

# East Anglia OFH 5 Morning Session 1

00:05

Morning and Welcome everybody to today's open floor hearing five for East Anglia, ONE North and East Anglia TWO offshore wind farms. This is the fifth welcome floor hearing in these examinations. Before we introduce ourselves, I'm going to deal with a few preliminary matters. Can I just check with the case team that you can hear me and that the recordings and the live streams have started?

00:29

I can confirm that we can hear you the live streams have started and we're recording. Thank you very much myself. Well, I'll start by observing that this is the fifth open floor hearing that we are holding today's hearing and yesterday's event were introduced due to the amount of interest that we receive to be heard. It's our earlier events in October. There are also more open floor hearings planned to be heard in the new year, and our published agenda we plan to hold this hearing in two sessions. However, since issuing that agenda, the number of speakers appearing today has reduced. And so as my colleague Mr. Williams has discussed with the participants in this morning's arrangements conference, we will instead ruin the hearing as a single session, we have one further speaker who we are expecting to join us at 1130. This will hopefully mean less waiting around for speakers listed later in the running order. And when I was to run the hearing more efficiently, we plan to take a short conflict break at around 11am to allow all parties a break from their screens. And so two introductions I'm Caroline Jones, and member of this panel, which is the examining authority for the East Anglia one North offshore wind farm application and another panel, which is the examining authority, the East Anglia to offshore wind farm application. I am in the chair today, I'll draw your attention to annex B of our most recent little six letter dated 16th of July 2020, where you will find my brief biography and the explanation of the purpose of the examining authorities appointments. I made a declaration of interest at the preliminary meetings part one on the 16th of September. And you can do that online. If you wish my fellow panel members will introduce themselves and I'll flag that they too have brief biographies in the rule six letter annex B and B declarations at the preliminary meetings part one. I will start by introducing Jessica powers.

02:13

Good morning, everybody. I'm Jessica Powis . I'm a panel member and I'll be leading on the main elements of the hearing today once the introductions are complete.

02:27

Good morning everybody. My name is Rynd Smith and I'm the lead member of these panels are mainly be observing and taking notes at the start of this hearing, but may ask questions if they arise. And I will lead the hearing with a small group of later speakers on the agenda.

02:43

Good morning everybody. My name is John Hockley. In this era, I'll mainly be observing and taking notes. Thank you, Mrs. Jones.

02:51

Thank you. Those of you who are involved with or watched any of the previous hearings will note that the full panel is not here today as you would appreciate this is so that they are free to work in the background on the information that we received a deadline one on Monday. However, if needs to be for contingency purposes, our colleagues will join us and I also introduce our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with us on these examinations, some of whom you will have spoken to already. Emery Williams is the case manager leading the planning Inspectorate case team for these applications.

03:20

And we read the arrangements conference and as managing the team today. They are accompanied today by two case officers KJ Johansson and Caroline Hopewell. Hopefully the agenda papers for these hearings provided a clear explanation of our and your reasons for being here this morning to hold open floor hearings, which are your opportunity to raise anything that is important and relevant, and I think we should know about and consider before we make any findings on our recommendations to the Secretary of State on either application for development consent, you will find information about the applications and documents produced for these examinations on the national infrastructure website is a landing page for both projects and further tabs that set out the examination procedure, the timetable relevant representations and examination documents for each project separately. Our rule six letters include the web addresses, please look at the website regularly because we do use it to communicate with you and to provide access to documents throughout both examinations. Now we know who we are and why we're here. I'm going to hand you over to Mrs. Paris.

04:26

Thank you, Mrs. Jones. Good morning, everybody. This is Jessica Powis speaking again. Shortly I'll be asking attendees to speak in the order set out in our agenda. But before I do just a few things to note. Today's hearing is being live streamed and recorded. The recordings that we make are retained and published. Therefore they form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the general data protection regulation applies. Does anyone have any questions about the terms on which our digital recordings are made?

04:57

I'm not seeing any raised hands. Alright.

05:00

Do have a raised hand, Mr. Gary Waffle and Mrs. Fiona Gilmore, I think.

05:07

Good morning, I just like to raise an issue about the transcripts, if it's appropriate. Now, I did some research looking at transcripts, particularly that of Dr. Tres Coffee, our local MP. And I was getting gassed at the numbers of errors. Her name is spelt coffee as in the drink. Thought nurse is referred to

often as fatness. And I just thought that if these are matters of public record, you're going to have to do something perhaps to realign the transcripts to what was actually said, Because going forward, they're not going to read sensibly if anyone wishes to refer to them. Thank you for that point. And I can completely appreciate where you're coming from we've we've picked up the same issue. And we have mentioned in some of the earlier hearings, I think the point to make is obviously a recording of this hearing is also published and retained on the website, and will remain in the examination libraries for these projects. So actually, that's the record, the transcript is really help as an additional measure, or anyone who can't access that. So we don't plan to make any changes to the transcripts, we're using an automated function that comes as a result of the Microsoft team's platform. And we're putting it out there and publishing it as a kind of additional measure of help people, but we don't plan to go back and try to repeat it because simply is just a great big job.

06:41

It may it may then be useful if there's some kind of caveat with each of the transcripts that says, please refer to the original, because you would expect the MPs name to be correct. And the place near

06:57

future reading. Absolutely. Take the point. Matt, thank you very much for that. And we will look into your your suggestion there about adding a disclaimer or a comment to so that people understand how they should be used. Thank you. Thanks a lot. Thanks very much. Okay. And can I consider your hand lowered? I think I think it's down.

07:19

Oh, not quite. Thank you. Okay, so there's nothing else being raised at this stage by anybody about the terms of our digital recordings, then I'll move on. And so open floor hearings are an opportunity for individuals and community groups to speak directly to the examining authorities and they're not about a particular location or topic. So the topic of your representation today is absolutely up to you. However, we may disregard the representation if it's vexatious or frivolous.

