

[REDACTED]

Ed Crane

**Sent:** 05 January 2022 11:31

**To:** Secretary Of State (Kwasi Kwarteng [REDACTED])

**Subject:** East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) Offshore Wind Applications

Dear Mr Kwarteng,

East Anglia will play a significant part in achieving the UK's 40GW wind power goals by 2030. I endorse these important goals. At the same time, the government has stated on page 80 of the Energy White Paper 'Powering Our Net Zero Future', "to minimise the impact on local communities, we will implement a more efficient approach to connecting offshore generation to the mainland grid". I wholeheartedly support this intention.

As you are aware, the PINS Examinations relating to ScottishPower Renewables (SPR) EA1N and EA2 wind power applications have drawn to a close. Over the course of the Examinations, it became increasingly apparent that the severe adverse impacts of these projects on our onshore environment, local tourist economy and coastal communities far outweigh the benefits of this particular onshore infrastructure plan.

To locate an Energy Hub, possibly the biggest of its kind in the UK (currently seven substations and inter-connectors are being proposed for Friston) in the midst of one of the UK's most fragile nature based tourism destinations, will lead to: the decimation of a thriving tourism economy; the principal revenue stream for the Suffolk Heritage Coast; the destruction of biodiversity as multiple cable corridors cut through the protected landscapes of the Suffolk AONB and Suffolk Sandlings; and the decline of the health and well-being of those rural communities whose lives will never be the same. It is needless destruction, when it is clear that there are more appropriate brownfield or industrialised sites such as Bradwell or Grain, which are better aligned with government policy.

The recent historic judgement by The Hon. Mr Justice Holgate to overturn and quash the consent for the Norfolk Vanguard Wind Farm project on the basis that cumulative impact was not taken into account has significant bearing on the legality of the Examinations for EA1N and EA2 at which SPR has to date refused to present the cumulative impact of these known additional projects to the Planning Examiners.

In order not to delay the offshore turbines, which I endorse, I am proposing a constructive way forward, a 'split decision' between offshore and onshore elements, where the offshore wind turbines are given consent, but the onshore works are rejected.

I was pleased to read and hear Dr Therese Coffey advocating this 'split decision', and her own expression of this approach, as presented at the Hearings, can be found at this link to her [REDACTED]

This 'split decision' would buy time, time for the UK government to take the lead and bring together the key actors to approve the new regulatory change needed for offshore integrated solutions, time to allow EA1N and EA2 to

benefit from the BEIS Review and to become flagship pathfinder projects of which we can all be proud, and finally, time to bring these projects to fruition in a way which minimises their greenhouse gas emissions in line with the government's Ten Point Plan. Only if the onshore infrastructure minimises the destruction of our environment by connecting to the grid at a brownfield or industrialised site, whilst minimising onshore cable corridors, can these projects contribute positively to climate change and support the Government's stated intention in this regard.

There is time. We have nine years to get this right before 2030. Let not time and targets become our enemy. Let's not have wind energy at any price. Please recommend a 'split decision'.

Yours faithfully