

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: EA1 North & EA2
Date: 15 December 2020 07:52:53

Dear Sir,

[REDACTED]

However, some of the individual additional land plots are nevertheless of substantial extent in their own individual terms. Their taking and use by the proposed development is of prospectively substantial effect, in terms for example of additionally taking or affecting the use of a substantial element of a field (Work No.7 and Work No 33 (High House Farm), or bringing the effects of construction substantially closer than previously to residential receptors in a village (Work No.7 and Woodside Barn Cottages/ Work No.33). There is a proposal to acquire permanent rights that, although over a relatively small land area, will have an enduring and significant effect for those with current interests in that land (High House Farm) and on those using the Public Right of Way network. These are indicators of materiality and of the desirability of the provision of notice to and engagement with classes of persons broader than those with interests in the affected land and entitled to notice under the CA Regulations.'

We are dismayed that the Inspectorate has accepted this change from the applicant to the development area of the landside works in the notification dated 19th November 2020. The proposed development now reaches within a whisker of our Grade 2* Listed Church and has come into the village, consequently, it is unreasonable to state that *'The ExAs note that the proposed additional land is of limited extent when compared with the scale of the land required for the onshore works as applied for'*, as this has a material effect to the application at least for the landside development at Friston as the applicant has chosen to locate this massive development in a wholly unsuitable site adjacent to and now within a village.

The applicant chose the site, consulted on the land required, stated that the Rochdale envelope was used in order to demonstrate that this would be the maximum extent of the development. Now effectively is saying the assumptions made at the consultation stage were incorrect and more land is required.

Extensive representations were made to the applicant on the impact of the development on the choice of Friston from the very initial stages of the consultation process, all ignored. These sustained that the site chosen is too small and too close to the village to successfully accommodate the infrastructure needed to support the scale of development proposed on the village of Friston especially that the village is prone to flooding as demonstrated by last year's events.

The proposed amendments to 'the land grab' demonstrate the inadequacy allowing the applicant to use the Rochdale Envelope to consider such massive transformative proposals especially in such historically sensitive locations within a settlement. That in such sensitive locations the Inspectorate should require a full design is submitted by the applicant. Effectively the applicant is now maintaining an inadequate design was produced, *consulted on*, applied for, but now more land is required.

How can any new proposals be relied upon that they will achieve the required performance?

Is the applicant in fact creating infrastructure to support future projects?

These are the similar tactics as deployed by the applicant in the change of transmission from Bowdsey to Brandford which have been highlighted during the hearing the whole process appear to be one of shifting sands.

We have always maintained that the proposals at Friston were too close to the village did not allow sufficient room for adequate mitigation and now find that the applicant actually intends to revise the design to bring the development adjacent to the village church.

This is design by stealth and proves the inadequacy of using the Rochdale envelope to evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Yours faithfully

Luigi Beltrandi and Mya Manakides