07:48

So turning to this morning's meeting, and given that we've decided to run this hearing as one rather than two sessions, I will just confirm that we plan to hear speakers in the following order. And so I have Julian Horrocks, Nicholas Thorpe, Jemima and Scott Tyndall, Gary capulin Fiona woo Gilmore, Nicola and Bruce winter sybella and pauses Minh, Paul Chandler, Mike Kaplan on behalf of Fishman Friston parish Council, Tim beech from snaky parish Council, Anthony Easton, and David why bar at the end. And I think just to note that Anthony Easton is the party that we're waiting for, and we're expecting around 1130 today.

08:32

He just sets out the speaking time guides that apply.

08:38

Please don't leave until you've had your turn to speak as if we as if you do, we won't be able to include you in a later session. To ensure that everyone has their opportunity to speak, we will need to be strict

in managing the time it's this morning. So please don't be offended if I have to ask you to stop talking at the end of your allotted time. If you have more to say you're very welcome to submit it in writing the deadline to which is the 17th of November. And as we've said before, written and oral contributions carry equal weight in this process. Good. I kept the name of the main speaker that we have representing the applicants today, please.

09:21

Can we have Mr. minutes today or somebody for the applicants?

09:30

Hello, hello. Yes. Good morning. everspace. Yes, it's Colin in us from the law firm of Sheffler Wedderburn appearing on behalf of both applicants set this open floor hearing. I'm instructed by Fiona Coyle, divisional solicitor with SPI legal. And I'm also accompanied this morning by Rich Morris, Senior Project Manager. Thank you very much, Mr. Ines. As my colleagues have done in the previous open floor hearings, I'll remind you may perhaps have this morning. You've heard this before. It's

10:00

To hear from the interested parties, and that you are here primarily to listen

10:05

to hearing, we will give you a brief opportunity to make some responding remarks on the matters that you consider must be drawn to our attention. Please confine these to five minutes. Detailed responses can be provided in writing at deadline to thank you only remind everybody that this is an opportunity for everyone here to have their say. So in fairness, just as you would not want to be interrupted when you speak, please do not interrupt other speakers. If you agree with or disagree with what they say then you can make that clear to us in your own speaking time, or in writing a deadline to every speaker should be allowed to make full use of their time to speak. If anyone does interrupt in a way that's unnecessary or disrupts the hearing, I will warn them and ask them again. Ask them to allow the hearing to continue. But if the same person interrupts again, we'll provide a second warning and repeated interruptions that lead to disruption can be viewed as unnecessary, unreasonable behaviour for which award of costs can be sought by other interested parties. So if anyone interrupts on a third occasion, following two warnings, in the interest of fairness to all participants, I will need to ask the case manager to exclude that person from the hearing.

11:08

introductions are now complete. Before I move on to the main business of the hearing, does anyone have any questions about how today's hearing will run?

11:21

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised or cameras coming on. So I assume that means we can move on to item two of our agenda and hear contributions from our speakers.

11:32

Before I introduce our first speaker this morning, I'll let you know that it's our intention not to intervene and your submissions as long as you remain relevant and within time, we will not interrupt you will listen carefully to you and my colleagues, if my colleagues or I have questions, and we'll raise those at the end of your speaking time. So the first speaker I have on my list is Julian Horrocks.

11:57

Good morning. Good morning, Dr. Horrocks. I can see and hear you. You have five minutes in which to make your points this morning. Mr. Williams will let you know with a slide on the screen when you have one minute left. And when you begin your contribution, could you also introduce yourself please? We're ready whenever you are.

12:15

Good morning. My name is Joe Horrocks. My family has been here for decades providing medical care to the local population and living among the Oregon has interdependent connectivity with the adjacent villages. And with the towns of Leysin and obrah which provide most of our needs shopping education, health services, emergency services and jobs. ordinance children attend co fairgreen or less in schools and we're able to walk to primary school or to the shop and Market Garden through the ancient footpath network. This will be lost when features land is destroyed. Forcing anyone suffer the pinch points on too long and unpleasant detour path past the works to get to school shop per church. This plan is not really fit for purpose. During the assembly 110 villages had weeks of total closure of one road for cable lane is this in store for ordering another pinch point. It would not be an inconvenience, it will be hardship. There are more than a mile of dwelling self with a pinch point on both sides of the road. That's a b 1122 there will be cut off when the road is closed. Why? Because there are no roads off the B 1122 that could be used to divert traffic. The only way out of ordering there will be through obrah making it an eight mile trip in one direction to lexden instead of one and a half mile long.

13:46

So this means suddenly the doctor dentist pharmacist optician vet care artist Leisure Centre physios cinema good at band practice football gym dance nursery, playgroup midwife primary schools High School, food shops, pub church and work will require contracts of 16 months there and back. A bus trip to lace than or to the train at Saks monitor will be glacial then school buses won't be able to pick up our children easily. access by the medical nursing and emergency services to the southern part of the village will be cut or slowed. It will feel like the Berlin Wall.

14:25

Perhaps this problem could be mitigated by not trenching by tunnelling under the road and River. Hardly. If the cables are underground, there is still whole roads on top. From configuring to order them the whole road looks at least 10 metres wide and wider junctions to accommodate articulated lorries turning from culture green it cuts through farmland passes within a few dozen metres of benefit Hall, and worryingly kofa green primary school then removes features lane two acres of the woods. There'll be two feeder junctions known as five and six from home.

15:00

Roads onto the obrah road. They're sited within an opposite ordinand core nursing home. So ATVs will Thunder by the pond of the nursing home on the west side of the road to stop at junction with sex, or drive by to turn off and shake the houses in gipsy lane on the eastern side at junction five

15:21

to access junctions that also plan not far to the north of ordinand caught on the east side. This means for junctions in very close proximity and a lot of noisy gear changing braking and engine idling whenever a vehicle approaches and 12 hours a day. The bus stop used by care workers and chill schoolchildren will be a pollution so on the road safety assessments admits that visibility of these junctions will be inadequate.

