

SEAS– GUIDANCE FOR RESPONDING TO THE LIONLINK STATUTORY CONSULTATION
We suggest you email your responses and NOT use the NGV questionnaire.

Deadline: 10 March 2026

Email: info@lionlink.nationalgrid.com

Subject line: Response to LionLink Statutory Consultation

Bcc:-info@suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk (SEAS)

This guidance is intended to help you submit an informed and effective objection to LionLink. You should make clear that you support offshore wind and the transition to renewable energy, but object to the outdated and damaging radial, point-to-point connection model currently being imposed along the Suffolk Coast. This piecemeal approach is unnecessary when a coordinated offshore grid solution exists — one that is more strategic, less environmentally destructive, and ultimately more cost-effective and efficient to deliver. For further background on offshore solutions see:- [The Better Infrastructure Solution for Offshore Wind](#)

Landfall and associated infrastructure should be directed to appropriate brownfield industrial locations such as Bradwell or Grain, rather than imposed on ancient coastal landscapes and historic Saxon and Anglian towns and villages. The current strategy creates avoidable cumulative harm, repeatedly industrialising the same fragile and protected stretch of coast and countryside.

We advise supporters not to complete NGV's consultation questionnaire because it forces people to choose between NGV's preferred options- for example the Eastern vs Western and Northern vs Southern cable corridors, which are divide-and-conquer tactics designed to pit communities against each other and distract from the fundamental objection to the entire LionLink project.

YOUR INTRODUCTION

In your introduction, briefly state:

- Who you are (resident, visitor, business owner, or concerned supporter).
- Your connection to the Suffolk Coast, Walberswick, Saxmundham, Friston or the surrounding area.
- That you are responding by email because NGV's questionnaire is structured in a way that limits or constrains objections.
- Clearly and unequivocally: **YOU OBJECT TO THE ENTIRE LIONLINK PROJECT.**

You may then wish to draw on one or two of the topic areas below. A small number of well-chosen, clearly expressed points can be very powerful — especially where you speak from personal knowledge or lived experience.

This guidance is not exhaustive. You do not need to be overly formal, but you should remain respectful and avoid abusive or inflammatory language.

PLEASE USE YOUR OWN WORDS and do not simply copy and paste, as authentic individual responses carry far greater weight than copied text.

1. NATIONAL GRID VENTURES (NGV) & THE CASE AGAINST LIONLINK

Why the “needs case” for LionLink is weak, outdated, commercially driven, and cannot justify the harm.

National Grid Ventures (NGV) is the competitive, non-regulated commercial division of National Grid plc.

LionLink is being promoted on the basis of a “needs case” that does not withstand scrutiny. NGV continues to assert that LionLink (like SeaLink) is “critical” or “essential”.

NGV has not demonstrated that LionLink is necessary, justified, or the lowest-impact option.

Key Points:

- NGV has not demonstrated that LionLink must come ashore in Suffolk, nor that Suffolk is the only or best option; key alternatives have not been properly assessed.
- There has been no assessment of brownfield or industrial sites, no consideration of co-location with existing energy infrastructure, and no meaningful assessment of offshore alternatives despite UK policy increasingly favouring offshore solutions.
- NGV has provided no clear explanation for rejecting alternatives such as the Isle of Grain, where Nautilus was relocated.
- There has been no whole-system analysis as required by the Green Book, and NGV has not shown that LionLink represents the lowest-impact or most efficient option.
- As a result, the case for LionLink is incomplete and is being advanced without the evidence required under EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. THE LANDFALL SITE - WALBERSWICK

Why Walberswick, and Manor Field in particular is an entirely unacceptable location for LionLink's landfall. Walberswick is one of the most sensitive, protected and valued landscapes on the Suffolk coast. It is a village defined by tranquillity, dark skies, nature-based recreation, and internationally important habitats. NGV's proposal to construct a major industrial landfall at Manor Field is fundamentally incompatible with this setting. Supporters should make clear that they reject the choice of Walberswick as a landfall site and reject Manor Field. Further information can be found at www.WALL-update.org

Key Points:

- Walberswick is an inappropriate landfall location due to its highly protected coastline (SSSI, SPA, Ramsar), erosion-prone and hydrologically fragile environment, and sensitive coastal habitats.
- The proposed landfall threatens fragile coastal environments and has not been adequately justified.
- NGV has not assessed alternative landfall locations or considered an offshore-to-offshore connection option.
- Walberswick has one of the oldest populations in England, which has not been properly considered in the landfall assessment. Physical and Mental Health will be greatly impacted during LionLink's intended 24hr HDD Drilling and 7 day working plan.
- The village is served by a single access road, creating emergency access risks.
- Manor Field, the proposed site, is surrounded by residential properties on three sides, increasing local impact concerns.

3. TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT

Why the road network from Walberswick to Saxmundham, Friston and beyond the A12 cannot support LionLink. LionLink's construction traffic would affect not just Walberswick, but the entire transport corridor from the coast to the A12. NGV has provided no traffic modelling, no cumulative assessment with Sea Link and other NSIPS, and no analysis of the risks to residents, emergency access, or the local economy. The transport case is fundamentally incomplete.

Key Points:

- The local road network is already constrained and unsuitable for HGV construction traffic, including existing congestion and pinch points on the A12 and narrow rural lanes around Walberswick, Benhall, Sternfield, Friston and Saxmundham.
- The Benhall railway bridge bottleneck and the cumulative impact of using the proposed access road have not been robustly assessed.
- NGV has not provided traffic modelling or assessed impacts on the A12, B1122, B1121, B1387 or surrounding rural lanes.
- Construction traffic would create safety risks on roads not designed for HGVs, and emergency access arrangements have not been assessed.
- The project overlaps with other major schemes — Sizewell C, Sea Link, EA2 & EA1N, Helios Solar Farm and Essex & Suffolk Water NSIP — yet cumulative traffic impacts have not been properly evaluated.
- The lack of modelling, reliance on single access roads, risks to residents and emergency services, and impacts on tourism make the transport case unworkable and prevent meaningful consultation.

4. NOISE, VIBRATION, DUST & LIGHT

Why LionLink's construction impacts are unacceptable for Walberswick, Saxmundham, Friston and the surrounding area.

NGV has not provided meaningful assessments of noise, vibration, dust or lighting impacts. The proposed construction intensity - including 24-hour HDD drilling, is incompatible with quiet rural communities, sensitive habitats, and the dark-sky character of the Suffolk coast.

Key Points:

- LionLink would cause multi-year construction noise, vibration from trenching and HDD drilling, dust and air pollution, and 24/7 lighting at construction compounds.
- Operational noise ("hum") from the converter station and substations has not been adequately modelled or assessed.
- Construction dust, vibration, noise and lighting impacts are missing or insufficiently addressed in the consultation materials.
- NGV has not demonstrated that noise, vibration, dust or lighting impacts can be managed safely or acceptably.
- No cumulative assessment has been provided alongside Sea Link, EA2/EA1N or Sizewell C, particularly for noise and lighting impacts.

- The combination of 24-hour drilling, 12-hour/7day working weeks, sensitive habitats, dark skies and nearby homes make the proposed construction fundamentally incompatible with Walberswick, Saxmundham, Benhall and Sternfield, Friston and the surrounding area.

5. FOOTPATHS & PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (PROW)

Why LionLink threatens the footpaths, access routes and recreational landscape that define Walberswick and the wider area.

Walberswick, Southwold, Dunwich and the Blyth Valley are defined by their network of footpaths, bridleways and quiet lanes. These routes are essential for daily life, tourism, recreation, and access to internationally protected habitats. NGV's Draft Order Limits include multiple PROW and quiet lanes, with no clear justification, assessment or mitigation.

Key Points

- LionLink would close or divert public footpaths, reducing access to the countryside and harming recreational use.
- Walkers, cyclists and local tourism would be disrupted, with no adequate assessment of these impacts by NGV.
- The project would cause long-term visual and noise intrusion in valued landscapes used for recreation.
- LionLink would duplicate the impacts of the Sea Link project without providing effective mitigation or alternative routes.
- Rights of way and recreational access impacts have not been properly assessed or addressed in the consultation materials.

6. SAXMUNDHAM CONVERTER STATION SITE

Why Saxmundham is the wrong location for the Converter Station.

Key Points:

- The proposed converter station would consist of two buildings over 26 metres high, with a footprint comparable to a large warehouse complex, which would industrialise the rural landscape around Saxmundham.
- This scale and height are completely out of character with the surrounding low-lying, agricultural countryside and have not been properly presented or assessed.
- The site is close to residential homes and has access constraints from the A12, raising concerns about suitability and safety.
- Saxmundham is a growing town with around 800 new homes planned, and locating two converter stations (LionLink and Sea Link) here is incompatible with local development and poorly justified.
- NGV has not demonstrated that this rural greenfield site is the lowest-impact or most strategic option and has failed to properly assess brownfield or industrial alternatives.
- The cumulative visual impact of two converter stations (Sea Link and LionLink) in the same sensitive location has not been adequately assessed.
- Overall, this is a sensitive and inappropriate location for infrastructure of this scale, and the proposal remains unjustified.

