

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Received:** Sat Nov 27 2021 16:55:37 GMT+0000 (Greenwich Mean Time)

**Subject:** FW: Proposed Electrical Developments at Friston, Suffolk

Resent as per the automated reply.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 November 2021 15:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed Electrical Developments at Friston, Suffolk

Dear Sir,

Whilst I fully understand and am totally supportive of the need to quickly develop renewable energy; I feel that the proposal to build the substations for East Anglia 1 and 2 and the terminal buildings for the Nautilus Interconnector on the very edge of Friston, Suffolk, should be rejected for the following reasons:-

ECCONOMIC. The proposed zig zag underground route is impractical and unnecessarily long making it extremely expensive to construct. The long construction period will cause major delays

on the narrow , winding, single track country lanes, affecting the lives and livelihoods of residents. The area will be blighted and not attractive to tourists on whom many businesses depend. This proposal is already affecting house sales in the village.

ENVIRONMENTAL. To tear a sixty metre wide strip through the AONB to dig down for the underground ducting with the construction of a service road will damage wildlife, destroying habitats and their routes in a unique coastal region. The area will never fully recover. The close proximity to the world renowned Minsmere nature reserve will have a devastating affect on wildlife there owing to construction noise, light pollution and the continuous humming of the transformers and filters when completed. The vast amount of greenhouse gases that will be emitted during the digging and installation could be minimised by using a site near to the coast.

HERITAGE. Friston is one of the few Medieval English villages still having a village green. To build all the constructions on the very edge of the village, towering above the Grade II\* listed parish church and village green is totally unjustified and unnecessary. It is not acceptable in our national wish to conserve our beautiful countryside and villages.

HEALTH. The noise and disruption during construction and the continuous humming of the transformers and harmonic filters will seriously affect the health of many villagers who will be living right up against the proposed development. Relocating the site would avoid this.

DANGER. The site is higher than the village. To cover this huge area of prime arable land with concrete will prevent the natural drainage by absorption through the soil. The proposed drainage ponds would not cope with the excessive rainfall forecast to occur during the extreme weather caused by global warming. There is no other route for water to drain other than by the ditch which flows through Friston. Floods regularly occur in the village now. THIS WILL RESULT IN MANY OF THE HOMES IN THE LOW LYING PART OF THE VILLAGE SUFFERING REGULAR AND SERIOUS FLOODING.

SOLUTION. Other sites are available which would limit the threat to wildlife and the damage to the peaceful village of Friston. A coastal location is essential on both environmental and economic counts. One site which could be used as an energy hub is the former WWII airfield next to the power station at Bradwell on Sea, Essex. The cable would only need to be taken a short distance inland and is well way from any centre of population. (West Mersea, over 4 km away is the nearest).

SUMMARY. Friston is completely the wrong location owing to the unnecessarily high construction cost, the damage to wildlife, the loss of prime arable land, the health and flooding risks and wrecking of a beautiful presently unspoilt English village.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best wishes,

Colin Roxby,  
