

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)  
**Subject:** Relevant Representation and OFH statement  
**Date:** 02 November 2020 14:32:13  
**Attachments:** [SPR Open floor hearing.pdf](#)

---

Please find attached the notes from my presentation at the OHF2 on 9th Oct. As you know my observations were more specific to ISH2 as they refer to the lack of consultation by National Grid for the development of a Grid Sub Station "Hub" on the back of the SPR project.

With National Grid offering offshore projects such as SPR (EA1N and EA2), National Grid Ventures (Nautilus and Eurolink), Galloper array expansion, Greater Gabbard array expansion, along with National Grids own (SCDC 1 and SCDC2) links to Kent it is clear that the Sizewell to Bramford Pylon Route (due to also carry the output from Sizewell C) will become a strategic line (and single point of failure) in the national network.

Kind regards  
Russ Rainger

[REDACTED]  
My Ref EA1N = 20023124, EA2 = 20023123

*Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important matter. Others will and have spoken about the traffic issues, the damage to the coralline cliff the implications for the wild life etc. I want to talk to you about the uncontrolled wide spread damage to the Heritage Coast. My understanding is that the NSIP procedure only allows you as the ExA to consider the proposals that are on the table at the time. As a resident this is a significant flaw in the system of National Policy Statements and the NSIP process  
I have some sympathy for Scottish Power Renewables as they are trying to develop a grid connection for their project and as wrong as the Friston site selection is, this is what they have consulted with me about.*

*However it is evident that National Grid are developing a Grid Connection Hub by stealth. They are using the work of SPR to deliver a National Grid project without any planning regulation or consultation. We know of many other energy projects planned for this area, such as Galloper, Gabbard, Nautilus, Eurolink etc. all being offered grid connections at Friston and to really demonstrate what a shambles it all is National Grid are even proposing 2 connections (SCDC1 & SCDC2) to relay the energy from here to Kent.*

*If approved, the development of the Friston Sub Station will begin a cascade of energy projects all making land fall on the heritage coast and then excavating cable corridors that traverse their way across the AONB and SSSI passing through converter sub stations, sub stations and cable sealing ends to also terminate in the tranquil surroundings of Friston or some other nearby village, all because National Grid are taking the lazy option of directing connections to the Sizewell lines.*

*Putting aside the questions around grid security from failure or terrorism or reactive power balance etc. with such a large proportion of the national energy (we keep hearing rumours of it being a third of the national capacity) being directed to this part of the East coast how do we get a full and fair review if the NSIP process*

*does not look at these in combination and precedent setting implications?*

*Ironically given the National Grid proposal for network distribution cables (SCDC1 and SCDC2) to run off shore down to Kent there will also be cable corridors going back out through the AONB again. How will the NSIP process challenge this assumption and push the real developer (National Grid ET) to make land fall in Kent where the power is clearly wanted and not here in Suffolk?*

*Also - with all these connections being clustered around Friston, how will the pylons from Sizewell to Bramford and Bramford to Twinstead cope? This much energy will almost certainly require upgrades to the distribution network even to the point of requiring additional lines of 400Kv pylons in a corridor across many miles of Suffolk countryside. Since 2013 your own web site holds details of the Bramford to Twinstead connection project that has been suspended - so NG clearly recognise the future capacity issues and yet have not developed a solution.*

*We should not be looking at SPR, but at National Grid ET, getting them to submit a DCO for develop of a Grid Network here that will spoil and destroy many square kilometres of tranquil Suffolk countryside. This is borne out by the challenging issues that SPR are facing in trying to deliver their project. The cable corridor will pass through the fragile coralline crag to make land fall and then through AONB, SSSI land passing close to local properties - within just meters of homes - so close in places that the cable corridor width will need to be reduced to squeeze through.*

*This is an additional concern around the lack of in combination consideration because if cable corridors are being shrunk and there are requests from NGET to avoid sterilisation of cable routes, this could force the developers to research and implement yet further new cable corridor routes across the other countryside areas as demonstrated by the NG Ventures consultation.*

*Even SPR may not commission both EA1N and EA2 in tandem, meaning the cable corridor environmental damage and disruption could run for many years with the other energy projects following on in turn resulting in decades of impact.*

*Bizarrely with all this power being drawn to our fragile landscape – we found that during the lockdown Sizewell B was asked to reduce power production to help balance the grid. How does this demonstrate that the NGET proposals for cramming all this power in the locality is a sound one?*

*With all these projects being taken in isolation how can the NSIP process looking only at SPR ensure the best possible environmental solution is being demonstrated? It may be acceptable to refer to these as low carbon energy sources, but it would be wrong for them to be called green energy projects if they do not consider the combined environmental damage they will cause.*

*I'm aware of the BEIS review, but I would ask you to reject these SPR proposals as they cause Unplanned, Uncoordinated, Unnecessary disruptions and ask that you recommend to the SoS that a broader energy DCO be prepared by National Grid for public consultation. I recognise there are specific hearings on 2 and 3 Dec, but this flaw is so great it needs action now.*