

To the Planning Inspectorate Reference East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two Windfarm projects.

Submission from David Steen, [REDACTED].Ref 20023461 and Ref 20023462.

Dear Sir.

Following the open floor hearings please find below my submission with regards the planning application for Scottish Power renewables for East Anglia 1 North and East Anglia 2 Offshore Wind Farms.

My submission is made as a general member of the public and of the East Suffolk community. I am not an expert or engineer (Electrical or otherwise) and my comments have been developed whilst going through the whole application and planning process so far.

Firstly I must state that I am not against off shore wind power, I am however completely against these developments taking place not only because of the obvious permanent environmental damage that the whole process will inflict on the East Suffolk Coastal Area and particularly in the area around the village of Friston but because it has become abundantly clear that Scottish Power are using these planning applications as a smoke screen to allow National Grid to do further developments in the Friston area without the need to go through all the necessary planning procedures that should be required. Please see attached Appendix One. This in turn means that the public consultations that Scottish Power held throughout the area were a complete sham and show Scottish Power to be completely unfit to be involved in the planning and construction process. It also means a far greater destruction of the local area and surrounding countryside than has been put forward in these planning applications. This is totally unacceptable.

All though offshore wind power has progressed by leaps and bounds the onshore element seems to be stuck in the dark ages. It seems absurd that in today's environmentally aware society it requires the potential destabilising of a fragile heritage coastline, the wholesale destruction of ancient woodlands, the concreting over of acres of prime farmland, with all the inherent damage that does to wildlife, and the desecration of a beautiful and peaceful historic village. Add to that the continuous noise and light pollution the damage to the economy of the local community. It beggars belief that the proposal even got off the drawing board. To make matters even worse all of this is completely unnecessary due to the fact that all the technology exists for the whole process to be developed offshore and there are ample brown field sites available to take any on shore infrastructure that is needed, thus negating the need for any of the proposed developments to take place. This planning proposal should be dismissed, and the applicant should be told to produce appropriate plans for a modern and clean future.

#### 1). Scottish Power's Public Consultations.

In the main the public consultations appeared to be a box ticking exercise. To begin with Friston was not informed of the public consultations and when they were involved the meetings were well attended. However Scottish Power were not well prepared. At the second consultation they were unable or unwilling to answer over 50% of the questions put to them. Considering that they are supposedly one of the leading and experienced off shore power companies and were already

involved in a large project in Suffolk their performance was woeful. This basically made the whole process pointless. The situation did not improve over the remaining consultations.

## 2). Traffic.

Throughout the consultations Scottish Power were inconsistent with regards the number of lorry movements the project would require and often the figures they quoted were met with derision. They also appeared to be unfamiliar with the routes that they had proposed for the construction traffic and dismissive of the concerns of the local community. They were also unable to explain what controls and sanctions they were going to implement with regards contractors and sub-contractors (White Van Man) to make sure that they adhered to the given routes etc. and did not begin to use unallocated country roads as rat runs. When asked if there was going to be an easy contactable central point where the local community could report any infringements by their contractor's they were evasive and would not commit themselves. This did not instill any confidence that Scottish Power would manage and police the movement of their contractors and sub- contractors. This matter must be addressed and should permission for the project be given then a strong and legally enforceable protocol holding Scottish Power to account must be put in place before any work can begin.

## 3).Noise.

During the public consultations Scottish power explained that they had done required noise level tests and that the noise and hum that the sub stations would emit will be negligible. As it now appears that a further five projects (coming in by stealth behind the present planning application) are planned for the area by National Grid, a move that Scottish power must have been aware of, it means that the sound tests carried out by Scottish power are meaningless and must be completely discounted. New noise and sound surveys must be done by an independent company (paid for by Scottish Power) to verify what the correct sound levels will be. It is completely unacceptable that the village of Friston should be subject to this development and the noise that it will create on such unsound reports.

## 4) Screening.

During the public consultation Scottish Power said that they would mitigate against such things as unsightly buildings, noise, light pollution by shielding the site by using existing woods and by planting trees around the site. One of the examples that the quoted was the use of Grove Wood along Grove Road to shield the village from the development site. Again Scottish Power would not commit to using well established nursery trees for planting and gave no assurances with regards who would monitor how the growth of these "New Trees" would be monitored or who would be responsible for replacing any that might die in their early stages of growth. They also did not appear to take into account the effect of the numerous diseases that are attacking our trees at the moment such as Dutch Elm disease, Ash Dieback (80% of U.K ash trees are likely to die because of this disease) Acute Oak Disease.

With regards Grove Wood which Scottish Power claim will shield the village the farmer has already had to cut down a considerable number of the trees for safety reasons due to Ash Dieback thus already reducing the shielding effect that the wood is supposed to give.

