

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 November 2021 13:19

To: kwasi.kwarteng.mp@parliament.uk; [REDACTED]

Cc: offshore.coordination@ofgem.gov.uk; Offshore Coordination
<offshore.coordination@beis.gov> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) Offshore Wind Applications

Dear Secretary of State

I am writing to you as a resident of Friston and an Interested Party to the PINS Examinations relating to Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) EA1N and EA2 wind power applications.

I have been vehemently opposed to the choice of Friston for the substation site throughout the examination hearings on the grounds that it would have a devastating impact on local residents, the environment and the listed buildings that surround the proposed site.

East Anglia will play a significant part in achieving the UK's 40GW wind power goals by 2030. I fully endorse these goals. At the same time, the Government has stated on page 80 of the Energy White Paper 'Powering Our Net Zero Future', "**to minimise the impact on local communities, we will implement a more efficient approach to connecting offshore generation to the mainland grid**". I also fully support this intention.

We must not, under any circumstances, use the banner of "green energy" to destroy our countryside, lives and livelihoods. We must look for alternatives.

I urge you to consider the **cumulative impact** on this area of East Suffolk. We cannot bear the brunt of all the energy projects proposed for this small geographic area.

Over the course of the Examinations, it became increasingly apparent that the severe adverse impacts of these projects on our **onshore** environment, local tourist economy and coastal communities far outweigh the benefits of this particular **onshore** infrastructure plan.

To locate an Energy Hub, possibly the biggest of its kind in the UK (currently seven substations and inter-connectors are being proposed for Friston) in the midst of one of the UK's most fragile nature based tourism destinations, will lead to: the decimation of a thriving tourism economy - the principal revenue stream for the Suffolk Heritage Coast; the destruction of biodiversity as multiple cable corridors cut through the protected landscapes of the Suffolk AONB and Suffolk Sandlings, and the decline of the health and well-being of those rural communities whose lives will never be the same.

It is needless destruction, when it is clear that there are more appropriate brownfield or industrialised sites such as Bradwell or Grain, which are better aligned with Government policy.

The recent historic judgement by The Hon. Mr Justice Holgate to overturn and quash the consent for the Norfolk Vanguard Wind Farm project on the basis that **cumulative impact** was not taken into account has significant bearing on the legality of the Examinations for EA1N and EA2 at which SPR has to date refused to present the **cumulative impact** of these known additional projects to the Planning Authority.

In order not to delay the offshore turbines, which I endorse, I urge you to recommend a 'split decision' between offshore and onshore elements, where the offshore wind turbines are given consent, but the onshore works are rejected.

I welcome the comments of our local MP, Dr Therese Coffey, who is also advocating this 'split decision'. A copy of this email is being sent separately to Dr Coffey.

It is the only sensible and truly green option open to BEIS. It would allow time for the UK Government to take the lead and bring together the key factors to approve the new regulatory change needed for offshore integrated solutions. Time to allow EA1N and EA2 to benefit from the BEIS Review and to become flagship pathfinder projects of which we can all be proud. And also, time to bring these projects to fruition in a way which minimises their greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Government's Ten Point Plan. Only if the onshore infrastructure minimises the destruction of our environment by connecting to the grid at a brownfield or industrialised site, whilst minimising onshore cable corridors, can these projects contribute positively to climate change and support the Government's stated intent in this regard.

The flooding implications for Friston cannot be emphasised enough. My own road has seen flooding in 2019 (photos attached) and 2021 and with climate change and global warming these instances will only increase. The last thing the village of Friston needs is any more hard-standing. SPR have shown scant regard for the serious nature of potential flooding and put forward no logical mitigating proposals.

The fields of Friston are home to pigs, cows and sheep as well as crops and meadowland. It is an agricultural village. The quiet lanes around Friston and the footpaths across the intended substation site are used by walkers, dog-walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders whose physical health and mental well-being must be taken into consideration. Friston is not, and was never intended to be, part of an industrial area. It is a peaceful village in undisturbed countryside with dark skies. It does not have room for an Energy Hub of huge electrical substations and interconnectors. It does not have the infrastructure to cope with a possible 12-15 year construction project.

It is unthinkable, and shocking, to even suggest that the location of these substations should be in the heart of a medieval village, where noise, light and industrial structures destroy well-being and mental health, if better site options exist. There are more suitable locations at industrialised or brownfield sites, where any unmitigable noise pollution, light pollution and air pollution will not impact on a local community, school children, the elderly and perhaps most importantly the mental health of all who live within metres of this site or who will have their land forcibly acquired. The adverse impacts of the proposed cable route and substations clearly outweigh the benefits, when less damaging alternatives are available.

I reiterate my comments above and urge the Secretary of State to consider the full **cumulative impact** on the area and to recommend a 'split decision':

1. That the offshore turbines are recommended for consent. This will mean that no time is wasted in respect of construction of the turbines.
2. That the onshore infrastructure is rejected in favour of full consideration of better locations for this infrastructure where the adverse impacts are minimised at a brownfield/ industrialised site.

Thank you.

Kind regards.

Mrs Carol Bizzell





