

From: [REDACTED] wick
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Chair SOS Written representation r.e. EAN1 and EA2 by 2nd Nov deadline
Date: 31 October 2020 17:15:28
Attachments: [Peter Chadwick written submission as Chairman of SOS.pdf](#)

Please find attached PDF written submission for Peter Chadwick - Written submission as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings. (I have also registered and made a different submission as an individual.) Application by East Anglia ONE North Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia ONE North (EA1N) Offshore Windfarm project; and Application by East Anglia TWO Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia TWO (EA2) Offshore Windfarm project. ENO10077 ENO10078
Peter Chadwick - Save Our Sandlings, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

When I registered as an interested party as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings I received these reference numbers: EA1N 20024845 EA2 20024842

This submission is also here copied into body of email:

My Submission reads:

The negative consequences outweigh any benefits. The project should not be sited in this precious part of East Suffolk. We strongly support the need for more wind power - but not like this.

There would be:

- environmental destruction of the Sandlings AONB coastal strip and other unspoilt countryside.
 - deterioration in quality of life for local people and visitors
 - loss of jobs and income in the tourist trade
 - detrimental effects on wildlife and rare species
- combined effects around gridlocked traffic and pollution compounded by other proposed energy projects
and so on.

All this greatly outweighs any benefits.

There are even no local jobs.

Drilling through crumbling cliffs at Thorpeness on an fast eroding coast is also very unwise. Desktop and other studies cannot predict what will happen in the future.

Things are made even worse - as giving the go-ahead to this project will bring not just one - but successive cable routes the width of a motorway with the associated hall roads and traffic -through the area of outstanding natural beauty. This is a fragile precious coastal strip - with its endangered Sandlings heathland - including sites of special scientific interest - and special protected areas. This

will make the timescale of any recovery very long. So it could be argued that the effect of the works in the AONB will not be temporary and so should be classed as coming under national planning law for works of national significance in an AONB. This states that where there is an alternative - the siting of the work should not take place in an AONB. In this case there are certainly other potential solutions or sites away from the AONB..

The main problem is with National Grid - a private company. They cannot be contacted by us and they will not engage. Surely this private company is not above the planning law? This is definitely a National-Grid-led solution - which makes SPR come ashore and connect in this beautiful area. It is not fit for purpose in 2020.

National Grid's remit is to provide the best value for the taxpayer but the detrimental cost on this region far outweighs any savings. This is only expedient for the National Grid and its shareholders - not the public good. The project should be made to connect to an out-at-sea multi hub or an out-at-sea ring main. Otherwise it should be bought ashore and the substation built on a brownfield site - of which there are many. The technology means cables can be taken up the Thames estuary where there are miles upon miles of brownfield sites and National Grid connections. Or it should go to other brownfield sites - Lowestoft, Bradwell, Bramford, Felixstowe industrial areas etc. The National Grid must be required to be what its name implies – a national grid for the benefit of the nation. It should update the present out-of-date Grid to give more ecological and socially acceptable connections in the 21st century -where these are necessary. It is not good enough to just use powerline runs from the 1960s - before the AONB was created -when there was little thought for the environment and broader quality of life. The government needs to replace this free-for-all wild-west policy and has at least initiated the BEISS enquiry into onshore connections from wind farms.

National Grid enterprises – who are a completely different company from the secretive National Grid company – have engaged on the subject. To quote them 'The MPI solution will provide the key to unlocking offshore wind whilst minimising impact on coastal communities. By combining offshore wind farms with Interconnectors offshore, MPIs will reduce the amount of onshore infrastructure needed and will also mitigate the environmental impact on coastal communities, compared to the current approach in which Interconnectors and wind farms are developed and connected separately.' and they also say 'Above all, we need to take a coordinated approach.'

This is certainly not what is happening with the SPR/National Grid Friston application - which does not fit in any proper plan. Making each separate wind farm have its own massive substation onshore - with its own cable route and the hall roads - is such a waste of time and money for the wind farm developers and so ultimately for the taxpayer. It causes needless destruction to the countryside. Residents and objectors who's lifestyle and livelihoods are under threat are

being forced to mount very distressing and time consuming campaigns against what is being proposed. This is all because of a lack of proper thought and planning. It is quite frankly inefficient and lazy - certainly not fit for purpose in the 21st century either for the industry or the taxpaying public in a large area of Suffolk - who are so badly affected.

This SPR/National Grid application with its overwhelming negative affect on the area should not be allowed to go ahead. This is short-sighted short term expediency. It is not planning - in all senses of the word - and I submit that the application should be rejected or put on hold until a different proper solution is found and not be allowed to go ahead with what will ruin this special area of East Suffolk with its unique and endangered Sandlings AONB and other un-spoilt countryside.

In addition we think that during the open floor hearings the status and difference between the two companies National Grid and the totally different National Grid Enterprises was not made clear or understood by some of the people making representations. One man quoted from a National Grid Enterprises document thinking that it was a National Grid document and this was not corrected - so the confusion was perpetuated. I am not sure whether it is in the remit of the Inspectorate to correct such confusion but if it is it would be helpful to do so especially when the National Grid keeps itself hidden behind SPR and will not engage with the public it should represent at all.

