

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION FOR SPR EA1N and EA2 PROJECTS (31st January 2022)



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

Date: 31 January 2022

Issue: 1

Dear Secretary of State and BEIS,

I would like to comment on your letter dated December 2021.

Flood Risk – If infiltration testing had been carried out at the appropriate time prior to selecting the site it would have become all too obvious that the site at Friston was unsuitable due to its inclined position which would clearly increase the risk of flooding to Friston village particularly as projects that will follow have not been assessed for their cumulative impact – more suitable locations were identified during the Issue Specific Hearings (ISH). Infiltration testing and site investigations were only undertaken after the original hearings' completion date and despite the extension of the process after the Planning Inspectorate made a request for additional time to try and deal with outstanding matters, several issues remain outstanding which have not been satisfactorily addressed.

The Applicant has not taken seriously the concerns of Interested Parties (IP's) and the evidence and reports and oral submissions by SASES flooding expert.

I am sure you are aware that even the Government's Cabinet Minister Dr Therese Coffey MP, who gave evidence during the IPH's identified more appropriate sites along with SASES and other IP's. The Applicant has ignored the request to look at alternative locations with better road access, thus reducing impact to local communities.

Cumulative impact – the Applicant has not addressed IP's concerns throughout the hearings about cumulative impact. The projects likely to follow the approval of EA1N and EA2 have not been fully considered using a cumulative impact assessment if these DCO's are allowed to proceed – some examples of projects that are likely to follow include Nautilus (already being planned), North Falls, Five Estuaries, Euro link, SCD1/Sea link along with the potential impact of The Sizewell C Project.

Site Selection – there was a significant amount of evidence provided by IP's during the various hearings to ask the Secretary of State to decline the DCO's on the grounds of inadequate due diligence and inappropriate site selection. The impression is Friston village and its residents do not exist and the Applicant is riding rough shod over the whole area.

Traffic & Transport - Cumulative Impact - the small roads, tracks and existing infrastructure is inadequate to take the loads, volume of traffic and HGVs proposed by the Applicant and the projects that will follow have not been assessed for cumulative impact. This will create danger for local people, cyclists, walkers, and tourists. Everyday life will be disrupted causing delays for people going about their normal business, getting children to school, and attending medical appointments.

Socio Economic and Tourism – the cumulative impact of the various projects in planning will impact on tourism as outlined in the DMO report for the entire region but the findings set out in the report were ignored by the Applicant without appropriate counter arguments.

Heritage and Landscape – I am shocked that the Pilgrims Way footpath across the substation site will be lost because of inappropriate site selection, which is of historical significance, a local amenity for the village and tourists which is hundreds of years old must be considered significantly detrimental to the area as well as its loss impacting on the approach and views towards the Grade 2* listed Church of St Mary the Virgin. The visual impact on other Grade 2 listed properties that surround the site and the visual impact from the village green resulting from industrialisation must be key reasons to recommend these projects are not allowed to proceed. There is no mitigation possible to be set against the environment damage these projects will cause.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – the points raised by Natural England and the MMO are endorsed and fully supported. The cliffs at the proposed landing point at Thorpeness have been eroding for years and it is well known how fragile the landscape is.

In summary, the Applicant's approach to the entire proposed development is arrogant and has no regard for the community, all disguised in the name of green energy.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Knight