Once again Scottish Power must be held to account and should permission for the project be given then a strong and legally enforceable protocol holding Scottish Power to account must be put in place before any work can begin. Making sure that correct shielding is in place and that any trees and shrubs etc that they use for shielding purposes, that die, are replaced with equally mature replacements in a short space of time.

#### 5) Flooding.

You will already have received many more comprehensive submissions with regards the danger of flooding to the village that this development will bring. To the general lay person, it is blindingly obvious that if you concrete over a large area of farmland that lies above the height of the village the runoff water has to go somewhere. So far at any of the consultations Scottish Power were unable to, or unwilling to give assurances that flooding in the village would not occur. Their proposed flood prevention plan has generally been regarded as inadequate and needs to be scrutinized very carefully to make sure that it is fit for purpose.

It is also wrong that if this development goes ahead the local community who are likely to be affected by it should have to carry the burden of increased household insurance costs due to the increased potential flooding risk. These costs should be covered by Scottish Power or they should be made to set up their own insurance cover run by an independent body, that will allow them to cover any flood damage costs that local households may be faced with due to this development.

#### 6) Local Businesses.

The proposal does nothing but harm to the local business community. The East Suffolk Coast is an area which relies heavily on tourism. (Again, I am sure that you will already have received far greater detailed submissions to this effect.) The long term construction of the numerous cable trenches and the building of the substations and interconnectors and the increased heavy duty traffic that these projects will require, will do nothing but deter people from wanting to either move to this area or holiday here. This in turn will damage the businesses of the hotels, pubs, B&B's, restaurants, builders, tradesmen, retailers, cleaners, estate agents, holiday attractions, campsites, tourist attractions, taxi drivers, fishermen, and so the list goes on. And what is the return to this area, absolutely nothing. The sites will be unmanned. They will bring no long term employment into the area at all. It is complete nonsense.

#### 7) Pollution.

The proposed construction of these applications on the East Suffolk coast will create pollution on a scale that should not be tolerated. The building of the cable trenches and the movement of all the heavy lorries and plant machinery along the haul roads will create dust and air pollution that will along a 10 mile corridor encompassing Thorpeness, Aldringham, Knodishall and Friston for years to come. This will undoubtedly create air quality problems in an area that is quiet and peaceful and also major health issue to anyone living within this area.

Then there is the light pollution that will also be created by all the industrial lighting requires over the same construction area from the beautiful Thorpness coastline all the way through to Friston again for years to come.

And with the light pollution will come additional noise pollution created by all the generators that will need to run while the construction is taking place and this will go on all through the night to power all the security lighting that will be requires 24 hours a day. All of this in an area that at the moment is clean, tranquil, and peaceful. Again it is not acceptable.

8).

Rights of Way and Footpaths. Again you will have been sent far more detailed submissions with regards the ancient footpaths, bridleways and rights of way that are either going to be closed, moved or destroyed by this planning proposal. This area is very popular with walkers and bird watchers, horse riders who bring much to the local economy. All this will go, and we are not talking about closing a footpath for a few weeks we are talking about for years. Possibly ten to fifteen years. It is so wrong.

The more I write this submission the more [REDACTED] I am becoming. It seems inconceivable that such a project can be given the go ahead. To destroy and blight such beautiful and peaceful countryside and to blight the lives of so many people over such a long period of time is beyond understanding. Consent for these projects must be refused.

# Appendix One

## **Future planned energy projects connecting to the National Grid in the Sizewell/Friston area of Suffolk**

Eight Offshore Wind Energy Projects are widely believed to be planned to connect to the National Grid at Friston. (This does not include future windfarm projects as a result of the seabed leases awarded by the Crown Estate in relation to the Round 4 process). Cumulative impact means eight substations and interconnectors constructed sequentially or consecutively. Plus, the addition of a nuclear power station, one of the largest in the world. This will be the largest complex of energy infrastructure in the U.K. situated in one of the most fragile ecosystems in the U.K. These are judged to be ill-conceived plans where the process of choosing the site for the mega infrastructure hub is shown to be flawed. There are a number of better alternative brownfield sites for this designated vast complex.

### **1. East Anglia One North Offshore Windfarm - ScottishPower Renewables - Projected to be completed in 2028**

An offshore wind farm which could consist of up to 67 turbines, generators and associated infrastructure, with an installed capacity of up to 800MW, located 36km from Lowestoft and 42km from Southwold. From landfall the cables will be routed underground to an onshore substation at **Friston**, which will in turn connect into the national electricity grid via a National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds, the latter to be owned and operated by National Grid. <sup>1 2</sup>

### **2. East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarm - ScottishPower Renewables - Projected to be completed in 2028**

An offshore wind farm which could consist of up to 75 turbines, generators and associated infrastructure, with an installed capacity of up to 900MW, located 37km from Lowestoft and 32km from Southwold. From landfall, the cables will be routed underground to an onshore substation at **Friston** which will in turn connect into the national electricity grid via a National

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/east-anglia-one-north-offshore-windfarm/>