15:47

negotiating the road and crossing it will become problematic and hazardous. I don't understand. If the local councils have accepted this.

15:57

Heritage building may well suffer structurally but the elderly inhabitants will certainly be harmed by noise, vibration, loss of tranquillity, loss of garden and garden access and a dramatic increase in noxious pollution from airborne exhaust fumes and metallic particulates. What a grim outlook for the poor residents last year's will the businesses even survive, how many jobs will be lost if this valued care facilities squandered national infrastructure principles of February 2020 require project should improve the quality of life for people, benefit the natural environment, mitigate emissions for the climate, and provide benefits for the community? This project fails on every point. Thank you for listening.

16:42

Thank you very much for that helpful submission. Dr. Horrocks. I believe that my colleague Mr. Smith has a question that he would like to raise at this point. I'll try my best to answer.

16:54

I indeed I do. But Dr. Horrocks would be very, very glad to notice that it is not one that I expect you to answer at all. And I just wish it to be placed on the record as an action for the applicant to address a deadline to and we have had a number of representations that expressed concern or methods proposed for crossing various roads, and the potential for significant community impacts as a consequence of diversions that might be put into place.

17:26

The examining authorities would be greatly assisted by a clear explanation of from the applicants perspective which roads might be crossed by methods such as horizontal directional drilling that potentially involve removing the need to trench the roads or close roads. And because essentially, if this is a matter that can be addressed by being clearer about construction method, then it may well be that there are elements of community concern on this point that might reasonably be allayed, but we would ask the applicant to put in a statement a deadline to drawing our attention to the method proposals for principle road crossings.

18:07

And if methods that do not interfere with the road surface are not proposed to be used. If trenching is proposed to be used, then we need a clear explanation of why that is.

18:19

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Smith. And thank you to Dr. Horrocks for your time this morning.

18:27

I'm going to move on now to our second speaker, who we have Mr. Nicholas Thorpe.

18:33

I think representing beachview Holiday Park. Mr.

18:39

Good morning, I can hear you but I can't see you yet. It might be about that. You're about to hear it on screen.

18:49

Do you have your camera switched on stay Mr. Thorpe, just reset it. Anyway. Take some time to take takes a few moments to appear. There we are. I can see and hear you now. Thank you very much. Mr. Thorpe. As you're representing the organisation the beachview Holiday Park, you've got 10 minutes in which to make your points. Mr. Williams will let you know where the slide when you're halfway through your allotted time. And again, when you've got one minute left. And when you begin your contribution. Could you also introduce yourself please. We're ready whenever you are. Thank you. Thank you. opportunity to speak. My name is Ivan I'm on behalf of beachview Holiday Park. I would like to say that we are also positive towards offshore wind and renewable energy. However, it must not be at any cost. With EA one and an EA t DCR. application. There remains too many issues of sustained long term damage concerned concerning the onshore development. bhp Holiday Park is located just south of sizewell village and north of the proposed cable landing zone at Thorpe ness. My family have owned manage the holiday park for 15 years. And prior to this in the 80s and 90s. We had our own

20:00

Family caravan here. We love the unspoiled coastal landscape as to all our residents and guests who visit and stay full time to the year. Last we heard of these proposals. This was when saddles who were acting for Scottish power at the time requested to visit, they wanted us Scottish powers intentions. The visit did not involve any talk about tourism or how the proposals would seek to minimise impact on the protected OMB landscape. There was no attempt at mind rest. Instead, we were told that scottishpower explore exploring cable landing points scottishpower interested in our section of the beach and running cables across our holiday park, having worked from other cable routes and adjacent fields, we knew their plans would have involved moving all caravans and lodges off site and closing beachview down. It made clear that this could be done in scottishpower West under wished under a compulsory purchase order. Luckily, we issue all holiday homeowners with the licence which provides individual rights, and we informed saddles that this would not be so straightforward, as under the terms of individual licences. scottishpower have to negotiate separately with each owner. Thankfully, this helped rule out further

exploration by SPR, however, highlighted to us that scottishpower would have had no concern about closing down a tourism business to achieve connection for these wind farms. The content these DCIS confirms the SPR continues to remain oblivious to the impact of their proposals on tourism and the OMB. We remain extremely concerned about Scottish cars intentions. The content of these vcos does little little to reduce fears that scottishpower will seek to ensure minimal damage or destruction to local communities and businesses. There is no serious attempt to mitigate or offset set damage done during construction or for that matter post construction.

22:03

National Grid equally culpable, is becoming clear that these DC O's are the first in line of an onslaught of energy projects being directed to this location by National Grid National Grid appears to operate without concern for planning processes. They were virtually in this process long before COVID-19.

22:24

National Grid were absent throughout consultation. And today, they have not been available to be subjected to any form of scrutiny. We're all earning that national grid intend to or have already provided connection offers to a number of other projects at first, and their speakers have indicated that spot Scottish powers ill conceived plans are also national grid's Trojan horse. And it's abundantly clear that if these DCIS are granted, the precedent will be set that allows grovewood Friston to become a strategic connection point, a connection that national grid intend to exploit over and over again.

23:05

This is already happening even though the Friston grid connection has not yet been given the Go ahead, let alone built

23:13

the Suffolk coast and he's a OMB is a landscape that is supposed to be protected in law. This year it should be celebrating its 50th anniversary. These should be the golden years. However, lamb is facing the biggest this time from National Grid, Scottish power and other energy companies who see no issue and repeatedly digging up on industrialising the OMB and surrounding countryside scottishpower say they are a world leader in in energy in offshore energy.

