station, cable runs and landfall with the undersea cable to Kent rather than reinforcing the network to transmit energy from where it is generated to homes and businesses where it is needed (Yes/No/Unsure).
Suggested answer: *No. The project would not be needed if there was an offshore hub with convertor station and cable to the South East/Kent. If the network does not have the capacity to transmit from the proposed substation, why come ashore to begin with. Use brown field sites nearer to where the energy is needed.*

Q2. What do you think about how our proposals have evolved? Do you think this is an improvement on what we presented previously? They previously suggested a range of options for convertor sites, cable runs and 5 x landfalls along the coast but they were all here in East Suffolk (convertor stations can only be a maximum of 5km from the substation) and would impact our lives, our environment/wildlife unnecessarily (Changes are positive/broadly positive/neither positive or negative/are negative).
Suggested answer: *The changes are negative. Previous feedback requested use of brown field sites or an offshore solution, this wasn't incorporated. National Grid has ignored concerns at all stages of previous consultation. The options are not improvement they will devastate our local natural environmental and the tourism economy.*

Q3. What do you think about our proposal to connect into the existing network via proposed Friston substation? (It's the best location/have no preference/not the best location to connect into the existing network)
Suggested answer: *Not the best location - Sea Link proves Friston (which has two outstanding Judicial Reviews) is not the best location to connect, because there is no capacity to transmit from here to where the energy is needed. It is a rural hamlet, without the road infrastructure needed to build a substation, in an area subject to flooding. The choice of Friston for the substation also means the associated infrastructure is in green field, areas of AONB and SSSI. Totally the wrong place. There are brownfield alternatives which are far less damaging.*

Q4. What do you think about our proposed HVAC cable route in Suffolk? (Best route/agree with some elements disagree with others/no preference/disagree with proposed cable route)
Suggested answer: *Disagree. A High voltage alternating current (HVAC) underground cable of approximately 1.7km in length between the proposed Friston substation and the proposed Converter station (near Saxmundham) would not be needed if the power could be transmitted via the existing network. The connection to the network should be elsewhere or from windfarms to an offshore network. This cable is taking the power away from Friston back out to sea to South-East/London. Why bring it ashore to begin with to a new proposed substation at Friston?*

Q5. What do you think about our proposed converter station, including the proposed location? (It is in the right location/no preference/it is not in the right location)
Suggested answer: *It is not the right location. The converter station would not be needed if alternative solutions are developed. The location is not suitable for this scale of industrialisation and the road network would not sustain the construction. It is of concern that you suggest that up to three converter stations could be built at the same location!*

Q.6 What design approach would you like to see explored for the converter station? (options include a green roof, what colour, what shape for the buildings)
Suggested answer: *This question presumes the converter station will be built. It should not be, it can never be landscaped or designed to blend into the area which is not industrial.*

Q.7 What do you think about our proposed HVDC cable route in Suffolk?

(Best route/agree with some elements disagree with others/no preference/disagree with the proposed cable route)

Suggested answer: *Disagree with route. A high voltage direct current cable connection of approx. 10km in length between the proposed converter station near Saxmundham and a transition joint bay approximately 900m inshore from a landfall point is not needed if other solutions were developed. There will need to be haul roads, workers compounds/parking, areas for spoil and equipment access to dig the trench across rural, farm land with residential properties in an area of tranquillity, dark skies and important habitats. This will negatively affect wildlife, the environment, people's lives and our tourism economy. The joint bay has been located immediately adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and North Warren RSPB reserve which should be protected from development.*

Q.8 What do you think about our proposed landfall between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness?

(Best location for landfall/no preference/not the best location)

Suggested answer: *This is not the best location. This is totally unacceptable in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, SSSI, part of the North Warren RSPB nature reserve and internationally important for our tourism economy, enjoyed by everyone for their mental and physical health and well-being. This option has been discounted by other developers. It is of great concern that you claim that up to three projects could use this area for landfall.*

Q.9 Our proposals include the option of co-locating infrastructure with that of up to two other projects. If they are required. Do you support this approach?

(I support co-location/no preference/do not support co-location)

Suggested answer: *Do not support co-location. Co-location is not coordination, as infrastructure remains separate. It will not reduce the main infrastructure footprint, only minor elements such as worker compounds if projects are co-located into the same area. More infrastructure in one place will increase the harmful impact even more, even if it is done at the same time. If the project were co-located to the same brownfield site or to an offshore hub and grid I would support co-location in principle.*

Q.10 Anything else you would like us to take into consideration when developing our proposals in Suffolk?

Suggested answer: *Yes, you need to present the complete picture of energy projects in this area, not just isolated projects*

Q.11 Do you have any comments or issues you would like us to take into consideration regarding our marine proposals

Suggested answer: *The unique Suffolk Coralline Crag protects against coastal erosion. So, how will you avoid breaching the Coralline Crag protecting Aldeburgh without altering the tidal flow of the sea?*

Q.12 to Q.17 Our proposals for Kent - there is no need to answer these questions

Q.18 Do you have any key concerns regarding the construction stage of Sea Link? (see [feedback form](#)).

Suggested answer: *Yes, I have many concerns regarding the construction of Sea Link which will cause disruption and destruction. But the bigger picture is worse, the cumulative impact will stretch over a wide area and a long timescale*

Q.19 Do you have comments about how we could deliver environmental mitigation and enhancement (such as hedgerow creation, native tree planting or funding wildlife groups) as part of our proposals. (see the [Preliminary Environmental Information Report](#) (PEIR)).

Suggested answer: *These would not be required if you listened to our feedback. Many credible alternative proposals have been made, but we see little evidence of these being properly assessed. National Grid's response is generally to dismiss them out of hand "too difficult", "too expensive", "offshore shipping lanes", "offshore breeding grounds". Most of these "constraints" have subsequently been overcome by other energy projects – hypocrisy!*

Q.20 Anything else?

Suggested answer: *The failure to present this project alongside all the other energy projects hitting the Suffolk Heritage Coast is appalling. The cumulative impact of half a dozen projects similar to Sea Link arriving in the Sizewell area at the same time as Sizewell C construction is enormous. Not only will this blight the lives of residents for decades, but it will seriously damage the visitor-based economy resulting in significant and measurable net job losses. The area has boomed since the end of the Cold War, these proposals will take us backward and risk creating isolated coastal "left behind" communities the Government is trying to address.*

There have been no Government or industry assessments of the total picture in this area, showing the cumulative impacts of multiple projects. This in itself is a significant abrogation of duty at best, or deliberate obfuscation at worst. The piecemeal presentation of individual projects puts an onerous responsibility on individuals to stay informed, attend events and provide feedback repeatedly over the last 5 years. This is likely to continue for more years. Not only is it unfair and unreasonable, it is inefficient and ineffective as the total picture is hard to discern

Q.21 to Q.26 These questions are about the consultation process – we suggest you answer if you wish

Q.27 to Q.30 These questions are to establish the demographic of respondents – we suggest you answer if you wish