

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Response to request for additional responses to EA1N and EA2 projects from Rt. Hon. Kwasi Kwarteng  
**Date:** 28 January 2022 13:51:47

---

My Ref: EA1N – AFP 128; EA2 – AFP 130

## The Secretary of State (BEIS) The Rt Hon Mr Kwasi Kwarteng MP

Dear Sir, I am a resident of Friston, Suffolk, and on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2021 submitted what I supposed was my final submission to you. I am now aware that you have requested more information/observations on several matters including **Flooding**. I am delighted this is the case as **Flooding** is my special interest and, in my opinion, is the single most important factor in the objection to Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) proposal and application to site the onshore infrastructure (Substations) for the EA1N and EA2 projects so close to the village of Friston.

I am not sure what further points I can add, I hope there are some, these I will mention later in this submission. I do however, request that the Minister re reads my submission of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2021. In precis I said that the siting of the proposed Substations at Friston was ill advised in terms of **flooding**. By their own admission SPR recognise that the Substation site will exacerbate the existing **flooding** problems of the village. Why? Because of their attenuation proposals ie to build two linked reservoirs adjacent to, and below, the Substation site ie enabling them to release water when it is safe to do so. **Question** - What if it is not safe to do so and the reservoirs are full? **Answer** – The water will run into the existing inadequate Friston watercourse system.

I have discussed attenuation proposals by contractors in my earlier submissions. In short they have two characteristics: (i) they look good and appear logical but are woefully short of detail (ii) they never involve pumping or any long term commitment or maintenance factors after construction. Thus if constructors can get their proposals past the planners and/or commissioning authority it's 'game over': they make the money and escape liability if things go wrong in the future.

There are other problems associated with **Flooding** which I have covered in previous submissions. These involve the separation of surface water, rain water and foul water sewage. This is required for new builds and covered in building regulations, not so in older buildings, however all water companies reduce their fees if householders can prove they have adapted their systems to separate the different waters. The reason for this is that the majority of householders use far more water now than they did in the past and sewage pumping stations cannot cope with the extra volume of water. In locations likely to **flood** the situation is far worse because of cross-contamination between the two systems. Downstairs toilets and shower rooms are the most vulnerable to these problems. Notwithstanding this there is the impact on adjoining properties because of backup.

Another problem associated with **flooding** is the electricity supply. Traditionally our homes have power sockets placed at skirting board level: water and electricity is a dangerous mix so, if a property is **flooded** the electricity supply will be knocked out. With no heating or lighting such homes become a hazard at night apart from the ever present risk of the death by electrocution of the residents. This is one of the **flooding** factors in Friston that should not be ignored.

Another point associated with **flooding** is that the A1094, the main road between the A12 and the town of Aldeburgh, may well be rendered impassable by a major flooding event. The current **flooding** prevention system of the Friston watercourse entails flood water ending up in a field which abuts the A1094, water pools there but can escape via a culvert under the road. The

culvert has a weir on the North Friston side so the embankment is always likely to be wet, or indeed, waterlogged. A question that must be asked is: 'Has the stability of the embankment been investigated?' The best parallel here is from the experience of railway engineers: embankments and cuttings are, by nature, unstable structures, with time they will fail, erosion from water hastens this process.

**Conclusions:**

SPRs proposals to build two Substations within the Friston **flood** bowl, notice that I have not even referred to the proposed National Grid Substation, and indeed any other Connector structures, already being consulted on to come to this location, will only produce additional risks to an already fragile **flood** prevention system. Climate change and changing weather patterns will also increase the risk factor.

Should there be no other viable alternatives to locating the onshore aspects of the EA1N and EA2 projects in the Friston area, relocating the proposed site, and indeed any other infrastructure buildings, to the North East, ie outside of the Friston **flood** bowl, would enable surface water to link to an established watercourse and river system, this is the only sensible option in that it will eliminate an unnecessary **flood** threat to Friston village: it's residents and their properties.

It is a clear choice for Planners who recommend and those who have the final responsibility to make a decision on the current EA1N and EA2 proposals. Either take a risk and face the accountabilities that go with this or, reduce/eliminate the unnecessary additional risk factors. As such, I request that consent is **NOT** granted for the onshore elements of SPRs EA1N and EA2 windfarm projects in it's current location.

Yours.

Mike Lewis.