23:47

And on their website they state will bring you more than just energy. How true these words are for us in East Suffolk as Buddhists will bring diggers cables, trenches, who read haul roads, footpath and road closures and acres of industrial build, plus many more years of devastating damage if other projects follow. The tourism industry here in this part of the Suffolk coast is symbiotic. With the appeal of our A and B the natural soundings he's the big skies the peacefulness and tranquillity. Access to coast and countryside, footpaths and walks are all essential to the sustained sustainability of tourism and tourism businesses. In our world Boris and visitors not Scottish power and energy companies that support the local shops cafes, restaurants, holiday parks, BM B's guest houses and hotels scottishpower have consistently failed to acknowledge the true potential for these proposals to cause economic economic damage locally. Instead, they tried to build a case for local benefit, highlighting a handful of job training placements and a small number

25:00

permanent jobs be based in Lowestoft. We know from past development of Gallup and greater Gabbard, there are no permanent construction at construction jobs in the immediate area. substations are unmanned automated facilities, they only access for occasional safety inspections or when there are problems or equipment failures, and they do not sustain a local workforce or local jobs like those created and sustained by the tourism industry here on the soft coast.

25:32

And these troubling times, it's hard enough to run a business let alone breakeven research undertaken by the Suffolk coast dmo in 2019 found that the impacts of Scottish powers e one and E two construction along with EDS sizewell c construction could reduce annual spend into the local economy of up to 40 million pounds a year 113 local businesses surveyed including beachview 60% felt energy proposals meant visitors would be less likely or much less likely to return or repeat visit 85% of annual revenue could fall could be impacted on by up to by up to 20%. In revenue reduction, and 23%. nearly a quarter of businesses felt the impact could go in up to sorry, more than 50% reduction in annual revenue.

26:29

A 20 to 50% reduction in annual revenue is enough to make most businesses viable. So potentially 85% of local tourism businesses could be rendered on viable from the effect of a one and a two and sysvol. See, and this does not include the impact of other energy proposals that we are learning curve. It's clear that a full and concise independent cumulative impact study is urgently required that these and other enset projects.

27:00

To stop these and other projects writing off the tourism industry here. The impacts of these proposals cannot be underestimated. These vcoss are a national scandal in the name of offshore green energy. A scandal that is happening right here in Suffolk, where I OMB and tourism industry is being felled by its custodians, National Grid power companies and government. We should all be ashamed if nothing is done to address and resolve this whilst we still have the opportunity. Because if nothing is done, our children and grandchildren will again be asking that familiar question, could they not do anything right? It's hard to comprehend how these projects cannot be placed at the top of the agenda within the offshore transmission network review. An end esoc own offshore coordination project or all avenues must be explored including an offshore ring lane offshore connection hubs and a quote and a coordinated onshore delivery. There are existing brownfield sites which have been mentioned within these examinations, and there is an opportunity to create shared connection points using existing facilities, especially in locations near to London, and along the Thames gateway where most of the energy will be required. All other options must be explored in order to save a Suffolk and the a&b from a legacy of industrialised nation and damage. Let this generation not be the one labelled with ruining the Suffolk counties or villages like Friston. By rushing through nuclear and offshore wind. We feel these proposals must be rejected to ensure the least damaging a least damaging solution can be found for all concerned, a rejection of the proposals provides National Grid scottishpower and others,

including the Secretary of State, time to agree an acceptable alternative, an exemplary solution that encourages coordination, where all parties can work together for a greater good.

29:06

Thank you very much, Mr. Thorpe, you've kept happily to time. And your points are really clear. So thanks very much for that I'd mentioned I'm sure you're aware, but you've raised a lot of issues around socio economic and tourism impacts. That is one of the principal issues we identified at the start of this examination, and therefore something we will be examining as we go through. So thank you very much. Just a final thing you mentioned, reference to other projects, the future projects that may be coming forward and trying to connect Friston to if you have any information about that, that you'd like to put in a deadline to about the specifics of which projects you believe that to be, then we've been asking all parties to do that as well because we are feeding into a our first or second issue specific hearing at the beginning of December in which we start to unpack some of these issues a bit more. So thank you very much. All that like to is the 17th of November like this. Thanks

30:00

Your time.

30:02

Okay. I'm going to move on now to our third pair of speakers and we have Jamal Murray and Scott Tyndall.

30:08

Please.

30:13

Hi. Good morning.

30:17

I can't see but I'm just waiting for you to appear on screen hopefully. Yeah. Turn off. Come on. Oh, no, thank you. Oh, lovely. Yep, I can see you now.

30:27

Thank you very much.

30:29

So as members of a household making a shared contribution this morning, you have seven minutes in which to make your points. And Mr. Williams will let you know when you have one minute remaining. And when you begin your contributions, could you please introduce yourselves and, and go ahead whenever you're ready.

30:46

My name is Dr. Tyndall. I grew up in Preston and my parents still live in the house I grew up in. So I no longer live in the area. My husband and I regularly visit primarily to see my parents but also because

we love it. We love the area we love coming in the area in and around Kristen offers so much to us and the many visitors that it attracts worldfamous views, landscapes, areas of outstanding natural beauty, great British wildlife and fresh sea air. Sadly, all these things are going to be negatively impacted by the proposed FPR plans, landscapes destroyed, torn up wildlife displaced killed with fresh air polluted all in the name of green energy. You have to question why, if the reasons for coming to this area or being ruined, or anybody want to visit, I have to be honest, sadly after loss.

31:43

Another concern of us as visitors is the impact the work is going to have on traffic.

31:49

Currently, it takes us on average three and a half hours to get from our home in southwest London, to Friston just about justifiable for a weekend away. But if that travel time increases much, which it will during construction, then coming down for a weekend might not be worth the travel time, a feeling badly backed up by many of our friends who visit the area as well. And I can only imagine lots and lots of other tourists to the area.

32:17

Considering how vital tourism is to the area's economy, this is hugely concerning. And I worry that if tourism is lost during the years of construction, the area may never recover once the project is completed, if that's the case, there are other projects possibly in the pipeline. I'm not sure whether this area's tourism industry will ever recover.

