

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#); [East Anglia ONE North](#)
Subject: Deadline 4 submission
Date: 13 January 2021 17:00:51

My reference:
EA1N 20023282
EA2 20023287

To: The Examining Authority

Dear Mr Smith and Colleagues

I write to take issue with Scottish Power Renewables [Submission of Oral Case Issue Specific Hearing 2 on 2nd and 3rd of December 2020: Onshore Siting, Design and Construction](#). SPR argue that additional projects, widely known to be connecting to the Grid at Friston if this current Application is consented, should not be included in their Cumulative Impact Assessment.

The documents submitted to you demonstrate clearly that Friston is destined to become a hub if the Application is consented. NGV in its response with reference to the Nautilus and Eurolink Multi-purpose Interconnectors makes this clear. They describe the initial work at Friston as being based upon a reasonable assumption that it will become a "potential connection location". Other documents which SEAS and others have identified make this clear as well.

[East Suffolk Council](#) says: "The Council maintains that {as} the National Grid substation proposed by EA1N and EA2 is being considered as a strategic connection point for multiple projects ..."

SPR is burying its head in the sand. It lacks credibility for SPR to suggest that it has no knowledge of these plans. [The National Policy Statement for Energy \(EN-1\)](#) states that:

"When considering cumulative effects the environmental statement should provide information on how the effects of the Applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other developments.."

[SPR's](#) argument about there not being enough information in the public domain and that future projects are "speculative and uncertain" is specious. If it's position were in fact true it would **prove** as much to the Examining Authority by disclosing **all** relevant internal documents, including exchanges with National Grid. But it has not done so for the obvious reason that logic and commercial common sense indicate that there will be have been extensive communications between SPR and National Grid about possible future plans for Friston. If these were court proceedings they would have to disclose this material. They should not be able to make loud self-serving assertions without backing them up.

I am calling on the Authorities to uphold their pledge to take **all** additional projects into account. SPR must undertake a full Cumulative Impact Assessment of **all known** projects; and the Examining Authority must subject that assessment to deep scrutiny and analysis.

The cumulative impact **must** include the site of the additional substations which includes future projects but also (a) the landfall site and also (b) the cable corridor.

All the primary stakeholders (including The Rt Hon Thérèse Coffey MP, East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council, Aldeburgh Town Council, Natural England, SASES, SOS and SEAS) believe that the effects of these projects and associated impacts should be fully considered within this Examination.

It would be scandalous if, as a result of SPR's DCO applications being consented, NG was allowed to develop Friston as a hub by the back door. The impact of this would have an even more devastating effect on those of us living nearby for years to come as each additional project is developed. Our home would be metres from elements of a potentially ever expanding substation.

Kind regards

Fiona Cramb