

This submission is in addition to our earlier objections, these follow on from our attendance at the recent hearings at CUFC. Having not attended anything like this before I was appalled by the poor quality of NG's responses, waffle and prevarication appeared to be a strategy in a time limited meeting.

My wife and I live at [REDACTED] about 600m west of the proposed EACN site and 300 m north of the cabling and pylon run TB05-TB09.

Our main concern is for our health, not only because we will effectively be living in a building site, probably for a number of years, but the [REDACTED] is causing at the moment.

This [REDACTED] is mainly caused by not understanding why the current proposed site was ever chosen in the first place. We fully understand the need to update and increase the capacity of the UK's electricity transmission system, indeed we have recently moved over to EVs and electrical house heating but believe this proposal is in the wrong place for a number of reasons.

"Dog leg route" The main pylon route runs basically along the A12 corridor but runs under the A12 and main railway line towards the EACN near Little Bromley and back again. NG says this is to save its customers (North Falls and 5 Estuaries) the cost and inconvenience of going across the A12 and railway line, but at least they would only need to cross once. If NG were really concerned about its customers it would have chosen a coastal site for connection.

Dedham Vale National Landscape/AONB. Once NG had made the decision to place the EACN at Arleigh it was inevitable that the cabling route would adversely affect the National Landscape of Dedham Vale in wilful disregard of the requirement to "seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty".

Of course NG could come up with an alternative route to the EACN to avoid Dedham Vale by moving it to the east of Ipswich, but then they would rightfully be questioned about alternative brownfield sites in Ipswich, Feixstowe and Harwich. It would also highlight the folly of not moving a bit further east and having an offshore route direct to Grain or Tilbury.

Grade 1 agricultural land. On agricultural land quality basis alone it beggars belief that this site could be chosen, only about 2% of UK's farmland falls into this category, so almost any other site that NG could have chosen would have had less of an impact on national food security than their proposal.

Given these three criteria we just cannot understand how this current site has been chosen, we do not think that NG have ever explained how they came to their decision and so it is impossible for us to challenge them, which is what leads to our anxiety.

We are also anxious about the disruption and disturbance the building of the EACN, erection of pylons and underground cabling, all close to us will have on our daily lives. Inevitably the noise, dust and road closures will affect how we live our lives.

When we bought our house in 2006 we chose it for its quiet rural location, narrow lanes and local footpaths, allowing for long countryside walks and love of nature, all of these recreational opportunities will go during the construction process, not to mention the knock on effects of actually driving into Arleigh or Colchester. Since retiring I cycle most days to my allotment at the Lawford end of Hungerdown Lane this can be quite scary even with the few private cars that use Hungerdown Lane at the moment, I dread to think what this will be like with construction vehicles and site workers cars inevitably using it.

Another area that is making us anxious, should these proposals go forward, is the lack of requirement for these major projects to coordinate their construction schedules. Without adequate coordination the length of time we, and particularly Little Bromley residents, will be impacted will be unnecessarily extended.

We worry about this because during discussion about mitigation work, for [REDACTED], by NG in readiness for construction traffic using Bentley Road, the point was made from the floor that NF/FE intend building a haul road to their substation site to reduce pressure on Bentley Road. The question was asked whether NG would be using this haul road. If I heard correctly NG responded by saying they would use it if the construction schedules of the two projects aligned. I understand that to mean they don't think that is likely, which raises more questions.

Is there any requirement for the two projects to talk to one another and coordinate project planning to reduce the impact on local communities?

Do we know if these two projects will be built at the same time or does one happen before the other? If they don't happen at the same time then our disruption will just extend into the future finishing just in time to see Tarchon appearing on the horizon.

If there is not close coordination between these companies to reduce impact on local communities then once again the financial needs of these large companies are given far more weight than the needs and welfare of the local community, almost appearing as if local residents well being is simply collateral damage.

Finally we are also anxious about how this project might affect our future plans, we are both in [REDACTED] and over the next few years may need/want to move to a less remote location with closer facilities and amenities, it is hard to see how a purchaser will want to pay a current market price for a property that is surrounded by construction work.