

*Submission to Planning Inspectorate
Relevant Representation as Interested Party
On behalf of Marlesford Parish Council*

Regarding

*Scottish Power Renewables Onshore Infrastructure Proposals
for
East Anglia One North & East Anglia Two
Windfarms*

Dr. Roger Waterfall

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7 June 2020

Introduction

1. We support the development of renewable energy resources and accept the role that offshore wind will play. However, we have serious concerns regarding Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) proposed onshore infrastructure associated with East Anglia One North (EA1-N) and East Anglia Two (EA-2) windfarms.
2. The Planning Act 2008 provides a process for examining Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, the purpose being to weigh local impacts against national needs. We argue the SPR Environmental Statements for these two wind farms give insufficient weight to local impacts.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

3. SPR and National Grid have a duty under Schedule 9 of the Electricity Act 1989 to consider landscape and other features including historic buildings and to do what they can to mitigate any adverse impacts. We believe that SPR has failed to demonstrate that they have applied such consideration.
4. Plans for the developments in Marlesford lack detail and visualisations are poor. For development in a sensitive area like the River Ore valley detail of a “worst case “ scenario should be provided prior to Examination in order to allow local residents to make more relevant submissions to the Inspector.

Cumulative Impacts

5. The effects of cumulative impacts on traffic flowing through Marlesford on the A12 and increased use of *rat runs* in the immediate area have been inadequately addressed. Thus SPR’s highway assumptions are highly likely to be flawed.
 - The SPR application fails to adequately account for the possible future delivery of Sizewell C (SZC) nuclear power station and the impact of concurrent construction will have on predicted traffic flows.
 - Having announced the windfarm EA3 is likely to be built at the same time as EA1-N and EA2, the impact on traffic flow seems to have been overlooked.
 - There is no account of traffic impacts associated with the proposed Nautilus and Eurolink interconnect projects.

Noise

6. Little consideration seems to have been given to the increased noise pollution and the effects on the lives of those living near to the proposed development in Marlesford.

Site Selection

7. We believe that SPR have failed to identify all reasonable alternative sites in Marlesford or elsewhere (for example the vacant industrial site across to road from Station Meadow). We will argue that SPR should revisit the site selection process in a transparent way prior to Examination.

END