From: SEAS
To: East Anglia Two
Subject: Fwd: EA1N & EA2 preliminary meeting and hearings 24/25/26 March 2020
Date: 10 March 2020 00:00:00

Re EA1N and EA2

Suffolk Energy Action Solutions Campaign(SEAS)
Reference Numbers 20024494 and 20024496 respectively

We wish to attend the three days of Hearings on 24/25/26 March 2020 at Snape Maltings and reserve the right to speak on all three days, including specifically the following issues:

1. 24 March 2020
Item 4 - Initial Assessment of Principal Issues
We request that these Additional Principal Issues as detailed below are included on the Agenda.

1.1. The major Principal Issue which should be added to the Agenda is to call for National Grid and BEIS to attend the Hearings in order to answer this question: why has an unacceptable plan been developed with National Grid's approval at great cost and misusing valuable time?

If a national strategy for offshore transmission infrastructure had been agreed in advance of this planned onslaught of Norfolk and Suffolk offshore wind farms, a piecemeal and uncoordinated, outdated radial substation plan would not have been agreed. The NSIP process was not devised for this scale of wind energy infrastructure programme and the very process is flawed because it does not consider alternative better solutions or take full account of cumulative impact of at least seven wind energy projects in one small area and over 14 such projects in Norfolk and Suffolk. For a major energy infrastructure programme as this represents, it is clear that a deeper examination of cost efficiencies, synergies and necessary flexibilities provided by new style offshore substation hubs and integrated, coordinated transmission infrastructure solutions is required urgently.
SPR cannot be obliged to answer these questions on site selection and alternative solutions in the absence of National Grid and BEIS, because SPR was not wholly responsible in the first place.

1.2. The issue of mental distress, depression and ill- health caused by the threat of these ill-conceived plans should be put on the Agenda and examined and recorded in order that these findings provide evidence here and also, for the future planning of such energy projects. With NSIP projects, these health and well- being issues are skirted over. This exposes the flaws of the NSIP process. We live in a so- called democracy. These issues relating to health should be considered as priority questions.
To plan for an onslaught of seven wind energy substations, inter-connectors, new pylons and steel towers in such close proximity to a vibrant and ancient village Community has caused untold distress and anxiety for over two years.

1.3. Should the ExA delay this DCO process and halt it now and urge BEIS to call a full Review? Given the recent publications and announcements made by Ofgem and National Grid relating to offshore solutions and given the delay to the Norfolk OWF DCO applications for Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea Project Three and Thanet Extension should this SPR application be halted and BEIS call a full Review of the National offshore solution opportunities in order to optimise cost

efficiencies, synergies and flexibilities? It does not make sense to have different timetables for these East Anglian DCO questions. The core issues are similar.
The U.K. wishes to be a world leader for renewables. This goal will be undermined if these plans get the go- ahead. Surely this is the time to define the national strategy and then fast track the solutions? We have benchmarked Holland, Denmark, Belgium and other countries. They can fast track in four years what your doomsayers claim will take ten years to implement. We challenge their timetable assumptions and would like to ask relevant, objective and not conflicted engineers from these other countries to give evidence and outlines on timetables for coordinated offshore solutions.

2. 25 March 2020
ISHs1
2b the consideration and assessment of alternative development sites for this infrastructure

We challenge SPR and National Grid to explain why brownfield sites were not considered in the short- term? And why offshore solutions based on a national strategy were not designed in 2014 or even earlier?
We would like to know why Bramford was dismissed? The reasons given thus far, are not credible or acceptable.
Why Thames Estuary brownfield sites were not considered? Cost is not an acceptable reason. Tax payers would pay an extra levy to do green, wind energy properly.
Why have the offshore solutions which our geographical North Sea neighbours have been advancing on a fast track basis since 2014 and before then, been ignored or dismissed by National Grid and SPR? Speed of implementation(four years) is possible despite recent defensive statements made by their lobby groups. Offshore solutions are cheaper than outdated onshore radial, incremental solutions.

3c delayed decisions of the SOS in respect of DCO applications for other North Sea OWFs (Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea Project Three and Thanet Extension)

We challenge National Grid and SPR to ask BEIS to call a Review to explore more deeply the same underlying issues relating to these East Anglia proposed transmission infrastructure projects. Similar threats to birds, similar threats to porpoises, similar disruption to the environment, rare habitats, tourism and vibrant Communities apply, to varying degrees, depending on specific nature of the location.

4d whether the development of any ORM or other alternative connection development projects which it has been argued might serve the proposed developments are now or might in relevant timescales become seriously entertained matters to which the Applicants and the SOS might reasonably have regard

We know that SPR, National Grid and Ofgem have all in recent weeks said in the public domain that they are totally in favour of offshore solutions in the future, but that these will take ten years to implement. They have only recently made these statements as if to appease. We challenge their time plan. We have researched advances made by other North Sea countries and we see that these solutions can be implemented in four years. The legislation changes required

with a majority government are swift to implement. We believe that the claimed barriers are not significant. It just requires political will and that is why we are calling for a Review.

The onshore substation nexus could be located closer to London, nearer the Thames Estuary.

3. 26 March OFHs1
SEAS group wish to make a joint presentation relating to two issues, namely:

3.1.Marine coralline cliff and other marine life
The threat is judged to be significant by local specialists
3.2. Tourism decline leading to loss of jobs and social and economic decline
Personal stories as testament to this serious threat

Fiona Gilmore
SEAS Campaign
" yes to wind energy, let's do it right"
SuffolkEnergyActionSolutions.co.uk