

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#)  
**Subject:** East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarm  
**Date:** 02 November 2020 15:39:35

---

My Reference: 20024969

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

We fully recognise and support this country's future need for 'renewable' energy, and specifically with regard to these proposals, offshore wind energy generating development zones. Of course, this requires an holistic and integrated approach, taking into account the requirements of the whole country, including both offshore and perhaps, just as importantly, the associated onshore energy distribution network. There must be a balanced approach in considering the impact on environmental, social and economic costs. Too many times we have seen in this country that, in other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, the perceived benefits to the national economy always take precedence over the impact on local peoples lives directly affected by these schemes, severely curtailing their right to a quiet enjoyment of their homes and environment - a basic human right.

The National Grid plc, with responsibility to its shareholders, has reportedly had consultations with stakeholders to determine their preferred approach to both East Anglia ONE North Offshore and East Anglia TWO wind farm and onshore substations. The stakeholders consulted have a vested interest in the these projects going ahead but where was the public consultation? Surely the communities affected by these proposals are also key stakeholders. This omission appears to be at odds with both National Grid's Environmental Policy and their Renewables Business Charter.

Scottish Power Renewables' information submitted in support of their proposals via the Planning Inspectorate includes an ever growing plethora of words, charts, data, surveys etc. This wealth of information, not necessarily in language that could be easily understood by the 'man or woman in the street', could hardly be considered an inclusive approach to consultation. Some might deem that this is discriminatory.

We note that there has been some limited engagement with groups such as SASES (Substation Action Save East Suffolk) who have, and continue to carry out, admirable work on behalf of those communities in East Suffolk affected by these Scottish Power Renewables energy proposals. We wholly endorse the views expressed by this group on the detrimental widespread and far-reaching effect of these proposals.

We welcome the BEIS (Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy) review announced by the RT. Hon. Kwasi Kwarteng, the Minister for BEIS. Hopefully this review will engage meaningfully with groups such as SASES.

The biggest tragedy of these proposals from Scottish Power Renewables

is the siting of a large substation a 'mere stones throw' from Friston's village boundary and the proposed cable corridor requiring sixty metre wide trenching and haul roads that will cut a huge swathe through the landscape for ten kilometres from Thorpeness across the AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) through Aldringham and Knodishall to Friston. This will cause major disruption and subsequent desecration of an AONB and the beautiful countryside that Suffolk is rightly famous for. It should be noted that the substation sited at Bullen Lane is some two miles from the village of Bamford. Surely the alternative siting of hubs offshore has to be a more economic solution and is clearly less destructive of communities and the environment.

Alan Bryant on behalf the Bryant Bolt Household