

Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council - Sea Link Proposals in Suffolk – Consultation Response

1. What do you think about our proposals?

Items 1 to 5 listed below each include a landfall location, underground cable corridors and converter station site.

The landfall location for items 1 and 2 is between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness. This landfall location may accommodate up to three projects, including the Sea Link project.

The landfall location for items 3, 4 and 5 is near Sizewell. This landfall location can only accommodate the Sea Link project.

1. Suffolk site 1 emerging

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Do <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not support	Unsure
------------------	---------	---------	--	--------

2. Suffolk site 3 emerging

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Do <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not support	Unsure
------------------	---------	---------	--	--------

3. Suffolk site 1 alternative

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Do <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not support	Unsure
------------------	---------	---------	--	--------

4. Suffolk site 3 alternative (option 1)

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Do <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not support	Unsure
------------------	---------	---------	--	--------

5. Suffolk site 3 alternative (option 2)

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Do <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not support	Unsure
------------------	---------	---------	--	--------

Add your comments here:

The proposed Sea Link landfalls between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness or at Sizewell are clearly predicated on connection to the proposed Friston substation which remains subject to legal challenge. It is our opinion, that the greenfield site at Friston is entirely unsuitable for infrastructure on the scale proposed by Scottish Power Renewables and note that if further connections are made to that substation it will need to be expanded with further bays to accommodate the cables from the convertor stations. It is consistent therefore for us to oppose any options for the Sea Link project that include connection at Friston.

However, one landfall site that can accommodate up to three projects is preferable to a landfall site that can only accommodate one project.

If future North Sea windfarms connect via a Modular Offshore Grid to brownfield sites further south leaving Greater Gabbard and Galloper as the only connection with a landfall site in East Suffolk would Sea Link still be needed? Similarly, if Sizewell C is not built, or if as expected it does not start generating until well into the 2030s, will Sea Link still be a good solution for network reinforcement over the next ten years?

2. As we develop, refine and narrow down our proposals do you have any views or local knowledge that you would like us to take into account?

Add your comments here:

Residents and regular visitors to the area are concerned about the levels of construction traffic required for the proposed Sizewell C project, if it goes ahead. There are also concerned that increased traffic levels on the A12 south will increase the frequency of already problematic rat running incidents along the minor roads in the area. While we appreciate that the scale of construction traffic connected with the Sea Link proposal is much less than for Sizewell C, we are concerned about the cumulative impact of potentially multiple energy infrastructure projects proceeding over the same period of years.

3. What do you think about co-location of (up to three) converter stations?

Strongly Support Support Neutral Do not support ~~Unsure~~

Add your comments here:

It is not clear whether there would be any savings on total land take from co-location. If not, we assume co-location of two or three converter stations would involve sites of around 14 or 21 hectares. A site of this size at any of the indicated sites with building heights up to 30m would be totally out of place in any of the open countryside sites proposed.

4. What do you think about the projects (up to three) sharing underground cable corridors?

Strongly Support Support Neutral Do not support ~~Unsure~~

Add your comments here:

It is not clear how wide a combined corridor would need to be. The HVAC cables are proposed to require 40m wide corridors and the HVAC cables require 100m. What width would be needed for cables combining two or more projects?

5. What do you think about the potential to share a landfall location between (up to three) projects?

Strongly Support Support Neutral Do not support ~~Unsure~~

Add your comments here:

If two or more projects make landfall between Thorpeness and Aldeburgh how much greater will be the disruption to the popular beach area during and after construction?

6. As we develop, refine and narrow down our proposals do you have any views or local knowledge that you would like us to take into account about the potential coordination of (up to three) projects?

Add your comments here:

If, after landfall between Thorpeness and Aldeburgh, a cable corridor of up to 1200m width (for three projects) across the North Haven/North Warren nature reserves is needed we would expect this to be mitigated by Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) so as to minimize damage to these biodiverse and sensitive landscapes. We note that there is no assurance that HDD will be technically possible in this location.