

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: EA1N and EA2 - DEADLINE 13 - PINS 2002365 & 2002366 - Paul Carlaw
Date: 03 July 2021 17:56:27
Attachments: [EAN1 EA2 deadline 13 July 2021 submission Paul Carlaw.pdf](#)

PINS REFERENCE - 2002365 & 2002366

Dear PINS Team.

Please see attached Deadline 13 submissions and my final representations.

I would like to request a split decision – recommend approval the offshore element if acceptable and **recommend rejection of the onshore works.**

Best wishes,
Paul

Paul Carlaw BSc(Hons) MRICS
Chartered Surveyor

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION FOR SPR EA1N and EA2 PROJECTS (DEADLINE 13)



Interested Party: Paul Carlaw **PINS Refs:** 2002365 & 2002366

Date: 3rd July 2021 **Issue:** 1

Dear Mr Smith,

I have listened to every hearing throughout the review, and I would like to make the following final representations and comments.

I fully support and endorse the use of green energy but based on what I have heard, and the evidence presented the only satisfactory solution for all concerned is a split decision – approve the offshore element of the projects and **reject the onshore proposals**. This will then allow the Applicant time to find a suitable site - several suitable sites were identified at the most recent Issue Specific Hearing on site selection, or alternatively EA1N and EA2 could be used as a Pathfinder Projects as part of the BEIS review.

I wish to support the points raised and evidence presented throughout the Issue Specific Hearings opposing the onshore elements of these projects. I support the views of SASES, SEAS, Save Our Sandlings, Suffolk County Council, Aldeburgh Town Council, Friston Parish Council, Friston Parochial Church, Snape Parish Council, the points of disagreement offered by East Suffolk Council, along with the significant concerns and comments presented by Dr Therese Coffey MP at the most recent Issue Specific Hearings

The onshore project works should be rejected for the following reasons where the Applicant has not provided satisfactory responses, often very late or not responding, leaving everything to the last minute due to the lack of pre-planning or waiting too long to submit new documents and amendments.

1. **Flooding** – it's clear that even until the last moments of the various hearings and even until the end of the process, the Applicant is still unable to mitigate the concerns over flooding, the infiltration tests show drainage on the site is an issue. Friston Village is already subject to serious flooding events at regular intervals and most recently in June 2021.
2. **Cumulative impact** – the Applicant has not addressed concerns raised throughout the hearings concerning cumulative impact. In addition to the proposed onshore projects other significant projects have already been identified and the pre-examination process has already started for at least one of these projects, the Nautilus interconnector. There are significant housing developments planned nearby that will have a cumulative impact on traffic and air quality outside of these projects, along with Sizewell C already at the examination stage.
3. **Site Selection** – I have heard sufficient evidence provided during the various hearings to enable the Planning Inspectorate to recommend these DCO's are not approved for the onshore works.

4. **Health and Social Well Being** – we have heard about the significant impacts of these projects on the health of local people, stress, mental health, and physical wellbeing at ISH 10 on 9th March and I fully endorse the concerns raised by IP's including SASES, SEAS and their medical experts who attended and submitted their representations. The onshore elements of these projects will have a significant impact on the people of this region, in particular the people living in the village of Friston, Knodishall, Aldringham and Aldeburgh, impacting those people living in Snape as a result of people taking short cuts to miss out a congested section of the A12, those people affected along the A1094 and other local roads used to access the onshore sites and the construction consolidation sites. Construction personnel using local roads to create rat runs affecting people's anxiety and stress levels.

5. **Noise** – I listened to the evidence at ISH 12 held on 11th March. I believe operational noise has not been mitigated and the arguments raised by SASES acoustic consultant should be accepted.