32:42

It's not been shown that this project will bring many jobs to the area. So the jobs lost won't be replaced.

32:51

I'm mainly focusing on tourism, but I also think it's worth focusing on new residents to the area. As mentioned, I grew up in Preston. And despite currently living in London, my husband and I plan to move back to the area in the next two to three years. This plan is now sadly very much in question.

33:10

The idea that new young families as well as retirees are going to be put off moving to the area due to the proposed plans is very sad. And again, it's great to have a negative impact on the local economy. I think yesterday one of one of the speakers mentioned he was a retiree living in Bristol, but he would have been put off moving to the area if he'd known what was happening.

33:33

Um, I know.

33:36

Hi, my name is Scott. I drive and I were married a year ago. And I guess you could say I'm married into Suffolk and we do have plans to move here on a permanent basis in the not too distant future.

33:50

I guess I have some specific points I borrowed a little bit of I've watched Dr. Coffee statement. And I mean one of a few of the things that stuck out and I wanted to relate some of my comments in our comments to the national policy statement for energy as well. One of the things that stuck out from Dr. Comments was,

34:10

I mean, the idea that first of all, there's significant greenhouse gas emissions that will likely come from the substation, and that those greenhouse gases might be made illegal or outlawed by it by some upcoming government directive.

34:26

and choosing to think that therefore the substation will need to be six times its current proposed size. So I guess I just encourage you to look into that properly, because in either case, either there's going to be a lot of presumably unhealthy greenhouse gases being admitted in first and I'm talking obviously post construction here.

34:46

You know, other than either there's going to be a high degree of unhealthy greenhouse gases emitted in person or, more likely there's going to be a need in order to

34:57

make the substation six times six times larger, both ways.

35:01

Both of which the impact seem too great to satisfy the criteria as outlined in the NPS statement, NPS for energy. And that just seems to be a major red flag with regards to the environmental considerations, again, post construction.

35:15

You know, I think the impact on the health of the residents of the local area, which is another specific point covered by the NPS, I think is obviously been well documented. Dr. Horrocks mentioning, you know, the destruction to children walking to primary school, and obviously, it's a relatively older area. And the anxieties that must be caused

35:37

on people with the disruption that it will cause, I mean, I just encourage you to guess to consider the mental health, as well as the traffic, the dust, and the noise that contributes to physical health is a real mental health impact, I'm sure on the anxiety of people having to deal with all this

35:53

final two points.

35:56

I guess, reading through the NPS, for energy, it seems clear that you need to consider both the accumulation of and the interrelationship between the effects on the environment, the economy and the community as a whole. Even though each chapter will on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place, I'm sure there's lots of mitigation measures and considers mitigation measures being planned. But really just encourage you to, to stick to that work, stick to those guidance and consider what the accumulation and the interrelationship because specifically, the environment will be dramatically worsened by the construction. And as we've said, the ongoing operation of the substation, from noise as well as greenhouse gas emissions, specifically, the economy will clearly suffer as there's little or no permanent jobs created. Well, there's a very obvious negative impact on tourism, and on potential future residents to the economy, which affects things like the provision of services, you know, we all know more people that are in an area, the greater the access to, the closer the hospitals will be, the less time people will need to spend an ambulance and that sort of thing. So there's a real economic impact there. And that relates to the community as a whole as well, we're just going to suffer considerable physical and mental health detriment, both as a result of the construction and I think, indeed, it is an ongoing operation of the substation.

37:15

And well, maybe maybe each of these measures can in part be mitigated. When you think of them together, as I think you must. The mitigation is just can't can't be done appropriately.

37:27

And just finally, I would, again, this relates to something Dr. Coffee said, and I just wanted to ask, I think she was I'm paraphrasing here was basically saying, we think you should wait until the government has a clear strategy on how to bring all this offshore energy onshore in a way that is less detrimental to the environment as a whole, which makes eminent sense, rather than doing this one by one. It makes sense. That should be one overarching strategy. And I think your response, Mr. Smith, which, which I think makes sense, which is the government is always planning new things, and we have to poke it, we have to kind of work with what we have. I just wanted to ask whether that is your decision, ideally, is it within your remit to pause this decision or not? Because if it is within your remit, I would really strongly encourage you to wait until there's a clear plan from the government. Otherwise, we're going to end up with a massive substation first. And that is unnecessary when viewed in the context of a coherent plan from the government.

38:27

Thank you very much. Thanks very much for these and this all of these submissions. That was very useful. On your final point, I think Mr. Smith would like to answer that final question. So let's handle that. Well, whether whether it's

38:41

an answer or not, we remain to see but I thought it deserved a response given that the question was formally posed. And as, as we've reflected on a number of occasions, we we are any decision maker dealing with substantial infrastructure proposal such as these nearly always finds themselves in a circumstance where

39:03

there are a sequence of reviews potential changes to legislation, potential changes to policy that could affect the decision that might finally be made. And essentially, the position that we find ourselves in here, and reporting to the Secretary of State as the final decision maker on these applications is that we must provide the secretary of state with the best advice that we can distilled from our investigations conducted during these examination processes. If, for example, there are changes to the policy or legal framework in relation to to these matters of making connections to the transmission system during the time of our examination, then we can clearly report those changes to the Secretary of State as we move along. We will also in any case, here, and we'll be reporting to the Secretary of State on the matters, the concerns raised by

40:00

a broad range of organisations and members of local community. And

40:06

if there is no formal change by the end of our examination, then we must report on the basis of the policy framework which is in place before us. But again, as I, as I indicated at the preliminary meeting, meetings are over, we are in a world where the final decision maker on these two applications is also the secretary of state who was commissioned a review of the offshore transmission network. This is coming to that Secretary of State's desk as well. And essentially here.

40:38

This is about a process that ensures that that Secretary of State is armed with the best set of information to make the decisions that they have to make. And that is what we are charged with doing. And whilst we have indicated that we can't stop, because decision making processes examinations in this context do not stop unless the Secretary of State in person essentially says to us, please stop. We can't. But what we can do is assemble the best evidence sets that we can for the Secretary of State, and that's our job.

