

## Westleton Parish Council submission to the online Lionlink consultation – October 2023

Q1) I confirm I wish to be kept updated with news about this project via email and/or post. Your details will used solely for the purpose of this application and will not be forwarded to any third parties.

Yes

Q2) Please tick Yes or No if you responded to the 2022 non-statutory consultation.

Yes

Q3) How would you describe your interest in LionLink? Please select all that apply.

Statutory organisation

Q4) With 1 being the highest preference and 5 being the lowest preference, please rank 1- 5 your preferred landfall site options, including the newly identified alternative landfall site (Landfall option G2).

(Multiple choice question) Answer: No answer (*rationale: WPC does not support any of them*)

Q5 We have identified broad underground, onshore cable corridor options, including an alternative option north of Southwold. What are your views on the original options and the new option north of Southwold? Please include any local knowledge or evidence you think would be helpful here. (Map 2 shows expanded sections of the cable corridors, including the new alternative options, whilst Map 8 shows an overview of the alternative option north of Southwold).

Westleton Parish Council does not support any of the options proposed as all are unsuitable. If Sizewell C is given the go-ahead, this section of the Suffolk coast will be the site of one of the largest construction projects in Europe. That alone will cause a significant and detrimental increase in traffic in this area and will be the cause of a host of environmental and social concerns, not least the destruction of large areas of Area of Natural Beauty (AONB) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). **The implementation of any one of the cable corridor options will add significantly to these concerns: more construction means more traffic; more air, noise and light pollution; and more damage to AONB and SSSIs.** The cumulative impact of these large infrastructure projects will turn an area which depends to a large degree on tourism into an industrial zone – unpleasant to live in and unattractive to visit.

Significantly, we understand that there is a more cost effective and practical counter-proposal which we believe NGV should be considering: pooling the energy from the off-shore windfarms to an offshore interconnector platform and bringing the energy onshore via cables with landfall at a brownfield site closer to the demand - such as at Bradwell. We believe the viability and merits of this proposal need to be considered against the NGV proposals.

Q6 We have identified landfall options, including an alternative Walberswick option (G2). What are your views on the original landfall options and the alternative Walberswick (G2) option? Please include any local knowledge or evidence you think would be helpful here. (Map 3 shows all the landfall options, including the alternative Walberswick (G2) option, whilst Map 8 focuses on the alternative Walberswick (G2) option.)

See answer to Q5.

Q7) Have you visited our virtual exhibition and/or in-person exhibition to view information about LionLink for this supplementary non-statutory consultation? Please select one of the following options.

(Multiple choice question) Answer: WPC attended an in- person exhibition and on-line webinar.

Q8) How informative did you find our virtual exhibition and/or our consultation materials? Please select one of the following options.

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Quite informative.

Q9) How did you find out about this consultation? Please select all that apply.

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Received a leaflet and email.

Q10) Delivering the energy infrastructure required to deliver net zero and reduce carbon emissions should continue to be a national priority?

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Agree.

Q11) The UK needs to improve its energy security to protect against fluctuations in supply and demand?

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Agree.

Q12 Energy infrastructure should be delivered if it will help keep energy prices down

(Multiple choice question). Answer: Don't know (*the rationale being that the question was loaded and designed to generate answers favourable to the project. Moreover, the question could not be answered easily hence the "Don't know" response*).

Q13) To what extent do you think that the Aldeburgh landfall site option E could be a shared by up to three projects as a joint landfall site and underground cable corridor?

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Strongly disagree. See answer to Q5 above.

Q14) To what extent should the proposed converter station sites enable co-location of up to three converter stations?

(Multiple choice question) Answer: Strongly disagree. See answer to Q5 above.

Q15) National Grid Ventures' (NGV) commitment to working with other developers in East Suffolk is a welcome step in improving coordination in the region?

(Multiple choice question). Answer: Don't know (*the rationale being that the question was loaded, was designed to generate answers favourable to the project and did not specify coordination with the Scottish Power projects which WPC does support - hence the "Don't know" response*).

Q16) In your view, what more could NGV and other developers in the region do to improve coordination between projects?

Westleton Parish Council have answered "Don't know" to Q15 as the question does not differentiate between coordination to keep cabling and converter stations onshore or offshore. As we have said in answer to Q5, we do not want cabling, converter stations and substations in this part of East Suffolk because of the disproportionate damage that the works for the infrastructure would cause and because we do not welcome huge warehouse type buildings and substations in a rural setting. More pertinently, we believe that a much better/more appropriate solution is for the cabling to be in an offshore corridor with landfall at a suitable brownfield site nearer the demand. We would support NGV and other developers coordinating to realise an offshore solution.

Q17) With 1 being your highest preference and 4 being your lowest preference, please order these converter station sites.

(Multiple choice question) Answer: No answer (*rationale: WPC does not support any of them*)

Q18) Are you supportive of the overall concept of the proposed LionLink project? Please select one of the following options.

(Multiple choice question) Answer: No answer (*rationale: WPC was concerned that any other answer could be used to suggest support for the project*)

spun by NVG to support their case.

Q19) Do you think there are any additional criteria and evidence that we should consider in identifying the final preferred options for onshore infrastructure? Please select one of the following options.

Yes. Other solutions need to be considered – notably off-shore cabling with landfall at brownfield sites. These options should be assessed in both a straight cost benefit analysis and an analysis of NVGs proposed action assessed against the off-shore proposal on a consideration of environmental and social criteria.

Q20) What are your views on the options identified for the converter station search areas? (See Map 4 for reference). Please include any local knowledge or evidence you think would be helpful here.

Westleton Parish Council does not support any of the options proposed as all are unsuitable. If Sizewell C is given the go-ahead, this section of the Suffolk coast will be the site of one of the largest construction projects in Europe. That alone will cause a significant and detrimental increase in traffic in this area and will be the cause of a host of environmental and social concerns, not least the destruction of large areas of Area of Natural Beauty (AONB) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). **The implementation of any one of the proposed converter stations will add significantly to these concerns: more construction means more traffic; more air, noise and light pollution; and more damage to AONB and SSSIs.** The cumulative impact of these large infrastructure projects will turn an area which depends to a large degree on tourism into an industrial zone – unpleasant to live in and unattractive to visit. Significantly, we understand that there is a more cost effective and practical counter-proposal which we believe NGV should be considering: pooling the energy from the off-shore windfarms to an offshore interconnector platform and bringing the energy onshore via cables with landfall at a brownfield site closer to the demand - such as at Bradwell. We believe the viability and merits of this proposal need to be considered against the NGV proposals.

Q21) Do you have any comments on our offshore study area, which is presented on Map 7? Please include any local knowledge or evidence you think would be helpful here. – not relevant Q5-6 answer

See answer above.

Q22) Do you have any further comments on our proposals for LionLink?

No.