

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#); [East Anglia ONE North](#)
Subject: Written Representation by Interested Party EN010077 & EN010078
Date: 02 November 2020 21:27:27

Dear Sir/Madam

Written Representation - East Anglia ONE North – EN010077 East Anglia TWO Offshore Wind Farm – EN010078

We know that offshore wind is coming, we know we have clear government targets of 40GW and we know a significant proportion of the electricity generated will make landfall on the eastern side of England.

In order to meet these ambitious targets the offshore wind industry needs suitable onshore grid connections. But, investment in UK grid connections to facilitate offshore wind transmission infrastructure which could power a green economic recovery is simply not good enough. As Tom Glover, RWE's UK boss said "The one thing that is delaying our projects is the onshore connections ... It is getting quite serious. We are getting to the point of concern over whether that 40 GW target can be met purely because of the onshore grid. It is only the onshore grid which could stop this happening."

With this major problem in mind, it is essential to examine the suitability of the proposed onshore grid connections both for EA1N and EA2 and for the six other wind farm projects widely considered to be following the same route. Plus we need to examine the sustainability of these grid connections for the future projects which will inevitably arrive inline with the country's legally binding target of cutting carbon emissions to net zero by 2050. These onshore grid connections cannot be examined in isolation.

Let's start with the landfall near Sizewell. The fragility of the cliffs is glaring for all to see. On my walk last week at the site of the landfall there is a notice "DANGER DO NOT GO BEYOND THIS POINT CLIFF EDGE CAN GIVE WAY WITHOUT WARNING." The fragility of the Coralline Cliff here has been well documented. An extraordinarily risky, short sighted choice of landfall.

The cable corridor from Sizewell to Friston is a 9 km trench, 60 metres wide which cuts through peaceful countryside, gouges through an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in the long term compacts agricultural land. Neither the environmental impact nor the impact on mental health is justifiable when there is an alternative. And there is an alternative. The power must be connected to the grid close to the coast to ensure the minimum impact on communities and their environments and to ensure that any future offshore wind projects can connect with ease to the National Grid.

Finally, the end of the road for the proposed grid connections, the substations at Friston. Currently, by SPR estimates a 30 acre industrialised site with substations up to 18m high sited bang in the middle of rural Suffolk surrounded by grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, 1.3 km from an AONB, 200 metres from listed buildings and residents of a medieval village. Their site does not even factor in the emerging plans for 6 other wind farm projects widely believed to be planning to connect to

the grid at Friston. Will 30 acres then become 120 acres? This is not a brownfield site. This is a greenfield site. How then can this be justified unless all other options have been exhausted? Substations should be sited away from rural communities and protected environmental sites. If we are taking into account the governments expanding offshore wind targets then all substation hubs (and this, in reality is what is being proposed) need to be located with room to grow sustainably. Certainly the site at Friston could not expand without a terrible impact on communities and the environment.

There is a desperate need for investment in the onshore grid. But this proposal, in the name of green energy, is a short sighted environmental, economic and social disaster for coastal Suffolk and does not provide the offshore wind farms with a sustainable site for connections to the National Grid.

Finally, I would like to add that I holiday close to Bradwell nuclear power station, my family grew up here, still live here, it is with a sinking heart that I say, this site is a better option for the long term future. There would be no fragile cliffs, no cable corridor and room for substations to multiply on semi-industrialised wasteland.

I urge you to reject this proposal, reject the quick fix and force the applicant to take a long term sustainable approach to the location of its onshore infrastructure.

Jenny Wells