

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: WRITTEN REPRESENTATION
Date: 02 November 2020 20:55:38

EAST ANGLIA TWO PINS Ref: EN020078

Written Representation on

THORPENESS CLIFFS and CORALLINE CRAG

by Antony Easton

Ref. No. EA2: 2002 4496

Dear Madam/Sir,

INTRODUCTION

Where do you start with the enormous problems created by this tangle of governmental, corporate, humanitarian and environmental issues? An unpopular government in tough times finding a good news story to fulfil its laudable energy commitments. Three foreign-based companies, all outside of the UK's future political sphere and all inevitably responsible to their own nation's and stakeholder's interests. Or the people on the ground, responsible for the needs of their corner of the world and best-placed to make observations about how these plans will affect it. The rebranding of the Suffolk coast into the 'Energy Coast' made a good headline but its application has created a problem of sizeable proportion.

MY PERSPECTIVE

My interest comes as I live within the tangled web of byroads that criss-cross the affected area. My experience is based largely on what I see, walk, cycle or drive past. I walk the cliffs in Thorpeness pretty much every day when I am at my house and I am highly aware of the physical environment - on the ground as opposed to a map. I regard myself as an educated, fair-minded and tolerant person. I'm not xenophobic, didn't vote for Brexit and have no axe to grind against other nations or people. I am aware of the need to have an environmentally sustainable energy system, entirely free from fossil fuel consumption, I am neither *nimby* nor to coin a phrase, a *numpty*. I think I am intelligent enough work out the core of the proposal and disseminate the various voices, influences and interests. This is not a simple issue and requires a good deal of perspective to attempt to even see the whole picture. In many ways, it's too complicated both for the area and its largely elderly population to take on board. As a by-the-by and having gained a considerable professional standing in writing and communicating ideas during my time working in *blue riband* advertising, I feel that the whole approach and communication of the proposals, all the way from having two applications (EA1 and EA2) to the multiple complex emails, makes involvement in the procedure very intimidating, especially when pitched against the doublespeak of corporate lawmakers and policymakers.

But, having lived through various iterations of the plans, walked the routes and paths in question and now read through what I've been able in what time I have available (not much), I do not think the proposal is a good idea, here is why.

YOU CAN'T IGNORE SIZEWELL C

This project, especially in the light of recent revelations from government, has to be considered in relation to Sizewell C. It would be disingenuous and evidentially dishonest to think otherwise. You only need to look at a map of the two projects to realise it would make sense that several asset groups from lorry parking to transport management would most likely be utilised by EDF when it comes to Sizewell C. Legally and procedurally, it may be important to differentiate the two projects, but it must be acknowledged that, to the resident, this means that virtually none of the time lengths mentioned in this application are as relevant as they claim. I am not going to go into detail about the group of associated power cable schemes that are also in the pipeline, but I feel there should be a tacit understanding of their presence too.

I know the public benefit made supersede the needs of local people, but to ride rough shod over our obvious concerns is not acceptable.

At the root of the knot is the relationship between the government's aims and their application. Government, in line with fulfilling an admirable commitment to international carbon-reduction energy protocols, has identified nuclear and wind as the two systems of energy generation that satisfy their appraisals to the country's future needs. I don't know how much, in terms of a percentage of future national needs this small area of land is expected to bring ashore, but I do know that it is inappropriate and highly socially and environmentally disruptive.

As this is not the platform, I'm not going to go into any detail about my feelings for nuclear, suffice to say it is highly divisive and even the possibility of Sizewell C is enormously disruptive to the mental health of all living within its stead. But it must be taken into consideration and must mitigate attitudes to the wind farms because it is intrinsically linked.

THE WIDER ENVIRONMENTAL COST IS SIGNIFICANT

I'll work from the wind turbines inwards. Our coastline, almost as far as the eye can see is now dotted with wind farms. No problem, I actually think they look pretty cool and do a great job. At night though, you get a chain or red beacon lights from the tops of each turbine, that's not so great in such a dark sky area. It's a bit nimby I admit, but I own up to being an astronomer.³ Even worse the idea of more red lights, but progress is as progress does, and the big picture for all is a clearer environment, day and night. I can live with it anyway. It's worth adding to that that these potential plant and construction sites will presumably be lit at night as well, so that will further damage the light levels and considering the area allotted for vehicle parking will presumably be transferred to Sizewell C, that could mean 15 years of noise, air and light pollution for us. To say nothing of the miles of temporary tatty hi-viz barriers and tape that will no doubt end up littering the countryside around their infrastructure for years to come. What is their responsibility in that regard? How will it be enforced?

THE SHORELINE AT THORPENESS IS UNSUITABLE

On-shoring and delivering the energy to the substation is riven with problems. Firstly the

cliffs to the north of Thorpeness are pretty unique as I understand, beyond soft sand I don't know what they're composed of or how you would measure their fragility, but every spring hundreds of sand martins fly there from Africa to take advantage of it, to peck and dig their nests from their sand face. They only choose that exact area along the 200 metre stretch the southern end of the designated cable landfall area for the very good reason that it's unique. I see ornithologists there who tell me that it's as special and rare as it appears. The cliffs are so soft that, as I am sure you are aware, a couple of years ago part of it fell on and tragically killed a man sheltering underneath an overhang from a rainstorm, so soft that their shape changes almost on a tidal basis. There are two wartime pillboxes that regularly appear above the tide and the ever-shifting pebbles and shingle. They are a good thirty metres from the cliff face now, which means that, give or take the odd bit of forward momentum in their tumble down to the beach, in the last seventy years that distance is as accurate an appraisal as any on how much the cliffs have regressed and how unstable they are. To say nothing of the largely failed project to hold back their erosion. Houses will soon follow. The coastal path at the coralline cliff's southern end, immediately to the north of the village, has completely disappeared within the twenty years of my being there. A kilometre further north it reappears and seems more robust, but that may be because it's no longer on the coralline cliffs. In fact, they seem so unsuitable for drilling underneath that it makes you question the motives of the engineers and their overlords in choosing them. Obviously the only remotely possible area is to the north, beyond the risen cliff faces but even that doesn't make it a suitable site to choose to onshore and then dig a cable trench several miles inland, across environmentally sensitive open countryside to an enormous substation built next to a medieval village eight miles away.

