

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Deadline 2: 17 November Written Representations EA1N and EA2  
**Date:** 17 November 2020 15:01:21

---

**PINS Ref: EA1N - EN0100356 and EA2 – EN0100356**

**My Ref: ID nos EA1N - 20024391 and EA2 - 20024393**

Dear Examining Authority

**Re: East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two**

**Issue 1: National Grid's unacceptable and vexatious attitude: the elusive National Grid**

I would like to respond and take issue with [National Grid's response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions](#) in which they have stated they will not attend Issue Specific Hearings 1 & 2 and have not fully answered the Examining Authority's Written Questions by using evasive and deflective answers.

I wonder then whether the Examining Authority can hope to continue with a fair, open and thorough examination when a major participant in these proceedings, National Grid, refuses to take part. As a consequence, the full extent of the Examination with regard to additional connections to the grid at Friston is not likely to be addressed properly or adequately. The motives for not taking part are dressed up in spurious arguments over commercial sensitivity yet the real reason may be more devious, that in this way, National Grid's real intentions to build multiple substations at Friston is disguised and not properly evaluated by regulators or planners. **It is time for National Grid to be transparent.**

I call therefore for the Examining Authority to enlist the support of the Secretary of State to then insist / summon / subpoena / or by whatever means, to get National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) to:

1. attend the Issue Specific Hearings and
2. answer the Examining Authority's Written Questions in full, in particular questions 1.0.16 and 1.0.17 with reference to ALL six additional energy projects that have been put on the table.

Confidence will be lost in the NSIP Examination process should PINS not bring National Grid to account on these and other outstanding questions. Similarly, it is doubtful whether the Examining Authority will have discharged their duties fully without National Grid's participation.

It is odd that senior National Grid executives, Nicola Shaw and Graeme Cooper amongst others, find the time to attend a promotional Virtual Spectator Energy Summit, sponsored by National Grid for a morning in November 2020 and yet they choose not to attend an Issue Specific Hearing which has significant ramifications for the whole of the UK because this Examination is unprecedented in its scale and size. If this Examination gives the green light to these proposals, it is opening the gates to further uncontrolled vandalism of the UK's countryside, not only in East Anglia, but in Scotland, Wales, the North East coast, the South West, the South East and Northern Ireland. **It is time for National Grid to show respect to local communities. Our habitats and our own lives and livelihoods matter.**

## **Issue 2: These outdated and irresponsible plans are dissonant with today's holistic thinking: the PM's new pledge**

The Prime Minister pledged an extra £40m for green spaces in England and this was reported by the BBC yesterday. To quote the Prime Minister: "Britain's iconic landscapes are part of the fabric of our national identity - sustaining our communities, driving local economies and inspiring people across the ages." Boris Johnson goes on to say: "That's why, with the natural world under threat, it's more important than ever that we act now to enhance our natural environment and protect our precious wildlife and biodiversity".

## **Issue 3: The Quintet stimulate debate in Parliament on 5 November 2020: the BEIS Review could signal a new opportunity for the short-term work-stream**

I should like to draw the Examining Authority's attention to comments made by Kwasi Kwarteng in Parliament on 5 November 2020, in which he said (*and I quote from Hansard*): "When I took over this brief, and I had the privilege of accepting the Prime Minister's offer to be the Energy Minister in this country, I was struck by the fact that thinking about this subject had not really evolved since 2015. That year was significant, because it was when Ofgem, to all intents and purposes, ruled out an offshore transmission system network of the kind that my hon. Friend has promoted. **However, in the short time since—in the last year and a bit—we as a Government and a lot of industry players have really shifted on this issue, and the contribution of hon. Members in this regard has been remarkable**".

