

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: My ref 20023093 and 20023092  
**Date:** 15 November 2020 16:55:50

---

As below

----- Forwarded message -----

[REDACTED] >  
Date: 15 Nov 2020 16:54  
Subject: My ref 20023093 and 20023092  
To: <[EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
Cc:

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to bring to your attention Two points that I hope will be put forward at the Issue Specific Hearings starting 1st Dec .

Firstly the fact that Thorpeness beach is suffering hugely from erosion and as far as I am aware there has not been a sight inspection take place to date. The fact that erosion has accelerated since the disturbance to the sea bed by Galloper/Gabbard cannot be dismissed . Not only would SPR be disturbing the sea bed close to shore but inland vibration from HDD at landfall .

Such landslip and destruction of the gampions that has taken place put to try to deflect the sea at Thorpeness means the future is bleak for that coastline.

Secondly in the scoping opinion John Pitchford SCC and Philip Ridley Waveney SC stated that on ecology no reference to anything relating to migratory birds. Lack of information in relation to wildfowl and waders woodcock and waxwing.

RSPB and Natural England will pick this up hopefully but it is essential is included in the Assessment. End quote.

I believe no reference to migrating birds have been put forward.

I feel that as the proposed landfall site is a magnet to exhausted migrating birds this needs investigating.

Finally the bird population as a whole is set to suffer due to loss of habitat Unnecessary removal of trees and hedgerows from landfall to substation location , no amount of replanting can mitigate this .

My parting comment is that as most other interested parties have quoted already SPR and NGrid should not connect here ,

Brownfield sites are the place for them.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Pat Dorcey