From:

To: East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two
Subject: Representation ref no 20023093/20023092.

**Date:** 31 October 2020 11:28:59

## Dear Rynd Smith

I would like to begin my submission by stating the following

In the East Anglia Newsletter available in the winter of 2017 the following was stated . In order to further minimise onshore construction impacts similar to EAI and EA3 projects we are proposing to install ducting for EAIN during construction of EA2 where the routing is the same) .

I am extremely concerned about the SPR project as if allowed will set a precedent for future companies as there is no guarantee at present that a MPI off shore facility may happen.

I will now continue with information I feel should be brought to your attention.I understand that my original representation is on file so I will not repeat as such those issues that are contained in that.

From the onset I tried to attend all the information days I cannot call them consultation days as they were not .

At the first few dates SPR were not prepared for the amount of people attending and quickly ran out of information leaflets which they made no attempt to rectify. This did improve as time went on however.

I found it weird that the public were supposedly asked to engage and give feed back to SPR regarding substation site location and the routing of the cable /haul road when not all the information was available to them

I queried this and was told that it was not possible to qualify the size of the substations( for example )at the early stages of so called consultation as it would depend on various factors ie the final design of the substation and the routing of the cabling which was not initially going to be used exclusively as a haul road ( until SPR realised the inadequacy of the road network and the opposition they were met with).

I honestly think they used the public to test the waters and my have they hit a brick wall! I am going to point out that if Bawdsey council had realised what was going to befall that location then they would have tried very hard to oppose it, sadly on their backs this area is more aware due to people delving into that project and exposing the shortfalls of SPR.

I am hoping that at the issue specific hearings the lack of information regarding the CCS compounds will be addressed as this is extremely important. Information required the following points being,

**Exact location of Compounds** 

Fumes from generators needed to power the sites

Noise from generators needed to power the sites ,Light pollution from the sites Duration of these compounds during the build certainly the landfall site and substation site will be on location for the entire build

Dust emanating from these compounds.

Will all these compounds have 24/7 security which would add to the disruption My other concern is the use of Size well Gap Road (Lovers Lane) for the delivery of this project . The huge amount of vehicle movements by SPR along this road also being shared by the build of Size well C/D for the first two years of its build , the future extension of Galloper/Gabbard wind farms, the daily movements of Size well B and A . Regular Outages for Size well B increase the amount of traffic dramatically . The relocation of facilities for Sizewell B . The knowledge that Nautilus and Euro link , will be trying to locate along with SCD1 N Grid ESO and SCD2 N Grid ESO

## WHERE will it end!!

Residents and holiday makers also many day visitors use the road. How can emergency services be expected to respond if needed.

If when the inspectors visiting the sites were to take a closer look at Size well Gap Road (Lovers Lane) they would not only see the significant traffic movement at peak times and the families walking to and from the beach the cyclists and runners( this is after all a area for leisure)

but if they walked the cycle path / footway running parallel with the road they would also see the many crossing points made by the red deer using the wildlife corridor link along this coast line .

The haul roads will be constantly crossing the cycle path / shared footway and this is of grave concern unless adequate signage is in place.

Once again the need for both EastAnglia One North and EastAnglia Two to lay the cable ducts/cabling at the same time is of huge importance to minimise the disruption of these projects and I urge the Inspectorate to insist this will be the case or the DCO should be refused.

I enquired from SPR more detailed information on the cable/haul road and, on 6th Aug 2019 they replied and I quote,

SPR are only in the pre-application stage of the project and a lot of the information you are asking for is detail we would not be able to confirm until we have secured consent and have contractors in place to establish the final detail of the construction of the project. Haul road traffic there is no information on vehicle movements on the haul road. Once vehicles have accessed the onshore development area via our designated access points they have freedom of movement along the haul road. End quote.

I look forward to the traffic management plan that SPR will have to submit to the district councils.

I must also point out that the haulroad/cable route will interfere with the Size well Hall road at point E1060250 on the cable route map .

This has huge connotations if there were to be a blockage on the main Size well Gap Road (Lovers Lane).

The reason being that Sizewell Hall Road is the only escape route were there to be an incident at the nuclear power stations and the main road was impassable.

The landfall site at Thorpeness is extremely vulnerable due to erosion and is losing large amounts of cliff face and is designated dangerous to the public by the council .Sheer lunacy to disrupt the fragile cliffs and in fact Bawdsey is suffering a constant loss of cliff face which may have been accelerated by the interference from SPR works bringing the cabling ashore there.

Regarding the bird and general wildlife that will be displaced by this project. So called mitigation ie providing feeding areas for turtle doves is hardly going to rectify the loss of habitat ensuing from such a disruptive project.

Areas along the cable route will needlessly be changed hedgerows and trees uprooted replanting sometime in the future cannot compensate for the wildlife will probably never return.

I will now start to as requested at the open floor hearings pass on the statement made by managing director of Iberdrola

Taken from Recharge Wind article 26th November 2019.

Quote

Speaking before the EastAnglia Hub announcement Cole said

What we have done with East Anglia 1 is to build all the onshore infrastructure for both EA1 and East Anglia 3 at the same time in order to do that work once,not twice ,to minimise construction disruption to the local community and our plans for the other two sites East Anglia 1North and East Anglia 2 is to a very similar thing building them together

to minimise disruption..

Also Iberdrola will roll its three remaining East Anglia UK offshore wind projects into a single 3.1 GW 6.5 billion mega development that it says will be finished by 2026 selling power with or without British government CFD deals .The East Anglia Hub will unite EAIN EA2 EA3 previously envisaged as distinct projects into a single development with a combined procurement programme to leverage their scale with a continuous installation programme from 2022 .

End quote

I will now finally state that the cumulative impact of so many projects all trying to deliver in this area of Suffolk is stifling the communities .

NGrid need to be taken to task over this we never dreamt that Size well Nuclear power here would ultimately bring the ruination of the area.

I have noted that PINS has requested that at point 1.0.18 that SCC/Parish Councils /SASES /SEAS/ SOS catalogue any additional connection offers of which they are aware and to submit details .

As my skills are somewhat limited in the use of electronic deliverence even though I have files containing such evidence I will leave that to the more competent to deliver.

Also a Mr Philip Watkins of Eastern Edge Ltd kindly detailed the reason why delivery by SPR of their projects to Bramford was changed. I am certain that SASES will be enlightening yourselves as to the reasons and evidence behind that change. However I can forward that information if you cannot obtain it from other sources. Finally I will touch once more on the Health issues that will arise from the disturbance to the people stress brought on by all these projects now that Size well C will no doubt get the greenlight as announced on national television .

Finally I am having to use internet connection to finish and send this as my internet connection has failed!

Regards Mrs P Dorcey