

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



Interested Party: Margaret Knight **PINS Refs:** 20023569 & 20023571

Date: 3rd July 2021

Issue: 1

Dear Mr Smith,

As we approach the end of the hearings at Deadline 13, I would like to express my concern about the devastation these projects will cause to the local communities onshore. I have listened to every hearing throughout the process.

I wish to support and endorse the representations made by SASES, SEAS, Friston Parish Council, Friston Parochial Church, Aldeburgh Town Council, Snape Parish Council, Save our Sandlings, Dr Therese Coffey, MP and the concerns raised by Suffolk County Council. I do not agree with the stance taken by East Suffolk Council – they are not looking after the interests of local people. East Suffolk Council only seem to be interested in the meagre compensation being offered by the Applicant which is insignificant and in no way compensates for the devastation that will follow if the onshore element of these projects is approved.

I fully support green energy and I am not opposed to the offshore works, but strongly oppose the onshore industrialisation in a rural area and therefore suggest a split decision if the offshore element is deemed acceptable to the Planning Inspectorate.

It was discussed at one of the recent Issue Specific Hearings relating to site selection that an alternative location either on a brownfield site or the use of technology via an offshore ring main is more appropriate. EA1N & EA2 could be used as Pathfinder projects as part of the forthcoming BEIS review.

I remain convinced that site selection was based on “sticking a pin in a map’ and ‘putting the cart before the horse’. The consultation process from the start was poorly managed and was a box ticking exercise. The Applicant has been playing catch up throughout the process with no due diligence and only plugging gaps in their poorly managed process when challenged by Interested Parties or the Planning Inspectorate along with the concerns raised by the groups listed above.

I remain convinced that the flooding experienced in Friston will be made worse if the onshore element is approved, as significant damage to the region will result due to the cumulative impact of other projects including Sizewell C, various proposed housing developments and interconnectors have not been addressed.

The resultant increase in traffic on roads made for agriculture, not HGV's, will be significant impacting on tourism and local communities. The recent site investigation works were planned to start at the end of the original hearings before the extension was granted with no concern about the devastation it has caused. Although the Applicant dismisses accusations that they did not poison and kill vegetation, it is clear when looking at the site using a Drone that the entire area of the proposed substation site has been poisoned and investigation works carried out during the nesting season, with no regard for wildlife. If this

is the attitude of a large corporation with a couldn't careless attitude to start the site investigations prior to formal approval and just prior to the extension being granted demonstrates all the Applicant is interested in is profit when they should be doing the right thing and protecting the environment. The Heritage Coast must be preserved for future generations.

In summary, please recommend rejection of the onshore elements of these projects, therefore preventing the damage that will follow to the AONB, protect the fragile and crumbling cliffs at Thorpness, the damage to tourism as demonstrated by the DMO report, the damage to wetlands of the Hundred River and reject the proposed industrialisation of Friston village.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Knight