

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#)
Subject: Interested party ref.20023740
Date: 26 January 2022 11:32:35

Dear Sir/Madam

I am an interested party in the monumental decision you are about to make and in response to the Secretary Of States request for information I am providing evidence as to why the cumulative impact would be catastrophic.

With the onset of consultations for Sea Link Interconnector, there are now **FIVE CONFIRMED ENERGY PROJECTS PLANNED TO CONNECT TO THE GRID IN THE LEISTON AREA**. That is: 1.East Anglia One North Offshore Wind Farm (EA1N)
2.East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm (EA2)
3.Nautilus Interconnector,
4.Eurolink Interconnector, and now
5.Sea Link Interconnector.

It is widely believed that SCD2 Interconnector, North Falls Offshore Wind Farm and Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm could follow. With the addition of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station, **this will become the largest complex of industrial scale energy infrastructure in the UK**. Under the guise of Net Zero, an energy hub on an enormous scale in the midst of rural Suffolk.

Cumulative Impact - The Consequence .Multiple landfalls on a fragile coastline of coralline crag (which is sand-based and already crumbling) near Thorpeness.
2.The destruction of biodiversity as **multiple cable routes**, running for approximately 9 km, cut through the protected Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty), the Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), the River Hundred, and the Sandlings SPA (Special Protected Area).
3.Multiple substation sites. [National Grid Ventures, in their consultations of September 2021 presented FIVE NEW SITES which are options for future projects.](#) **This is in addition to the Friston site of over 100 acres for EA1N/2.** This could impact

on additional communities including Theberton, Kelsale, Leiston, Sternfield, Snape and Saxmundham.

4. The decline of the health and wellbeing of those impacted rural communities whose lives will never be the same.

5. Research commissioned by the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation (DMO), suggests that new energy projects on the Suffolk coastline could damage one of the UK's most successful nature based tourism centres by up to £40 million per annum. This will crucially lead to loss of jobs in hospitality and other tourist related businesses. This estimate does not factor in any decline from Nautilus, Eurolink or Sea Link. Intolerable noise pollution, light pollution and air pollution to local communities, wildlife and livestock.

Cumulative Impact - The Issues 1. The confirmation of SEA Link Interconnector's plans to connect into the area, once again brings the issue of Cumulative Impact to the fore.

2. Cumulative Impact Assessments are a legal requirement of the Planning Inspectorate's Examination procedure. The Norfolk Vanguard wind farm DCO was overturned in a Judicial Review due to the failure to give consideration to Cumulative Impact, which goes to underline the significance of the point.

3. From early in the Examination, National Grid has been challenged by Interested Parties and the Examiners to be transparent about the scale and detail of this Hub. Their failure to present the full picture into the Examination is deliberate obfuscation.

4. Despite repeated requests from the Inspectors and Interested Parties, SPR's approach to cumulative impact was to ignore it or to provide the minimum possible information. Their fall back response of "*there remains insufficient information to undertake the assessment requested*" is not credible when one considers the evidence in the public domain on these projects. As a result, SPR has never provided a complete cumulative impact assessment of energy projects planned for the immediate area.

5. The adverse impacts will outweigh any benefits to this region. Quite simply a catastrophe for the Suffolk Coast and Heaths and the people living within it.

The Alternative 1. This complex of industrial scale

infrastructure in the midst of rural Suffolk is unmitigable and indefensible given the alternatives available.

2.It is clear there are more appropriate brownfield or industrialised sites or sites in need of redevelopment such as Bradwell or Grain, which are better aligned with the government's environmental policy. **Alternative site options exist and should be seriously considered**

3.There is a better, greener solution.

4.We endorse the Rt Hon Therese Coffey MP's proposal of a split decision which grants consent for the offshore infrastructure but the onshore is rejected in favour of full consideration of better locations for this infrastructure where the adverse impacts are minimised at a brownfield or industrialised site.

5.This gives time to enable Ofgem/BEIS to follow through on a spatial strategy for wind energy infrastructure and the aims of the Offshore Transmission Network Review and pivot to better solutions for onshore wind energy infrastructure using a reduced number of cable routes at a brownfield site.

I trust you will take all of the above into consideration.

Yours sincerely

Aline Mowat