Peter Chadwick - Written submission as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings

Application by East Anglia ONE North Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia ONE North (EA1N) Offshore Windfarm project; and Application by East Anglia TWO Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia TWO (EA2) Offshore Windfarm project. ENO10077 ENO10078

Peter Chadwick - Save Our Sandlings, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

When I registered as an interested party as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings I received these reference numbers: EA1N 20024845 EA2 20024842

My Submission reads:

The negative consequences outweigh any benefits. The project should not be sited in this precious part of East Suffolk. We strongly support the need for more wind power - but not like this.

There would be:

- environmental destruction of the Sandlings AONB coastal strip and other un-spoilt countryside.
- deterioration in quality of life for local people and visitors
- loss of jobs and income in the tourist trade
- detrimental effects on wildlife and rare species
- combined effects around gridlocked traffic and pollution compounded by other proposed energy projects
- and so on.

All this greatly outweighs any benefits.

There are even no local jobs.

Drilling through crumbling cliffs at Thorpeness on an fast eroding coast is also very unwise. Desktop and other studies cannot predict what will happen in the future.

Things are made even worse - as giving the go-ahead to this project will bring not just one - but successive cable routes the width of a motorway with the associated hall roads and traffic -through the area of outstanding natural beauty. This is a fragile precious coastal strip - with its endangered Sandlings heathland - including sites of special scientific interest - and special protected areas. This will make the timescale of any recovery very long. So it could be argued that the effect of the works in the AONB will not be temporary and so should be classed as coming under national

Peter Chadwick - Written submission as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings

planning law for works of national significance in an AONB. This states that where there is an alternative - the siting of the work should not take place in an AONB. In this case there are certainly other potential solutions or sites away from the AONB..

The main problem is with National Grid - a private company. They cannot be contacted by us and they will not engage. Surely this private company is not above the planning law? This is definitely a National-Grid-led solution - which makes SPR come ashore and connect in this beautiful area. It is not fit for purpose in 2020. National Grid's remit is to provide the best value for the taxpayer but the detrimental cost on this region far outweighs any savings. This is only expedient for the National Grid and its shareholders - not the public good. The project should be made to connect to an out-at-sea multi hub or an out-at-sea ring main. Otherwise it should be brought ashore and the substation built on a brownfield site - of which there are many. The technology means cables can be taken up the Thames estuary where there are miles upon miles of brownfield sites and National Grid connections. Or it should go to other brownfield sites - Lowestoft, Bradwell, Bramford, Felixstowe industrial areas etc. The National Grid must be required to be what its name implies - a national grid for the benefit of the nation. It should update the present out-of-date Grid to give more ecological and socially acceptable connections in the 21st century - where these are necessary. It is not good enough to just use powerline runs from the 1960s - before the AONB was created - when there was little thought for the environment and broader quality of life. The government needs to replace this free-for-all wild-west policy and has at least initiated the BEISS enquiry into onshore connections from wind farms.

National Grid enterprises - who are a completely different company from the secretive National Grid company - have engaged on the subject. To quote them 'The MPI solution will provide the key to unlocking offshore wind whilst minimising impact on coastal communities. By combining offshore wind farms with Interconnectors offshore, MPIs will reduce the amount of onshore infrastructure needed and will also mitigate the environmental impact on coastal communities, compared to the current approach in which Interconnectors and wind farms are developed and connected separately.' and they also say 'Above all, we need to take a coordinated approach.'

This is certainly not what is happening with the SPR/National Grid Friston application - which does not fit in any proper plan. Making each separate wind farm have its own massive substation onshore - with its own cable route and the haul roads - is such a waste of time and money for the wind farm developers and so ultimately

Peter Chadwick - Written submission as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings

for the taxpayer. It causes needless destruction to the countryside. Residents and objectors who's lifestyle and livelihoods are under threat are being forced to mount very distressing and time consuming campaigns against what is being proposed. This is all because of a lack of proper thought and planning. It is quite frankly inefficient and lazy - certainly not fit for purpose in the 21st century either for the industry or the taxpaying public in a large area of Suffolk - who are so badly affected.

This SPR/National Grid application with its overwhelming negative affect on the area should not be allowed to go ahead. This is short-sighted short term expediency. It is not planning - in all senses of the word - and I submit that the application should be rejected or put on hold until a different proper solution is found and not be allowed to go ahead with what will ruin this special area of East Suffolk with its unique and endangered Sandlings AONB and other un-spoilt countryside.

In addition we think that during the open floor hearings the status and difference between the two companies National Grid and the totally different National Grid Enterprises was not made clear or understood by some of the people making representations. One man quoted from a National Grid Enterprises document thinking that it was a National Grid document and this was not corrected - so the confusion was perpetuated. I am not sure whether it is in the remit of the Inspectorate to correct such confusion but if it is it would be helpful to do so especially when the National Grid keeps itself hidden behind SPR and will not engage with the public it should represent at all.