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/pages/east\\_anglia\\_one\\_north.aspx](https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/pages/east_anglia_one_north.aspx)

Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds, the latter to be owned and operated by National Grid<sup>3 4</sup>

### **3. Nautilus - National Grid Ventures - Construction 2025-2028**

The Nautilus Interconnector is a proposed second Interconnector between East Suffolk and Belgium. It would create a new 1.4 gigawatts (GW) high voltage direct current (HVDC) electricity link. The project would involve the construction of a converter station in each country and the installation of offshore and onshore underground direct current cables (HVDC) between each converter station and underground alternating current cables (HVAC) between the converter station and substation in each country. In the UK, the offer from National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) allows for a connection at a new 400kV substation located close to the Sizewell 400kV network, provisionally referred to as 'Leiston 400kV'. The current NGET substation location being promoted is less than ten kilometres from the coast, i.e. **Friston**.<sup>5 6</sup>

### **4. Eurolink - National Grid Ventures - Construction by 2030**

EuroLink is a proposal to build a High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) transmission cable between Suffolk and the Netherlands. The capacity of the link will be 1400MW. The proposals are to follow the same path as Nautilus (see above), i.e. **Friston**<sup>7 8 9</sup>

### **5. Greater Gabbard Windfarm Extension (North Falls Offshore Wind Farm) - SSE Renewables and RWE Renewables - Construction 2025 - 2030**

The North Falls Offshore Wind Farm will comprise a number of wind turbines on fixed

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/east-anglia-two-offshore-windfarm/>

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/pages/east\\_anglia\\_two.aspx](https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/pages/east_anglia_two.aspx)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.nationalgrid.com/group/about-us/what-we-do/national-grid-ventures/interconnectors-connecting-cleaner-future/nautilus>

<sup>6</sup> <http://sases.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/National-Grid-Briefing-Note-Interconenctors-Sizewell.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.nationalgrid.com/our-businesses/national-grid-ventures/interconnectors-connecting-cleaner-future>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.peacockandsmith.co.uk/project/nautilus-eurolink-interconnector-projects/>

<sup>9</sup> <http://sases.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/National-Grid-Briefing-Note-Interconenctors-Sizewell.pdf>

foundations, plus dedicated offshore and onshore electrical infrastructure. The newly-signed lease agreement is for an additional capacity of 504MW, the same as the existing Greater Gabbard Offshore Wind Farm. "it will comprise wind turbines and their associated foundations, array cables which will connect the turbines to an offshore substation, export cables which will transmit the power from the offshore substation to shore, onshore cables and an onshore substation. National Grid has not completed its technical and environmental studies so no conclusion has been made about the location of the onshore grid connection at this stage. National Grid has not completed its technical and environmental studies so no conclusion has been made about the location of the onshore grid connection at this stage". It is widely believed that National Grid will seek to use the **Friston site**.<sup>10</sup>

## **6. Galloper Windfarm Extension (Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm) - RWE Renewables - Construction by 2030**

Five Estuaries is an offshore wind farm to generate in excess of 300MW. The project consists of (but is not limited to): an offshore wind farm, including wind turbine generators and associated foundations and array cables; transmission infrastructure, including offshore substations and associated foundations, offshore and onshore export cables (underground), including associated transition bays and jointing bays, an onshore substation, and connection infrastructure into the National Grid. It is widely believed that National Grid will seek to use the **Friston site**.<sup>11</sup>

## **7. SCD1 - National Grid ESO - Construction by 2028**

SCD1 consists of constructing a 2GW offshore HVDC link and associated substation works between Suffolk and Kent. This project appears to have been sanctioned without it going through the DCO process. "Preliminary work to identify the optimal connection substations at both ends is ongoing". It is widely believed that National Grid ESO will seek to use the **Friston site**.<sup>12 13 14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.northfallsoffshore.com/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://fiveestuaries.co.uk/about/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity-transmission/document/134036/download>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/162356/download>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/national-grid-proposed-1bn-suffolk-to-kent-transmission-route-1-6526632>

## 8. SCD2 - National Grid ESO - Construction by 2029

SCD2 consists of a second 2GW offshore HVDC link with associated substation works connecting Suffolk and Kent. This project is currently on 'hold' which means that it is considered optimal but delivery of this option should be delayed by at least one year. Again, it is widely believed that once sanctioned, National Grid ESO will seek to use the **Friston site**.<sup>15 16 17</sup>

## In addition, there is Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station - EDF - Construction 2022 - 2034

A New Nuclear Power Station on a 33 ha. site near Sizewell. Two EPR reactors will generate 3.34 GW of electricity with 4 on-site pylons connecting cables to a National Grid Substation.<sup>18 19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/electricity-transmission/document/134036/download>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/162356/download>

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/national-grid-proposed-1bn-suffolk-to-kent-transmission-route-1-6526632>

<sup>18</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/>

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/sizewell-c>