7. ECOLOGY & BIODIVERSITY

Why LionLink poses unacceptable risks to internationally protected habitats and species.

Walberswick, the Blyth Estuary and the surrounding landscape form one of the most important ecological areas in the UK. The landfall sits beside SSSI, SPA and Ramsar designations, with species and habitats protected under UK law and international conventions. NGV has not provided the assessments required to demonstrate that impacts can be avoided or mitigated.

Key Points:

- LionLink threatens protected habitats, hedgerows and wildlife corridors, as well as designated sites near Walberswick, with species potentially affected by noise, light and habitat fragmentation both along the coast and inland.
- The proposed cable route would remove important landscape features such as hedgerows and disturb established wildlife corridors, risking harm to sensitive habitats and protected species.
- NGV has not provided the ecological surveys required to properly understand the impacts, and the ecological baseline remains incomplete.
- Seasonal mitigation appears unrealistic due to conflicting species requirements, and LionLinks PEIR (Provisional Environment Information Report) conclusions are unsound.
- The ecological information provided does not meet the requirements of EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy).

- For further detail, see WALL Blog- Walberswick Against Lion Link:- [Blog](#)

8. LANDSCAPE, HERITAGE & VISUAL IMPACT

Why LionLink would cause unacceptable landscape and heritage harm from Walberswick, Saxmundham and Friston.

The Suffolk coast and inland landscape are nationally valued for their tranquillity, dark skies, heritage character and open rural views. NGV has not demonstrated that LionLink's landfall, cable corridor or converter station cluster can be delivered without causing significant and lasting harm.

Key Points:

- LionLink would cause permanent landscape harm, fundamentally altering rural views, dark skies, tranquillity, and the setting of villages and heritage assets.
- The landscape character around Saxmundham, Benhall, Sternfield and Friston would be permanently changed, affecting the wider rural setting of surrounding communities.
- The project threatens dark skies and rural tranquillity, with impacts that have not been fully or properly assessed.
- NGV has not provided realistic photo visualisations of the proposed converter stations or substations, making it difficult to understand the true scale and visual impact of the development.

9. COMMUNITY, HEALTH & WELLBEING

Why LionLink poses unacceptable risks to the health, safety and wellbeing of communities from Walberswick to Saxmundham and Friston.

LionLink would bring years of noise, traffic, construction disturbance and landscape change to communities that are already facing cumulative impacts from multiple NSIPs. NGV has not assessed the health, wellbeing or social impacts on residents — particularly the older population in Walberswick, or young families and the growing community in Saxmundham or the villagers of Friston.

Key Points:

- Local communities already face 12 years of construction from Sizewell C and a further 10–12 years from EA2, EA1N, LionLink and Sea Link, alongside additional impacts from Helios Solar Farm and housing expansion in Saxmundham and Benhall
- NGV has not assessed the cumulative health and wellbeing impacts of prolonged construction on local communities, including mental health effects.
- Older residents in Walberswick and surrounding villages are particularly vulnerable, yet no Equality Impact Assessment has been provided.
- Emergency access risks during extended construction periods have not been assessed, which is unacceptable.
- The consultation fails to address the social, health and wellbeing consequences of long-term, overlapping infrastructure projects.

10. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Why LionLink cannot be assessed in isolation, and why the combined burden of multiple NSIPs and major developments makes this proposal unacceptable.

The Suffolk coast and inland communities are already facing an extraordinary concentration of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and major developments. LionLink adds to a stack of overlapping schemes that together create 10–12 years of construction, on top of Sizewell C's 12-year construction period, which has already begun. NGV has not assessed these cumulative impacts, even though EN-1 requires them.

Key Points:

- Suffolk communities face overlapping major developments, including Sizewell C (12 years, underway), NGET Sea Link, NGV LionLink, SPR EA1N & EA2 windfarm connections, the Friston (Kiln Lane) Substation Hub, Helios Solar Farm, the Essex & Suffolk Water NSIP, and 800 new homes in Saxmundham.
- These projects together will create 10–15 years of continuous and overlapping construction, placing unprecedented pressure on local communities.
- NGV has not assessed the cumulative impacts required under EN-1, including combined traffic, noise, landscape harm, health impacts, or construction duration.
- Already rent rises are pricing the locals out of the housing market and it is predicted at the height of SZC there will be 10,000 workers requiring accommodation in the East Suffolk District.
- Saxmundham and Friston risk being transformed into an industrial cluster without any proper cumulative assessment.
- Traffic, noise, landscape and health impacts must be assessed together, not in isolation, to reflect the real experience of affected communities.