

[REDACTED]

From: John Brown [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 January 2022 13:39

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

[REDACTED]

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

Dear Sir

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

Together with many other residents of Snape and the surrounding villages, I am concerned at the proposed developments in Snape and nearby Friston, relating to the above applications. Whilst the overall plan in relation to the offshore wind-farms is good, and I support it, there must really be a greater effort made in the transmission onshore, to minimise the effect this will have on all the local communities, and these applications must not be approved because they represent the cheapest option.

There is little doubt that the developments would have a serious adverse impact on all the local villages, and among the areas of concern are the severe impact on the economics of the area, the lack of a reasonable road or rail network to support these works (although I note that proposals have been made to improve these), and the interference with all the local flora and fauna the work would cause.

I can think of a number of places where the infrastructure of the power stations and inter-connectors could be erected, without impacting on the local scene and causing great disruption. Whilst some of the places I have in mind are some distance away from the current proposals the extra cost should not be used as a reason for ruling these places out. Whatever is decided in relation to these proposals, will be there for many many years, and generations to come will have to live with them.

The main area of concern to the local people is the erection of the substations and inter-connectors, the erection of the offshore wind-farms is not a problem.

It would seem there is no 'joined up' thinking, in that, as far as I am aware, the proposed development at Sizewell with the construction of Sizewell C, is being considered separately from these applications. Surely these applications should be considered together bearing in mind that both developments will have a very great adverse effect on the area should permission be given for either to proceed.

If my assumption is correct, and these applications proceed without the inclusion of Sizewell C, then I wholeheartedly support the suggestion of Dr Therese Coffey that the current application be

split, and permission granted for the offshore applications. The applications relating to the 'on-shore' work should be deferred and consideration given to linking that application with the Sizewell C application in order that all the necessary information could be collated so that the substations and inter-connectors could be placed in the best positions to serve both, and so as to cause the least intrusion and inconvenience in the locality.

The amount of 'greenfield' land that these developments would absorb (not only in buildings but also in the wanton destruction of land in excavating for the distribution cable lines) will have a very serious and harmful effect on this particular beautiful part of East Suffolk, not only to the residents but also to the tourist trade, and could well cause great financial problems to businesses within the area.

Please, when considering these matters, by all means grant permission for the offshore wind-farms if you so feel it is right, but at the very least defer a decision on the onshore infrastructure until that application can be considered alongside Sizewell C and see what could be gained in sighting a joint infrastructure in an area with less intrusion in this great area of beauty, and less inconvenience to the local residents.

Yours sincerely

John Brown