41:16

Great, thank you very much. machines. Lucky. Thanks, Mr. Smith. Thank you very much. to both of gentlemen, Scott Tyndall for your submissions today.

41:27

Moving on, then, the next household on my list I have is Gary waple. And Fiona Gilmore.

41:36

Good morning again. All right. I hope you can hear me and see me we can indeed Thank you very much. Am I pronouncing your name correctly, Mr. waple? Not in the slightest.

41:48

That's absolutely fine. It's been a lifetime.

41:53

And as we're a household, we've got a fair bit to say say I'm afraid apologies now, but we're gonna have to race. That's fine. And so as I've said, You have seven minutes as a household. And you'll be warned with the slide at one minute. And please, could you introduce yourselves when you speak and yeah, if you need to go quickly, that's okay, too. I'll give you a word. I'll let you know when you when you've run out of time. Right. Thanks very much. Good morning. My name is Gary Waple and I live in Snape. Our house is on the a 1094 Road, which will in turn be turned into a gridlock carpark because of increased commercial traffic over a period of a minimum of 12 years. Should the applicants proposals for building substations at Friston proceed. For the record I utterly reject the applicant has proposed plans for the landing of renewable offshore wind energy onshore it Friston by thought near speech, resulting in the unnecessary destruction of virgin coastal countryside. I also support the UK government's objectives of reducing the UK as carbon footprint through green energy initiatives and I support plans for wind farm energy generation, but we also need to ensure that we deliver clean clean energy green energy cleanly. I also commend previous oral submissions that have expressed disappointment at the holding of the oral submission hearings virtually instead of in writing, waiting rather until live meetings could have been held in due course, especially given the Bayes review that might overtake this process anyway. As I have already submitted detailed written submissions within deadline one, I shall do no more now than provide a short summary of the points I have submitted. The applicants proposals to damage irreparably an area of unspoiled countryside including an AONB is completely unacceptable. This proposed damage denigrates the green credentials of the offshore wind farm energy generation and taints the whole project as dirty energy, as whenever end to end processes are not significantly green. From start to finish of a process. The green credentials of the whole project must fail. My dismissal of the applicants proposals are supported by and influenced by our local MPs or submission that adopted tres coffee, also Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, who has concluded and I quote, the impact of this proposal on the country side vital habitats, heritage assets, the amenities of local residents and tourism mean that I formally object to these DCA applications and I urge the planning Inspectorate not to recommend them to the Secretary of State. The likely rippling effects from the time substations are proposed until final completion, and then onwards during their operational lifetime will bring about

45:00

adverse ecological, economic and health impacts for untold numbers of years to come, which could have been avoided if the applicant had heeded Dr. cough. his advice and I quote again, throughout the consultation stages, I have suggested alternatives to scottishpower renewables, including the proposed nuclear brownfield site at Bradwell, which would have meant less onshore cabling, and substations in a more appropriate location. SPR have chosen not to pursue that which in my view, would have made their applications acceptable, and are instead proposing a 32 metre wide cabling corridor across nine kilometres of sensitive landscape with large substations on the edge of frishman village without adequate landscaping. Added to this not a single oral submission at any of the hearings to date has expressed a single phrase of support for the applicant's proposals, perhaps hardly surprising, but nevertheless a condemnation of the stupid vandalism that these proposals will cause. If this outdated point to point system is used, the applicants proposals must fail any common sense test of what is allowable, when all are convinced of a perfectly acceptable alternative Brownfield solution that would not spoil an area of outstanding and fragile beauty in the British countryside irreparably that this has been endorsed by the area's MP, who is also a senior UK Government Minister of State gives me hope

that common sense will prevail in the end, even if in short supply thus far. Thank you. Thank you very much.

46:55

Good morning, Mrs. Gilmore. My name is Fiona Gilmore, I've been an advisor to the alternative fuels industry overseas for some years, and I'm now a supporter in every sense of green energy. My family's had a home here for over 30 years. We love this fragile environment precisely because it is not developed or industrialised. It's full, as other speakers have said, of beauty, wilderness and marsh. We know there are better alternative solutions. Many of us have been campaigning for this better future solution. This week, I attended the virtual spectator energy summit. National Grid sent us a message saying that nothing would change but wind energy projects due to be completed in 2028. EA one and EA two as you know are due to be completed in 2028. Mr. Graham Cooper told us that it was too late. However, Greenpeace at the same summit, John Sobhan stated that grid connections are very expensive. We need more of them. There's a failure by the German government not to provide the infrastructure sooner.

48:16

Our view is that these applicants' plans and I include National Grid in that are not good. Not moderately good, but very, very bad plans. And therefore, we're relying on you the inspectors to see from our detailed written sub-representations how flaky the research methods are, for example, the applicant says negligible impact on tourism, that is absolutely unrealistic. To see how flawed the alternative site assessments are, and to know that everything is connected. Jill Horrocks helped us understand what is at stake for our ecology. Just remember the number of species at the hundred river 872. The rich biodiversity will suffer enormously. The past two lives and livelihoods it's hard to imagine

49:12

a loss in the tourism sector of 700 million over 12 years of construction means severe economic decline, health decline, mental health decline, social decline, the exponential negative impacts are exponential, not a simple subtraction. Everything is connected. We look to you to reject these plans and stop this unnecessary destruction. And we know from earlier tenet K to specialist engineers, that there are better cost-efficient solutions available in the next few years. We support Dr. Theresa Coffey our local MP in calling for a brownfield site

50:00

solution and an integrated solution. And we believe that the government, in the next few weeks and months, can fast-track the necessary legislation to enable integrated solutions. Thank you. Thank you very much, feel more and a bit in that. And I suppose one of the things I would say the summit you refer to that take place this week, if there's any material from that, that you would like to submit into this examination, obviously, that's not currently before us. So anything that you would like us to see specifically, please put that in a deadline to on the 17th of November, as part of your submission? Thank you very much. And, and the other points raised about alternatives. We will take all that into account in formulating in particular our jet, our agenda for issue-specific hearing to which is about the site selection, and design aspects of the scheme. But thank you for your ongoing involvement and, and helpful submissions.

