From:

East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two

Subject: Deadline 9 submission. Comments on Pre Consent geotechnical ground surveys.

Date: 15 April 2021 19:40:28

Attachments: <u>image1.png</u>

To The Planning Inspectorate.

Deadline 9 submission

Ref: EA1N. IP: 20024031. AFP: 132

EA2. IP: 20024032. AFP: 0134.

These submissions concern both East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two.

Comments concerning commencement of pre-Consent geotechnical survey work.

1. Vehicles and Equipment.

On 13th March 2021 I received the generic email generated by SPR notifying the commencement of advance Onshore Ground Investigation Survey Works to take place along the proposed cable corridor and at the Substation site. It stated:

The work will include small teams of people investigating the ground at various locations... using different methods including soil and groundwater sampling, heritage feature and topographic surveys.....

.....in planning the ground investigation, the locations around the site have been chosen to minimise disturbance to the people, places and landscape within which the investigation will take place.

On Tuesday 6 April personnel, machinery and vehicles started arriving at the fields surrounding Ness House, including 2 excavators. Drilling rigs were set up, warning signage posted and arches to warn of overhead electrical cables.

According to an email received from SPR in response to an enquiry,

For all areas of the site, vehicle movements will be kept to a minimum on and off the site area.

At one point during the work this week, there have been around 16 vehicles excluding machinery and equipment at this site, parked on track and fields, frequently driving back and forth along the south/ north direction of our access track adjacent to the field by

Multiple vehicles with chevrons on the side kept their lights flashing throughout the day, even when stationary and parked on the edge of the track.

Where vehicle movement is absolutely essential, in this area, some access routes will use a Public right of Way which are signposted and vehicle speeds reduced to 5mph.

According to the Draft CoCP, vehicle speeds in the environs of Wardens should not exceed 10 mph. The frequent arrivals / departures were well in excess of that, raising clouds of dust on th track as they passed.

As personnel and equipment arrived, there was considerable disruption along the byway as traffic was held up for 35 minutes as an excavator was guided onto the byway at Sizewell Gap and a queue formed along the track with residents being unable to leave or return.

It is hard to understand under these conditions why these pre- Consent works are regarded as de minimis and therefore not subject to regulation.

2. Horse Welfare and Safety.

The website notification states:

.....in planning the ground investigation, the locations around the site have been chosen to minimise disturbance to the people, places and landscape within which the investigation will take place.

On 13 April 2021, one of the excavators took up a position on the field, Plot 11, opposite the stabling at what is referred to at Plot 10. Photo and location on an aerial map are attached.

The digger worked at and near the location for several hours through the day.

At the stables there is a miniature pony penned in a very small concrete area; suffering from laminitis, he cannot access the more easterly part of the paddock as he's not allowed to eat grass. His companion moved off in fright, but the pony was confined in close proximity to the excavators work, associated personnel and cars and flashing lights, and his owner found him sweating with fear, trembling, having retreated to the rear of his stabling. I understand that fear of this kind can bring on colic, which is dangerous to a 20 year old animal.

Subsequent to a complaint, we learned that the contractors had assessed that as they were the other side of the track, and judged there was sufficient distance maintained so there would be no effect on the animal. The owner has been present at the beginning and end of each day at the same time as the contractors, and yet the decision as to the horses welfare was made without reference to her.

As the works are on the tracks directly adjacent to both sets of grazing, the owners will be obliged to pass through the works when they exercise their horses in hand. The infrastructure itself requires desensitisation. The owners have contacted SPR community liaison to discuss how to make this process safe, but as yet there has been no response.

In the other grazing, the same activity in Plot 11 and further work moving round on Plot 13 to the north, caused a horse who has recently returned from surgery at Newmarket to bolt in its field when a mature deer was startled by the presence on the field at 13 and ran across it next to the grazing. This horse is recovering from leg surgery.

This horse was so agitated that its owner had great difficulty stabling it for the night, and was nearly knocked over.

It seems difficult to communicate to the Applicants that these issues are questions of human and animal safety, and not complaints about inconvenience. The impression is that the presence of livestock may not have been communicated to the contractors prior to the survey work commencing

We have been assured that there is a liaison officer dedicated to these works, but despite repeated requests from different quarters, we have still not been provided with the details after more than a week of work. The Panel will be aware that the Applicants have relied in the Examination on their excellent track record in community liaison on former projects to mitigate inconvenience and allay anxiety., evidence which was provided by There is little sign of it here.

3.Contractors on private land.

On Thursday 8th April two unmarked vehicles were parked on Wardens Land, by the drive inside Wardens gate next to the playing field. The occupants identified themselves as contractors working on a survey. They had a map of the cable corridor on a print out showing the area on Plot 13 closest to Wardens Playing Field, where they were parked, and they said they had seen this point as the most convenient at which to put concrete and heavy materials into the Plot 13 over the fence from Wardens.

On request they gave the name and number of their site manager, and when informed that there were two different land interests at this site and that they were on land where no agreement had been entered into, they did leave. The conversation was amicable.

The site manager, when contacted, by the landowner, was from Structural Soils, and explained that the contractors were lost.

In fact the contractors had already been approached at Wardens and asked to leave, but at that earlier point had not done so.

In responding to the landowner on this matter, SPRs Project Manager has said that a member of the Structural Soils team stopped on the public right of Way known as Sizewell Hall Road at the end of the road leading down to Ness House,(which is our main route for Wardens). It is not clear which end is being referred to. The project manager states that the use of this route has been agreed with Suffolk County Council Highways Department and is a Public right of Way byway open to all traffic.

The Panel will be aware that the drive at the point I am describing, at Wardens, is not a public right of Way, and it would be very alarming if the Highways Department had given that permission for its use.

The Project Manager goes on to say that they were approached by an individual who asked them to move their van.

Either this is a different incident, or the story has multiple representations.

4. Drilling/ Aquifer.

In the landowner's conversation with the Structural Soils Site Manager, it emerged that it was intended that borehole drilling was intended to a depth of 40 metres. It appeared that the site manager had not been made aware of the aquifer.

This is not the depth stated by SPR on their website, which is up to 30 metres below ground level. Either would breach the aquifer which is 11.7 metres below ground level. This is an ongoing discussion within the Examination, and yet it appears the Applicant is prepared to breach the aquifer, claiming that the risk to potential drinking water is exceptionally low.

This is dispiriting and alarming. There seems no common ground between SPR and site manager as to how deep the boreholes can be. The Examination process is still ongoing, in which multiple representations are being made to establish potential risk to the aquifer. Consent has not been granted. And yet it appears that SPR has not communicated this issue to their contractors, and are planning to risk breaching the aquifer without respect to the outcome of those negotiations, and that such work is about to begin. This behaviour fails to inspire any confidence in what is to come.

The impression of the last week at this location, which is shared by other residents in terms of infrastructure, street signage, traffic hold-ups, effective communication etc is that the main works have already begun.

5. Respect for Community and Residents.

Finally, a mobile welfare station has appeared at the end of our main access track, parked by the sign to Wardens and Ness House. There are wide areas just off the track nearby, so it seems an exceptionally inconsiderate choice of location, despite the claim of respect for residents.

I put these instances before the Examining Authority to explain the doubts that arise as to the match between The Applicants' assertions and actions.

End.



Excavator by stables.



Location of excavator by stables.

Sent from my iPad