6. **Traffic & Transport** – I listened to ISH 13 on 12th March. I still have major concerns that the small roads, tracks, and existing infrastructure is incapable of taking the loads, volume of traffic and HGV's even after the proposed road alterations suggested by the Applicant. This will create danger for local people, cyclists, walkers, and tourists. The A1094 from the A12 turnoff at Friday Street and other small village roads are too narrow to take large loads making their way to construction consolidation sites etc impacting on this beautiful and peaceful area. This locality cannot accommodate so many site workers travelling to and from the construction sites every day along with abnormal loads and significant numbers of HGV's.

7. **Socio Economic and Tourism** – we heard at great length the genuine concerns and the impact on tourism outlined in the DMO report for the entire region which appeared to be refuted by the Applicant without appropriate counter arguments including impacts on Friston, Benhall, Knodishall, Aldringham, Aldeburgh, Thorpness, the holiday park at Sizewell, the Wardens Trust all impacted particularly those people who are disabled or those who rely on these facilities to improve their health and wellbeing.

8. **Heritage and Landscape** – the loss of the Pilgrims Way public footpath across the substation site, a local amenity for the village, for generations, and for tourists alike that is 100's of years old must be considered significantly detrimental to the area. It's loss impacting on the approach and views towards the Grade 2* listed Church of St Mary the Virgin, chages and impacts significantly – please also refer to reports published by SASES reference to the impact on herigage assets. The visual impact on other Grade 2 listed properties that surround the site and the visual impact from the village green resulting from industrialisation must be a significant reason to recommend the onshore works do not proceed. There is no mitigation possible to be set against the environment damage these projects will cause.

9. **Habitats and Environmental Impact** – I would like to endorse the points and concerns raised by Natural England and the impact on the Hundred River Crossing, the fragile cliffs impacted by the cable access point, the impact on wildlife habitats, the wetlands, that could be avoided if a more appropriate site had been selected prior to the submission of the draft DCO.

10. **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)** – I have listened with interest to the points raised by Natural England which I fully endorse and support. I have significant concerns over the fragility and erosion of the crumbling cliffs where it is proposed to use Horizontal Directional Drilling. These very cliffs have been eroding for years and it is well known about how fragile the landscape is – in recent years at least one fatality has resulted due to fragile cliffs and rocks falling away.

11. **Emissions and Pollution** – the cumulative impact of other projects given the promise of connection points at Friston as well as the Sizewell C project which has now reached the examination stage need to be considered along with the Applicant's DCO. I do not believe we have seen a satisfactory answer to the concerns and questions raised by interested parties concerning NO2 emissions, even with the use of 80 % of Euro V1 diesel vehicles as has been suggested by the Applicant.

12. **Light Pollution** – the addition of artificial light controlled by an automatic movement sensor monitoring system will impact on the local community and the dark skies local people and tourists alike have enjoyed for 100's of years. There is virtually no artificial street lighting in the village of Friston – therefore selecting a more appropriate site with better transport links, remote from local communities or using a brownfield site is another reason why the Applicant should consider a more appropriate location or use more appropriate offshore technology or an appropriate site selected.

The recent successful case overturned by the Court of Appeal, the Vanguard DCO must be considered when making a recommendation to the Secretary of State, particularly the onshore elements. The Friston site and onshore cable route planned have a greater impact on this region than other DCO's. The Heritage Coast is a very special area and must not be destroyed for generations to come because of an uncoordinated approach by the Applicant and National Grid.

I have lived in Friston and Suffolk for over 27 years, moving here because of its rural location, closeness to the sea, its beautiful landscapes, dark skies, clean air, it's music at Snape Maltings, its wildlife and having lived and worked in London for many years I have found peace and tranquillity in Suffolk. We need to treasure beautiful landscapes, big skies, dark skies, natural habitats – keep and retain this region as it has been for centuries and preserve it for future generations.

In summary, I request the Planning Inspectorate recommends rejection of the onshore elements of these projects to the Secretary of State and recommends the Applicant uses a ring main approach or reviews its site selection criteria to use a more appropriate onshore location that reduces environmental damage.

Yours sincerely,

**Paul Carlaw BSc(Hons) MRICS
Chartered Surveyor**