



**Offshore Wind Farms**

**EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH**

**PINS Ref: EN010077**

**and**

**EAST ANGLIA TWO**

**PINS Ref: EN020078**

**Written Representation by  
Piers Sturridge**

**SEAS (Suffolk Energy Action Solutions)**

**Unique Ref. No. EA1(N): 20024756**

**Unique Ref. No. EA2: 20024757**



**SUFFOLK  
ENERGY ACTION  
SOLUTIONS**



The regulatory regime for offshore wind is currently heavily concentrated on competitiveness. It is falsely argued that this is beneficial for consumers and currently means there is no sharing of infrastructure, and each wind farm has an individual connection to transmit the power that it generates.

The result is that:

- It is financially inefficient.
- It has a negative environmental impact.
- It has a negative impact both on coastal communities where connections make landfall and on communities where the power is connected to the grid.
- The false drive for 'efficiencies' ignores the need for integration mitigation, good design, or consideration for the local communities and the local economy.

Failure to mitigate the impact on the environment, local communities, businesses and infrastructure pushes substantial costs on these communities as well as local services, local government and the state. They have to not only live and work through the major disruption but also pick up the pieces as businesses are destroyed, jobs are lost, infrastructure damaged and their amenity trampled.

Undoubtedly this has happened because of a lack of leadership from Government which has failed to update its regulatory regime to match the fast moving changes in the technology over the past ten years but also the dereliction of responsibility on the part of Ofgen and National Grid not to demand that Whitehall drives an integrated plan for the energy industry.

As a result SPR and National Grid are trying to force through an outdated, inefficient selfish and expensive scheme which has not been designed to integrate easily with other schemes.

## **Transport Strategy**

The new Blackhillock Substation near Keith in Moray, Scotland is designed to handle 1200MW of electricity from its Dorenell windfarm in the North Atlantic. The planned Friston Substation is designed to handle 1700MW of electricity from EAN1 & EA2.

Blackhillock required four x 245T transformers each carried individually by 50metre lorries at 5 mph. If SPR Friston is handling 50% more power it will presumably require up to six x 245T transformers or the equivalent, but the SPR plans suggest they are only having four 'extraordinary' 50m long deliveries.

If SPR/National Grid cannot differentiate between four and six 'extraordinary' mega loads how accurate is the rest of their transport strategy?

<https://www.ssen-transmission.co.uk/projects/blackhillock-substation>.



**Consultation.**

There have been many complaints about the failure of SPR/NG to consult fairly with the local area. My personal experience would agree. Promises to provide pertinent information which should have been included in the documentation went and are still unfulfilled.

More concerning though is their failure to consult with local businesses, Meetings with most of the large employers in Aldeburgh, Thorpeness and Saxmundham confirmed that SPR/NG failed to contact meet or communicate in any way with them.

We spoke to the following businesses and organisations. They are some of the largest tourism employers in the area

**David Scott - CEO The Hotel Folk Group**

The Brudenell Hotel	Bar Rest	Aldeburgh	44 Rooms
The White Lion Hotel	Bar & Rest	Aldeburgh	38 Rooms
The Dolphin Inn	Bar & Rest	Thorpeness	3 Rooms
The Golf Club & Hotel	Bar & Rest	Thorpeness	36 Rooms
The Country Club	Events Bar	Thorpeness	16 Rooms
The Parrot & Punchbowl	Bar & Rest	Aldringham	
The Crown & Castle	Bar & Rest	Orford	10 Rooms
The Swan Hotel & Spa	Bar Rest Health	Lavenham	45 Rooms

**Michael Pritt Owner**

The Wentworth Hotel	Bar Rest	Aldeburgh.	35 Rooms
---------------------	----------	------------	----------

**Alex Burnside - Partner**

The Plough & Sail	Bar & Rest	Snape	
The Golden Key	Rooms Bar & Rest	Snape	3 Rooms
The Regatta Restaurant	Rest	Aldeburgh.	

**Harry Young CEO – Snape Maltings**

The Benjamin Britten Concert Hall			
The Snape Maltings			
The Concert Hall Café	Bar & Rest		

**Keir Wyatt - Secretary**

Saxmundham, Aldeburgh & Leiston Rotary Club (Business Club)

**David Wybar – Secretary**

The Aldeburgh Golf Club	Bar & Rest		
-------------------------	------------	--	--



## **Cumulative Impact.**

The inspectors undertook to consider the cumulative impact of the other projects on the basis of the public information available at the time to the enquiry with the words “If we failed to do so, the process would be distinctly awry, and it will not be that awry”.

These are the currently planned energy projects in East Suffolk focused around Leiston/Friston

EAN1  
EA2  
National Grid substation one  
National Grid substation two  
Nautilus  
EuroLink  
Greater Gabbard (expansion)  
Gallop(er)(expansion)  
SCD1  
SCD2  
Sizewell C  
Sizewell D  
Connectors  
New pylons Sizewell to Bramford

I am advised that there will be a need for a minimum of six separate cable runs crashing through the AONB and ripping their way from the coastline near Sizewell to the substation sites.

There appears to be no plans to minimise disruption and destruction by building a single or even shared conduits for running cables to the substations. There is no integrated scheme to minimise the impact.

**It seems ridiculous, but the total cost amounts to nearly £27billion of industrialisation of Suffolk Coastal and makes it the sixth most expensive construction project in the world EVER.**

It is more expensive than the Channel Tunnel and the whole Apollo Space Program and is being planned for just five square miles of sleepy rural countryside with no road system, no infrastructure, no services and no facilities to match the impact of this expenditure.

But it is a free-for all, no central planning no integrated scheme, no consideration.

SPR/NG is compulsory purchasing land at the agricultural price plus 10%. It is investing the absolute minimum in the local infrastructure pushing costs onto the local economy It is refusing to compensate local residents for blighting their homes and their land and converting their pillage into a multibillion pound dividend for their directors and shareholders. All apparently with the blessing of the British Government.



## Tourism.

Scottish Power/National Grid has totally failed to properly research or present an honest and fair report on the effect of their plans on Tourism in East Suffolk reducing it down to one paragraph.

***“...No significant tourism and recreation impacts were predicted as a result of the proposed East Anglia 2 project. Tourism and recreation receptors would experience minimal visual impacts and only temporary physical obstruction, noise and traffic impacts.”***

In failing to properly reveal their true ambitions for Friston substation they inevitably mislead attempts by others to produce more honest and accurate assessments resulting in the misrepresenting of the scheme to the public and the downplaying of the impact.

Based on the smallest scheme SPR/National Grid are proposing, including the effect of Sizewell C, the Suffolk Coast findings suggest tourism income will be reduced by £23-40M. The build programme is planned to last 12 years without overruns resulting in a loss to the East Suffolk economy of up to £480M. Factor in the much larger SPR/National Grid project and the effect would be at the top end of this or even more substantial. Then add on the time required to rebuild the tourism economy if the changes have not permanently destroyed it, the loss would be around £600M.

SPR/National Grid are offering no new jobs, the stations are ‘unmanned’ but the Suffolk Coast findings suggest the loss of 600 in tourism alone.

It would appear that Scottish Power Renewables and National Grid are not honourable companies. If a scheme has the protection of being considered under National Infrastructure Strategy Planning, it must have sufficient merit to be considered appropriate. Its proposers should have sufficient belief in their plans that they are prepared to put forward the whole project for consideration. They should be totally transparent and not be permitted to hide their real intentions, mislead interested parties and statutory bodies and put out misinformation.

Piers Sturridge



30.10.20