CORPORATE COMPETITION LEADS TO A LACK OF CO-OPERATION

After all, there's a Nuclear power station only a mile up the coast and all of the relevant infrastructure for this sort of thing is as good there than anywhere within a hundred miles one would think. Why not onshore there? I am told that there are incompatibility problems with locating power cables too close to each other but am old enough to assume that it's more likely to be incompatibility problems of rival corporate interests. A nameless friend, a nationally recognised TV news journalist, told me that the CEO of SPR bragged to him that they were hoping to create a trench that would accommodate future cables and cabling programmes, which struck me as incompatible with them not being able to land near each other at Sizewell. Anecdotal yes, but you tell me whether these competing companies will put any needs of local people towards the top of their lists beyond their corporate liabilities?

Three foreign companies with no responsibility to the U.K. . One a hedge fund. Who even knows, beyond them profiting from the demise of markets and companies, what they actually do? Do you honestly trust them to do the right thing or the thing that makes them most profit?

LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE ACROSS THE AREA

Working inland, the environmental mess and pollution needed to adapt a woefully unsuitable road network to accommodate the heavy plant and transport needs of a project like this doesn't even take into account the problems these roads have in accommodating a cyclist. The A1094, even though it's the widest road in the area, can come to a halt behind a caravan, a tractor, let alone a tandem, of which there are curiously plenty. It's an area for people to unwind and enjoy themselves, not risk their lives in the battle for road space with

an articulated lorry. Anyone can see how unsuitable the roads are by getting on a bike and cycling them. I use the road on a bike myself, there's literally no alternative to getting to the A12 and beyond, and even now it's a terrifying experience. Unfortunately, anyone who agrees to this plan will have ignored these words and will have blood on their hands for any fatalities resulting from that conflict of interests. I can't see any plans to do anything as community orientated by the developers or council to put in a cycle lane or widen the road though. This is not even mentioning the traffic jams caused by tourists (many more this year and going ahead for years to come I imagine), farm vehicles, local commuters and contractors. As I say, that's the widest road, the rest get narrower and narrower.

From the plans, unfortunately I couldn't work out how the cable was going to get to the Knodishall junction from the fields inland of landfall in Thorpeness, it doesn't appear specified, but I imagine that they will attempt to put it along the B1353 road. It means that both routes out of Thorpeness, Aldeburgh, Knodishall, Aldringham and other villages will be compromised by vehicles of all descriptions with all of the problems and pollution that goes with them. I think it will affect my own travelling through and around the area to the extent, from experience, that it may add up to 20 minutes to each of my journeys to the A12, only 8 miles away. In other words, taking SizewellC into account, for possibly 15 years every journey to anywhere, bar Knodishall and Aldeburgh, both less than a mile away, will be affected.

OUTER AREA AND EMPLOYMENT OVERVIEW

My real knowledge is both less and less important outside my immediate area, it will be represented more authentically by others, but, barring these three, foreign-based companies, pension funds, shareholders, ministers, MP's and various others who stand to gain financially for this enterprise, you will not find one voice in favour from a local, not because we're selfish and spoiled but because we are the custodians of the land and the mental health of our families and neighbours.

The jobs argument is a non-starter as far as I'm concerned. Jobs will be created wherever these projects are executed.

I am not involved in the tourist trade but can only imagine what damage the Friston and SizewellC projects will do to that industry. What compensation will there be for locals?

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

I can't accurately comment on the viability of alternatives, but it doesn't take a genius to see there may be better, less destructive ones. I support a lot of the aims of SEAS, but I can't comment knowledgeably on their ideas for those alternatives, beyond agreeing with their general assessment and approach. It does seem that this sea-based ring main system has been utilised elsewhere and something we could be really proud of as a country if we could refine to the point that it will be perfect for all the aims around this project. Why is that not the main proposal, it's the least impactful and most flexible? Failing that, it seems obvious that it would be preferable to route this through a site on existing brownfield land than through a unique, environmentally-sensitive coastal shoreline and then out through land so delicate and loved that people from all over the country and the world come here for the peace it brings and the peace that will forever be compromised by this ill-thought plan. I sympathise with you as I wouldn't like to live with responsibility of deciding to approve it.

CONCLUSION

It's irresponsible, politically expedient and unfair to configure these projects across this tiny area. Through EastAnglia One and Two SPR, government, along with National Grid and EDF, can be torchbearers of environmental leadership and responsibility. The question is, are their interests more relevant than local and environmental ones? It's not a question of not supporting wind power, it's a question of making sure it's compatible with other needs and that all options mitigating those needs have been considered from beyond the realms of price and shareholder profit.

It's clear that they have not and as such this proposal must be rejected.

Yours Sincerely,

Antony Easton