

Subject: 31 January 2022 Deadline Comments - 30th January 2022

Reference: PINS Ref: EA1N: EN010077 and EA2: EN010078

From Peter Chadwick [REDACTED]. Interested party as Chairman of Save Our Sandlings and as an individual. Reference numbers: EA1N 20023839 EA2 20023841 and EA1N 20024845 EA2 20024842

I am writing to comment on the responses received to the previous round of consultation which closed on 30 November 2021. Several people have responded that the cumulative impact of all the proposed energy projects now proposed in the area has not been properly taken into consideration by the applicants. I gather that it is a legal requirement of the Planning Inspectorate's Examination procedure that proper Cumulative Impact Assessments are presented and this has not been done. I would suggest that on these grounds alone the on-shore part of the project is refused.

The Suffolk Coast and Heath's is a very special area. Completely the wrong place to put onshore substations for EA1N and EA2 which if given the go ahead with their cable routes will cause adverse impacts that completely outweigh any benefits and this will lead to these other proposed energy projects following on. This, with multiple 70ft cable routes and massive industrial infrastructure will destroy the unique characteristics of the area over several years. All because there has been no proper planning for this project and other follow-on projects. During the examination the National Grid has withheld information on the scale and details of its proposals.

One very specific danger of works for EA1N and EA2 should permission for these be granted - and the other projects that would follow on along with other projected energy projects - is damage to the catchment area and flow of the Leiston Beck which feeds Leiston Common and the Eastbridge marshes / Minsmere levels. The same applies to the River Hundred catchment area and flow. There is potential for damaging impact. Repeated ground works will result in increased sediment, maybe interruption of flow and possible contamination.

To quote from SPR's document - their Environmental Statement on water resources:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010077/EN010077-001286-6.1.20%20EA1N%20Environmental%20Statement%20Chapter%2020%20Water%20Resources%20and%20Flood%20Risk.pdf>

In 20.7.2 Cumulative Impact Assessment with Other Developments 155. Table 20.22 for Potential Cumulative Impacts it says Yes there is Potential for Cumulative Impact to all the listed potential impacts:

Impact 1: Direct Disturbance of Surface Water Bodies. Yes potential impact

Impact 2: Increased Sediment Supply. Yes potential impact

Impact 3: Accidental Release of Contaminants. Yes potential impact  
Impact 4: Changes to Surface Water Runoff and Flood Risk. Yes potential impact

Operation  
Impact 1: Changes to Surface Water Runoff, Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk. Yes potential impact

Then they go on to say:

'163. Construction activities associated with the proposed East Anglia Two project, the proposed East Anglia One North project, the Sizewell B Power Station Complex and the Sizewell C new Nuclear Power Station main development Site, Rail Extensions and Rail Terminal overlap in the Leiston Beck catchment. Furthermore, a small proportion of the construction activities for part of the Green Rail Extension Route will also take place within the Hundred River catchment. Therefore, there is the potential for a cumulative impact to occur in these catchments as a result of increased sediment supply during the construction phases of these projects.'

So even in this inadequate Environmental Statement which does not include the follow on projects SPR admit there is potential for cumulative impact. This does not take into account Nautilus and Sealink and is hazy about National Grid plans. So there is actually a much greater threat for cumulative impact damage to these water courses, water levels and water purity and so to the ecology of the area and the very special wildlife that it supports.

**Taking map reference 6H8W+QQ Leiston UK - the location which Leiston Beck passes through - and plotting a circle of 2KM radius on the National Biodiversity Network Trust Atlas 3689 different species have been recorded occurring in recent times within this area.**

The results of this National Biodiversity Network search show many priority species, protected and endangered species that all occur within this small area:

373 different species of Birds recorded - including Skylark, Woodlark, Many kinds of warblers including Marsh, Reed, Sedge. Many kinds of Pipits. Marsh Harrier, Goshawk, Buzzards, Falcons, Kestrel, Hobby etc for hawks. Bitterns. Nightingales Linnets. Different Wagtails, Crossbill, Firecrest, Goldcrest. Many species of Owls, Sandpipers, Ducks, Waders. Virtually every priority, protected and endangered species of bird has been recorded here.

6 species of Amphibians - including endangered Great Crested Newts, Natterjack Toad in addition to the more widespread species.

43 different species of Mammals including seven species of Bats. Shrews, Voles, most species of Deer etc.

5 different species of Reptiles, 1456 species of Arthropods - including 1372 species of Insects and 49 species of Spiders and allies.

1189 different species of Plants including 1022 different species of Flowering Plants.

I gather that another interested party will be making an in depth submission about the potential River Hundred catchment area so I have concentrated here on the Leiston Beck which feeds Leiston Common and the Eastbridge marshes / Minsmere levels and all the species at risk and where a vital proper Cumulative Impact Assessment has not been done on this specific potential danger.

Surely the potential for catastrophic damage to the ecology and special wildlife in the catchment areas of the Leiston Beck and River Hundred caused by silting up with increased sediment or even contamination from successive 70ft wide cable corridors and substation groundworks cannot be ignored in the planning examination process.

Then in addition to this aspect, proper Cumulative Impact Assessments have not been done regarding all the other factors - quality of life for residents and visitors, the great detrimental effect on the economy of the area especially to the vital tourism and wildlife orientated visitors. I agree with the detailed submissions that SEAS have made and are making. The dangerous effect of successive drillings through crumbling cliffs - the crippling effect on roads and traffic flow in the region if EA1N and EA2 were given the go ahead and act as a Trojan Horse for the other follow on projects that would then be sited in this region because of that.

Is it logical to place some of the largest industrial complexes in the country in this very special part of East Suffolk with its Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, SSSIs, special protected areas, internationally re-known Minsmere bird reserve, Heritage Coast, its reliance on eco and cultural tourism such as Snape Maltings and the Aldeburgh Festival as well as year round cultural events? It certainly is not a logical siting.

Surely no one in their right mind would choose to ruin this area. Also National Planning law states that when there are alternatives to AONBs then development should take place on alternative site and not despoil the AONB. What is the point of having such law if it is not adhered to?

This onshore massive substations energy projects, cable routes and the follow-on ones have not been properly thought out and the 'National' Grid have not been held to account to act as a proper entity for the nation instead of being a private company that just acts on what seems the most expedient quick solution at the time for them - regardless of the environmental and other damage that would be inflicted to a whole region.

Putting this scale of industrial infrastructure in this special unique part of Suffolk cannot be mitigated and is indefensible as there are alternative brownfield sites available. Bradwell or Grain, along the Thames estuary or brownfield sites elsewhere would be much more suitable with less catastrophic adverse effects and more in keeping with the governments environmental policy.

There should be a split decision where consent is granted for the offshore infrastructure but consent is rejected for the proposed onshore infrastructure in favour of a brownfield or industrialised site where adverse impacts are minimised. This would also give time for Ofgem/BEIS to follow through and look at an offshore hub or similar more-joined-up ways

of thinking and less connections for onshore cable routes - and these going to a brownfield site instead of ruining an irreplaceable and unique very special part of England through bad planning and short-term commercially-driven expediency.

Yours Sincerely,

Peter Chadwick