50:57

Thank you. Mr. Smith, I think may have a question. Before you go.

51:05

Ed, just very briefly, and there was a final reference there, Mrs. Gilmore to a specific engineering study. Now, we can't just that we have already and a plethora of documentation in front of us, all of which we are, are going through with fine tooth comb. But nevertheless, if that is if that is a document that is already with us, then merely in your written submission, highlight the reference to it so that we can find it. However, if that reference to to the engineering opinion on alternative approaches is is one that is not with us, then the document does need to be formally submitted. Thank you. Thank you very much.

51:49

Thank you, Mr. Smith. And thank you both for your contributions this morning. I'm going to move on now then, please. And our next speakers on the list I have down is Nicola and Bruce winter, please.

52:01

Good morning. Good morning. I can hear and see you. Thank you. My husband actually is Nicholas winter, not Bruce. That should have been made clear. Okay, so it's Nicola and Nicholas. Yes. Okay. Thank you, that's just hasn't transferred through. And good morning. Thanks for joining us, as members of a household making a shared contribution. You have seven minutes in which to make your points this morning. And Mr. Williams will let you know when you have one minute remaining by putting this slide up on the screen. And when you begin your contributions, please could you introduce yourselves for the benefit of the recording? And we're ready whenever you are. Thank you, and thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Nicola winter. My husband and I speak residents of Frisco and having lived here for 30 years. We're both self employed. We've been active members of this community, and our wish is to remain in this beautiful part of the country. We both heartily object to the plans proposed by SPR. At the concluding stages of these open floor hearings, it seems there is little new to be said earlier speakers have been varied, and they've made many valid points eloquently and the work done by the status group has been inspiring.

53:16

The sheer number of written representations and speakers demonstrate the strength of feeling regarding the plans, which hangovers like the proverbial Sword of Damocles. Most of us support the idea of green energy, but it needs to be done in a grown up intelligent well thought out way, not piecemeal, with further future projects being bolted on in a haphazard Oh, let's stick it their passion. The current proposals would create a vast Brownfield industrial site in an a&b This is a betrayal. There are already alternative brownfield sites available closer to the shoreline where the wind power will come ashore. I don't need to list these you know them. With additional energy projects planned surely in this country, we are not without planners and designers who can take the project envisaged and come up with a more joined up approach. One that doesn't just trash the local environment that the government allegedly claims it wants to protect and safeguard see the August 2020 environment bill. I find myself coming back to the same question. Why is the proposed substation being built so far inland at all?

tracking across from landfill to Friston is a significant distance. It will cost a huge amount of money. Much has been said about the effect it will have on roads, residence and land blight.

54:44

Mental welfare is something we hear about almost daily. Even before the COVID-19 lockdowns mental health was recognised as a key factor to the nation's health. We're all exhorted to live the kind of healthy lives that can help us cope with stress.

55:01

This part of Suffolk is a recognised place of recreation in the original sense of the word. It helps folk, visitors and residents alike, relax, unwind, de stress and rebuild the mental resources so that they can continue to face the challenges that our increasingly frantic world presents. You may think this is a purely emotional hyperbole, but consider the financial costs of medical care for those suffering from mental disability and the loss of their contribution to communities when they are disabled due to stress. Places that promote mental well being need to be treasured and valued. At the stroke of a pen. We are in danger of being deprived of just such an environment here in Friston, refreshment, and restoration of spirits is not going to be found when we're faced with the bleak walls of a soulless building, the background hum emanating from it and the light pollution it will inevitably degenerate. And then there's our wonderful network of local footmark footpaths, a seemingly simple pleasure, but rich in opportunities for enjoying and appreciating wildlife, for exercise for contemplation and reflection, for the inspiration of writers, composers and artists, and for simply recharging mental batteries. allowing this project to go ahead would betray our heritage. To misquote William Blake, please do not allow dark satanic substations to be built on England's green and pleasant land. Thank you. Thank you.

56:39

Good morning, Mr. Winter.

56:41

My name is Nicholas winter. And in hearing yesterday, there was mention of costs versus benefits. So the SPR proposals. And it seems to me though, that many of the environmental and human costs are intangible and very difficult to quantify. For example, how would you quantify the isolation of Kristen by this and the other construction projects that are likely to follow and potentially the death of Kristen as a viable village, or the shortening of someone on the side the life of someone on the cable route, because they are anxious and depressed about damage caused to their environment in a way of life. I'm sure that planning involves a lot of cost benefit analysis, and that you will be experts. But these are very difficult things to put on a spreadsheet. But just as an example, suppose you suppose 10,000 people are affected significantly by SPS proposals in some way. And the average cost to them is 100,000 pounds. That's a billion pounds. And I suspect it's an underestimate is SPR willing to pay a billion pounds to those affected by a scheme. I suspect not, in which case they don't want to pay the true cost or their proposals. They are expecting us to bear that cost though. And for it not to appear on their balance sheet. Whatever the actual number, it will be a large number and probably fundamentally unknowable.

57:58

The benefit to the country is that wind power is connected to the grid, but not at any specific place. Friston is surely the most environmentally damaging option being furthest from the coast. It is also the most damaging in human terms being so close to Friston and because of the long trench needed for the cable causing distress or disruption along its length. So we know there are alternatives and this makes it particularly upsetting for us all affected. This is simply unnecessary.

58:27

doubtless you will be asking SPR and National Grid about alternatives. But they have a vested interest. They want the site to be Friston. So they will inevitably say there is no viable alternative, that other potential sites are too small, too expensive or needed for something else. They won't see anything that compromises their case for the western side. But when you're talking about costs, they won't be including the direct and indirect costs of all of us who will be affected.

