



Offshore Wind Farms

EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH

PINS Ref: EN010077

and

EAST ANGLIA TWO

PINS Ref: EN010078

**SEAS Response to Applicant's Oral
LANDFALL REPRESENTATION
At Issue Specific Hearing 2, 3 Dec 2020
Deadline 3 – 15 December 2020**

SEAS (Suffolk Energy Action Solutions)

Unique Ref. No. EA1(N): 2002 4494

Unique Ref. No. EA2: 2002 4496



info@suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk

<https://www.suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk/>



DEADLINE 3
SEAS Response to Applicant's Oral
LANDFALL REPRESENTATION
at Issue Specific Hearing 2, 3 Dec 2020

LANDFALL Item 4a

Summary

1. Physical investigations and assessments
2. HDD a non-starter
3. The Examination is also a non-starter

1. When attending SPR's consultation PI in March 2019, I asked if there had been any seismic and coastal erosion surveys of Thorpeness cliffs and the sea bed. The answer was no as they did not want to disturb landowners unnecessarily at this stage.

A year and a half later, to the surprise of most attending the hearing, we discover that the Applicant is no further on and still relying on out-of-date DBAs and EDF's research which present its own problems.

SEAS once again request a time line of the following investigations as listed in the OLCMS

1. Offshore Investigations conducted offshore from a vessel:
 - Boreholes
 - Bathymetric survey
 - Geophysical survey
2. Onshore investigations at the landfall will include:
 - Boreholes
 - Hydrological monitoring
 - Trial Pits
 - Geotechnical, chemical and environmental laboratory testing
 - Cliff stability monitoring:



2. The Examining Inspectors Mr Hockley and Mrs Jones questioned the Applicant on the cable Landfall site at Thorpeness, and were taken aback when the Applicant's Engineer, Teo Demetriades revealed that the drilling method HDD was not confirmed, and that the Applicant was considering other methods such as pipe-jacking. If pipe-jacking/micro tunnelling is a possibility and apparently less disruptive, why has this not been researched over a year ago? This lack of action by the Applicant makes one wonder whether they have any regard for the Inspectors let alone the communities affected.

3. Finally, the Applicant went on to say the assessments would commence in the new year but not be complete until the end of 2021. The Examination process concludes after six months, at the start of April 2021. The Applicant will have failed to provide the technical information or risk assessment to evaluate the true impact of these plans. The significant risks posed by these plans to landfall on one of the most fragile and eroding coast lines in the UK are too great to be ignored by this Examination. There are many places along the East coast which offer more stable landing points and Thorpeness, of all places, has to be one of the most risky and uncertain for such a major industrial project.

SEAS urges the Inspectors to require that these physical and technical assessments are carried out forthwith and that the DCO for the onshore site is separated from the offshore DCO. This would then facilitate that the results are made available from these essential studies, and others referenced in the full set of Issue Specific Representations, before the onshore DCO examination can be realised to its full extent.

Once again, SEAS must express its dismay and disappointment that the information required to make a proper judgment is not available because the Applicant has failed to carry out its obligations to research fully the risks attached to such an ambitious, and in our estimation, unsafe site designation. We can only presume that this failure is born from an arrogance on the part of the Applicant and it implies an assumption by the Applicant that the Examination is simply a foregone conclusion.

End