

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** EA1N and EA2 preliminary meeting/hearings 24/25/26 March 2020  
**Date:** 10 March 2020 11:04:58

---

Dear Executive Authority,

Re EA1N and EA2 preliminary meeting/hearings 24/25/26 March 2020  
Glynis Robertson Registration ID: EA1N 20024525 and EA2 20024528

I am writing to let you know that I will be attending the Preliminary Meeting and Hearings on 24/25/26 March 2020 at Snape Maltings and reserve the right to speak on all three days,

PRELIMINARY MEETING – 10am 24 March 2020

I wish to request that the following issue be added to the Principal Issues list:

Agenda Item 4 - Initial Assessment of Principal Issues – No. 5.

Why was the Applicant allowed to submit two DCO applications in tandem and the resulting effects that this has had on the community's involvement in the process.

ISHs2 HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT, MITIGATION, IROPI AND EXAMINATION – 3.30pm 23 March 2020

I would like to ask the following question::

Item 3 - In the light of Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea Project 3 and Thanet being delayed by the Sec. Of State on similar grounds and the likelihood of Norfolk Boreas being delayed also, should this DCO not be postponed until the Norfolk and Kent issues are resolved? In fact, would it be better if they were ALL halted for a FULL REVIEW of the National Offshore Transmission Infrastructure?

If I am not invited to speak about the above subjects, would like them added to my Open Floor Hearing list below.

### OFH1 OPEN FLOOR HEARING – 10am 24 March 2020

I would like to speak on each issue that I listed on my Relevant Representation:

#### SITE SELECTION AND ALTERNATIVES

-It is unclear why a coastal area rich in wildlife and exceedingly rare habitats was chosen over brownfield sites more suited to industrialisation.

Alternatives, such as ORM or Island Hubs also appear to have been overlooked in the Application.

- Ofgem, as a consumer cost regulator, has failed since the area chosen will cost more in cabling and mitigation each time new infrastructure is built, than an ORM or brownfield site would cost - costs of which will go on the public user's bill.

THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT on local communities and environment of up to 10 energy projects occurring consecutively over 12 to 15 years has not been fully taken into account:

1. Sizewell B – relocation of facilities to make way for SZC before DCO has been approved
2. Sizewell C, DCO 2020,
3. NGV -Nautilus public consultation 2020 + new siting of a 25m high Connector Station 5kms from the Friston Interconnector
4. NGV -Eurolink tbc but again will require a 25m high connector station 5kms from Friston
5. Galloper extension, public consultation 2020
6. Greater Gabbard tbc
7. NG -SCD1 Sizewell – Kent interconnector – consent given
8. NG -SCD2 Sizewell – Kent interconnector tbc
9. EA1N – SPR – DCO 2020
10. EA2 – SPR – DCO 2020

#### LANDFALL

-Unsuitability of Landfall site due to fragility of Thorpeness Coralline Cliffs, shifting tidal shoreline, coastal erosion, and climate change.

-The Landfall site will affect the England Coast Path and the first National Trail in Suffolk which is anticipated to bring economic benefits to the region

## ENVIRONMENT

11Km of cable trenches destroying environmentally sensitive areas of AONB, SSSI, SPA, including The Sandlings and Fens heaths:

-UK has 20% of the World's lowland heathland which is internationally recognised as a 'rare habitat'. It should be protected, not dug up to release more carbon emissions.

-Threat to wildlife. It is not possible to mitigate protected or endangered wildlife such as bats, badgers, barn owls, nightingales, red deer and many species of migrating birds that live along the line of the intended cable route

-Cabling will sever the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and therefore the wildlife corridor, in turn, causing problems for migrating species.

-Loss of 83 acres of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land

-Loss of woodland and hedgerows with inadequate mitigation. If not replanted with mature trees/hedgerows it can take a further 10 years (on top of the construction years) for them to mature and hide 15 metre high infrastructures.

## ROADS

-The local road network is unsuitable for the high traffic levels of construction HGVs, associated service vehicles and workforce vehicles. The increased traffic on inadequate roads will endanger cyclists, walkers and residents.

-There will be inevitable delays of Emergency Services and, should there be a Nuclear incident, the evacuation routes would be severely hampered, both endangering lives.

-Impact on tourism, The DMO survey says traffic congestion and related issues would deter tourists from coming to the area.

## PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY

-The Application fails to address the impact on the amenity value of the 26 PRoWs that will be permanently or temporarily closed.

-There is a lack of detail on PRoW closures leading to disruption of the network, thereby leaving local walkers with very limited or no access at all.

-The Landfall site will affect the England Coast Path and the first National

Trail in Suffolk which is anticipated to bring economic benefits to the region

#### TOURISM and JOBS

-SPR's media continually promote the job opportunities, this might be the case in Lowestoft with offshore jobs, but there are NO BENEFITS to the local community, NO LOCAL JOBS, instead LOSS OF TOURISM and therefore LOSS OF JOBS.

-A recent article on the Scottish windfarm industry reported that just 16% of full time jobs materialised in 2020 from a government forecast of 28,000.

-The recent DMO survey stating that the energy projects "could impact the local visitor economy by up to £40m per year and could result in 400 job losses" has not been addressed in SPR's application and needs to be.

Yours

Glynis Robertson