58:52

In fact, National Grid said almost nothing at all. And this is quite unacceptable and open society, National Grid both secretive and parties on how to get around this problem when they are also the experts. The answer I suggest is to tell them that SPS proposal has to high cost, environmental and human terms. They must produce a more environmentally acceptable proposal connecting near the coast. They will complain but then being an urgent resourceful people, they will come up with an alternative. Indeed, if they are a well run company, they probably already have a plan B although of course they won't say so. I hope desperately that you will reject the SPR proposals. Thank you. Thank you very much for the submissions, Mr. And Mrs. Winter, much appreciated on the national grid point. You'll know that you're not the first to raise the question of their involvement and particularly in this examination we have we will be inviting them to issue specific hearing today referred to already

59:51

and we are continuing to there are interested parties that were continuing to request their submissions on some of these matters and also the

1:00:00

to consult on their behalf. Oh, that's good to hear. Thank you.

1:00:04

Thanks very much for your time this morning. Thank you.

1:00:08

Okay. I'm going to move on to our next speakers sybella. And Paul sysmon, please.

1:00:17

Yes. Good morning, Mrs. purse. I'm smell assessment. And my husband calls next week. We're residents of Reston. And we've lived here for 20 years. And I will speak on both of our hearts today. Thank you very much. I'll let you know. And again, you have seven minutes in which to make your points this morning. And we'll let you know, in the same way with Fs slide on the screen and you have one minute remaining. So can be introduce yourselves. And when you begin speaking, then we're

ready to hear you. Good. Okay. Well, I think I've introduced myself and I'm actually going to concentrate today on three areas. The first area is site selection. And I think it's been said many times before in these hearings that had the applicant conducted the site selection process properly, a different site or an alternative solution, with significantly less environmental and socio economic impacts would have been identified. One such site is board seat.

1:01:13

I would suggest that as inspectors might wish to consider in relation to the board the bramford cable route three points. The first point is whether the applicant makes sufficient disclosure of the impact of the changes from the HVDC to the HV AC technology in its application to amend the 2014 decio specifically, the reduction in the capacity of the trench to accommodate the cables for East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two and the consequent harm arising from those changes.

1:01:46

Secondly, whether the Secretary of State had the information to assess whether there was compelling case in the public interest to grant consent to those changes, no decision maker could come from decision when relying on a flawed evidence base. And so could the Secretary of State lawfully approve the changes to the 2014 DCF.

1:02:08

And thirdly, that the app is properly investigated expanding the existing board seat bramford cable trench, so that the terms of the 2014 decio could be implemented as originally envisaged.

1:02:22

The secondary I want to look at is reasonable alternative.

1:02:26

The applicant has failed to mention the reasonable alternative to the proposed development that it has investigated, namely the offshore transmission structures. A massive development of substations Friston conflicts with the prevailing view as to best practice for the delivery of power from offshore wind farms into the electricity grid, existing projects and proven technologies implemented elsewhere in the North Sea. instance the German ball in three and the dorwin. Three projects prove that it is feasible to build an offshore hub capable of collecting all the power from the wind farms off the East Anglian coast and connecting it to the grid onshore at a single point, either an existing substation site or a new substation on Brownfield land such as Bradwell.

1:03:16

The absolute should be required to revisit its approach to scheme design striking the correct balance between commercial and environmental considerations.

1:03:26

It is possible to speculate that the applicant is relentlessly pursuing the substations at Friston because the applicant has placed its own commercial interests to develop these onshore connections at the lowest possible cost to itself above those public interest. It is further possible to speculate that this

return for the Spanish shareholders of the applicant may be crystallised through the sale of the completed development within the next few years.

1:03:55

In effect, these projects are a massive transfer of value from the inhabitants and businesses of rural East Suffolk to Spanish financial investors.

1:04:08

The third point I want to cover today is that of cumulative impact which we have helped clearly heard much about in these hearings.

1:04:15

The findings of the cumulative impact assessment presented by the applicant are incorrect due to the applicant's assessment failing to consider other developments reasonably expected on the basis of information in the public domain to be cited next to the applicant's onshore infrastructure and Friston.

1:04:34

The six additional projects are the Nautilus HVDC interconnector with Belgium the Euro link HVDC interconnector with the Netherlands. The connectors for the expanded Greta Gabbard and galloper wind farms, and SCD one and SCD two

1:04:53

the cumulative impact considered by the applicant only in the context is only in the context of both

1:05:00

East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two projects. This isn't an adequate and flawed approach.

1:05:09

In conclusion, by rejecting the DCR applications, the inspectors will provide the time for the applicant and national grid to develop more appropriate plans. It will enable the conclusion to the base review to be taken into account and experts to develop plans for the future involving offshore infrastructure connected to the grid at brownfield sites.

1:05:34

This would align with the government stated policy in the offshore wind sector deal Of March 2020. March 2019, sorry, to ensure that impacts of transmission infrastructure onshore and offshore are acceptable.

1:05:51

For the inspectors to take any other decision would result in this process in the inspectors own words, being a rye. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your submissions this morning. And I note that some of the material covered those in your deadline one submissions, I don't think I need you to ask, I didn't going to ask you to do anything else and the deadline to but thank you very much. It's all very clear.

1:06:17

And this brings us then to the end of our list of speakers for session one in our agenda. And but as we've said, No introductions, we have taken the decision to combine sessions one and two this morning. But looking at the clock, we're now at 1106. It's it's some I think, probably time for short breaks. So what I'm going to suggest is that we take a 15 minute break

1:06:39

and reconvene after that to hear the session two speakers and at that point when Smith and my colleague will be taking over leading the receipt of submissions at that point. So where are we so if we say that we'll reconvene at 1125 and we'll see you all then. Thank you very much.