I assert from this that the Minister of Energy is in agreement with the so-called 'Quintet of East Anglian MPs', (George Freeman MP (Mid Norfolk); Rt Hon Therese Coffey MP (Suffolk Coastal); Duncan Baker MP (North Norfolk); Jerome Mayhew MP (Broadland); James Cartlidge MP (South Suffolk)), who brought the need for innovative, offshore-located solutions to wind farm energy connections to Parliament at this debate. These solutions would remove the need for needlessly destroying hundreds of acres of unspoilt countryside in East Anglia.

The Quintet produced a useful document ('Joint MP response to National Grid ESO (NGESO) Offshore Coordination Project consultation Autumn 2020'), which I commend to the Examining Authority. Each contributing MP strongly supports the acceleration of offshore wind electrical power generation, but is also grappling with the local onshore impact of the infrastructure necessary to transport that green electricity to the main population centres.

The Quintet conclude (*and I quote*): "However, whilst we very much welcome the enthusiasm with which NGESO has recently embraced coordinated offshore wind connectivity minimalism, **we are concerned that the regulatory system within which it sits is inherently unsuited to the kind of broader oversight needed to push a unified model**. In essence, the current model is based on unintended disincentives and conflicts of interest arising as a result of OFGEM / National Grid / Crown Estate profiting from the very fact that each connection of a wind farm is singular and not coordinated. This in turn leads to energy consumers paying for subsidies to monopoly quangos, benefiting a very narrow interest whilst the broader national interest of a maximally flourishing offshore wind sector – **minimizing harm to the natural environment – is held back**".

The Quintet go on further (*and I quote*): "We were also particularly interested in NGESO's diagrammatic representation of how onshore connectivity might differ in two contrasting futures in 2050 (p21 of consultation document) – one image for the 'current approach' showing a dense mesh of onshore connections; another showing very few, with a much greater emphasis on undersea transmission. With the clear precedent of the Western Link, brought in to protect a beautiful part of the country from physical harm from overhead

power lines, and the substantive vision of a 'connection lite' integrated future, **we would regard it as a difficult exercise to communicate to East Anglian residents in the months ahead were moves towards a coordinated offshore future be discarded, delayed or approached without maximum thrust from all relevant stakeholders**".

If there is any doubt in the minds of the Examining Authority about where the Energy Minister, Kwasi Kwarteng's thinking has concluded, let me refer again to Hansard of 5 November where he said: "My hon. Friend the Member for North Norfolk also did a good job in suggesting that net zero was at the centre of our strategy to fight climate change. We are, as he said, rightly proud of our commitment to that. In many ways, the problem that he refers to is a function of our success. It was not long ago that we thought 10 GW of offshore wind capacity by 2030 would be a significant achievement, and that it was a reasonable target. Today we want to have 40 GW by 2030. That is a quadrupling of the ambition, and because we have upscaled our ambition so considerably, his argument about the disruptive effects that point-to-point landing of electricity would have on his and other communities has been recognised. **I would suggest that the argument for some form of offshore network system has been won**".

It therefore seems unambiguous that Kwasi Kwarteng, the Quintet of East Anglian MPs, the residents of, businesses in and visitors to East Anglia are all in common agreement. Yes, to green energy but do it right.

Perhaps, it is fitting that Kwasi Kwarteng should have the last word, again quoting Hansard of 5 November: "**The crucial thing to remember is that most of this technology is already here with us right now. Shifting away from individual connections towards a larger, more integrated solution would be environmentally sensible as well as presenting an enormous economic opportunity not only for the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Waveney (Peter Aldous) but for the whole country**".

It is really hard to argue with these sentiments and conclusions. We would urge the Examining Authority to delay these Hearings until the BEIS Review reports its findings because surely there are better alternative short-term solutions which we have referenced previously, such as Bramford brownfield site and Bradwell brownfield site?

I thank the Examining Authority for the opportunity to submit supplementary written representations which I hope add new impetus for the need for the Applicants' current proposals, in conjunction with its more senior partner, National Grid, to be shelved in favour of integrated offshore delivery solutions to brownfield sites and in this way, complementing offshore green energy generation.

With kind regards

Fiona Gilmore

Sent from my iPad