<u>Suggestions</u> for you Relevant Representation (RR)

This Template is only a guide. Please use your own words rather than cut and paste or PINS may disregard your RR. Best to write your objections in a Word document, then cut and paste them into the online comments box when you register, so you will have a record of them.

Address your RR to: Dear Planning Inspectors,

Opening: Mention that you support offshore wind, and the offshore transmission network design principles of an INTEGRATED OFFSHORE GRID, using the North Sea as a corridor to take offshore wind power directly from where it is generated via subsea cables to pre-industrialised landfall sites, which are more suitable to become Energy Hubs and closer to where the power is needed e.g. London and the South East.

Why you are opposing: Mention you are extremely concerned by plans to locate the onshore infrastructure for National Grid's Sea Link transmission link in the Suffolk Coastal area, facilitating the industrialisation of the Suffolk Coast with the onshore infrastructure for multiple energy projects that could be taken offshore, closer to energy demand, connecting to the onshore grid at pre-industrialised sites; that if these other energy projects were taken to pre-industrialised sites more suited for developing energy hubs, Sea Link would not be needed to remove excess energy, with huge cost savings for consumers and avoiding untold negative impact on communities, the tourism economy and the environment, avoiding massive onshore infrastructure and miles of tunnelling and trenching; that it is impossible to look at National Grid's yet to be built substation (Friston), East Anglia Two and East Anglia One North, Sea Link, LionLink and Sizewell C energy projects as individual developments. The Cumulative impact of the onshore infrastructure for these projects would industrialise precious rural landscape with large swathes of farmland permanently affected by underground cabling, substations and convertor stations, turning The Heritage Coast of Suffolk into a massive Energy Hub, not for the benefit of Suffolk, but feeding power to London and the South East, and for exporting energy to the Netherlands, Belgium and France.

7 current energy projects due to impact the area: 1 & 2 Sizewell C (SZC) Twin reactors / 3 National Grid Substation at Friston for SZC / 3 & 4 SPR EA1N and EA2 Substations at Friston / 6 National Grid (NGET) Sea Link Converter stations at Saxmundham / 7 National Grid (NGV) LionLink Converter stations at Saxmundham

Choose issues below that concern you most and expand on them (please don't cut and paste) / Cumulative impact, Traffic and Alternative Sites should be in all submissions:

- Cumulative impact on local communities of up to 7 energy projects in a 5 mile radius occurring consecutively over 12 to 15 years (relevant to many/all of the objections and points here)
- There are alternative and better locations and sites for Energy Hubs than coastal countryside renowned for nature and tourism – all other North Sea choose major pre-industrialised sites, e.g. Zeebrugge and Rotterdam.
- Redundancy of Sea Link if energy is taken directly from where it is generated to pre-industrialised onshore sites closer to demand, saving consumers huge cost

- Traffic congestion/Gridlocked roads – road closures, increased traffic on roads, a danger to cyclists, visitors and residents / The local road network is unsuitable for high traffic levels and HGVs
- Delays to Emergency Services endangering lives
- Local economic decline - Impact on tourism. DMO report says traffic congestion and related issues would deter tourists from coming to the area
- Impact on businesses - Loss of trade, loss of visitor income, loss of jobs all leading to social and economic decline
- Unsuitability and fragility of North Warren for landing cables
- Loss of agricultural land at Wood Farm for converter station complexes the size of Wembley Stadium
- Converter Stations dangerously close to and dominating a market town already liable to flooding
- 15km of cable trenches, destroying environmentally sensitive areas
- Cable trenches and haul roads too close to residential homes.
- Long term damage to ecology and biodiversity impact
- Threat to wildlife and the important Leiston SSSI and Sandlings Heath
- Severing the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB causing problems to migrating species and wildlife corridors
- Destruction of hedgerows and trees
- Light pollution – loss of Suffolk's famous dark skies
- Noise pollution – loss of Suffolk's valued peace and tranquillity
- Air pollution - from traffic and trenches dug through Suffolk's light sandy soil which blows/runs away, causing visibility hazard and health issues
- Permanent and temporary closure of PRoWs (footpaths, bridleways, byways and cycle paths)
- Permanent destruction of landscape & heritage – flat peaceful landscape, views and silence replaced with industrial landscape during construction and beyond
- Serious impact on residents' wellbeing and mental health

THE ALTERNATIVES

The Government, NESO and Ofgem need to embrace modern technologies (Modular Offshore Hybrid Assets and Offshore Converter Stations) and the transmission network design principles of Integrated Offshore Grids as followed by all other leading European North Sea wind power countries, why this is not happening is beyond the comprehension of concerned communities and it is letting down consumers and future generations. These principles involve using pre-industrialised sites for Energy Hubs, and the transport of offshore wind energy using subsea HVDC cables closer to demand, pooling wind energy offshore where possible. These designs result in faster planning permissions, more flexible and reliable project execution, constraint cost savings, lower overall costs in the medium term and a more secure energy supply.

The new National Energy System Operator (NESO) needs to begin its spatial energy plan now not in 2027, with EA1N & EA2 going for example to the East Anglia Node, to ensure that future Energy Hubs for multiple energy projects are developed at suitable pre-industrialised sites. NESO could also begin Pilot projects, pooling offshore wind power and taking it closer to where it is needed, leading the way towards Britain's future Offshore Grid e.g. SPR's EA1N & EA2 and LionLink could pool energy offshore and goto a pre-industrialised site closer to demand, e.g. Grain, the East Anglia Node or Bradwell-on-Sea. These ideas would negate the need for Sea Link and save more than c.£1.8bn of tax payers' money.

Based on previous National Grid ESO's 2020 analysis significant offshore integration for the transmission network off the East Anglian coast could offer cost savings of more than £2bn in the medium term for East Anglia alone.

I urge you to take the very significant cumulative impact into account along with the superior alternative options for suitable energy hub locations, and best practice transmission network design principles being used by other North Sea countries, when making your decision, and to oppose Sea Link's onshore development plans.

Sign off with
your name, town and post code