


From: 
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Response Re. ENO10077
Date: 01 November 2020 12:06:06

Dear Sir,

My Ref: 20024108

I am writing as a resident of Aldeburgh and someone heavily involved in the tourism economy of the local area. I would make the following objections to the current proposals;

1. I am fully in favour of off shore wind power in the North Sea.
2. My objections are all in relation to the proposed means of connecting to the grid and the location chosen for so doing.
3. I do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to alternate sites for substations. In particular, Bradwell would appear to be an ideal site which would cause much less environmental disruption. It is not clear why this location has been overlooked. My assumption is that Friston has been chosen simply to enable cheaper connection to the grid but there should be a thorough comparison of the two sites on all criteria.
4. There appears to be an appalling lack of awareness of the local road network and, in particular, the link to the Permanent Access Road as planned – see analysis in the SEAC response.
5. Insufficient consideration has been given to the combined impact on traffic from both Sizewell and Friston/Thorpeness developments. This effect will be felt from the Orwell Bridge to north of Yoxford on the A12 and on all roads branching east from Woodbridge in the direction of the development sites. The effect on tourism to the area around Thorpeness and Aldeburgh of the inevitable disruption on these roads will have a disastrous effect on the economy of this area. This has not been fully considered by the applicants.
6. Insufficient consideration has been given, in general, to the effect of the combination of all the energy projects currently planned for the Friston/Leiston/Sizewell area. A large part of the area is in the AONB. The combination of the developments at Sizewell and Friston together with the cabling between Friston and Thorpeness will bring 12 years of disruption to the economy of an area which is heavily dependent on tourism. The application contains no plans to mitigate the loss of income and jobs that would ensue. It is likely that the negative effect of turning an area known and loved for its environmental assets and peace and quiet into an industrial landscape will have a lasting effect on tourism. Why is there no joined up strategy?
7. The Appendix in the submission from SEAC describes a totally different means of connection. Why has this not been considered? This offshore transmission structure is currently being employed elsewhere in the North Sea and clearly represents an advance

in technology which would render all my objections invalid.

8. It would appear, at all stages, that the applicants have proposed the cheapest and easiest means of connecting to the grid without evaluation of alternatives.