

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [Ruth Proctor](#); [Jocelyn Bond](#); [REDACTED] info@suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk;
Subject: Written Submission
Date: 17 November 2020 17:35:51
Attachments: [Windfarms Second AS Memorandum 17-11-20.docx](#)

Dear Rynd Smith and Colleagues

In accordance with the procedures under your Rule 8 Letter regarding deadline 2, we attach a second Written Representation on behalf of the Aldeburgh Society.

With thanks for your attention and kind regards
Katherine Mackie, Chair
Paul Bongers de Rath, Secretary

Paul Bongers de Rath

[REDACTED]

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE EXAMINATION OF DCO APPLICATIONS BY
SCOTTISH POWER RENEWABLES RE EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH AND EAST
ANGLIA TWO OFFSHORE WINDFARMS**

**SECOND WRITTEN REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF
THE ALDEBURGH SOCIETY**

17 November 2020

As the many submissions at the recent Open Hearings and the accompanying Written Representations have demonstrated, the Friston site is totally unsuitable for the location of the SPR substation. In addition, the landing site at Thorpeness Cliffs and the cable route to Friston carry the risk of great environmental and social damage. The Aldeburgh Society maintains its total opposition to SPR's onshore development proposals, on account of these factors and in particular the potential damage to the economic and social wellbeing of our town and its environs.

Two major additional problems have now come to the fore.

First, we understand that the law requires each individual offshore windfarm to have a separate connection to the onshore grid*. This requirement precludes the implementation of an offshore ringmain connecting several windfarms, for which we and many others have called. The BEIS review launched in July is expected by National Grid to reassess the overall approach to the further development of offshore wind energy. We hope that this review will be conducted swiftly, and we think it would be wrong for the Government to approve any further windfarm developments involving damaging onshore installations until the situation has been clarified.

Second, as many interested parties have pointed out, the Friston site is being considered by National Grid as the potential location for up to six additional connections. Any such additional connections would presumably require additional building construction, bringing with it more of the same environmental, social and economic damage about which local interests are so gravely concerned. And yet we have seen that National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET), in its response to the Examining Authority's questions, does not anticipate attendance at the forthcoming issue-specific hearings. National Grid Ventures (NGV) categorically state they plan to connect to Friston and want the NGET site future-proofed:

*"...NGV are seeking to ensure the proposed NGET substation is future-proofed for other future developments, namely the proposed Nautilus and EuroLink Interconnector projects".***

The Examining Authority has repeatedly stated that all planned projects about which information is available will be taken into account. The community and campaign groups have drawn their attention to the following six additional projects: Nautilus,

Eurolink, Galloper and Greater Gabbard offshore wind farms, SCD1 and SCD2 interconnectors to Kent. We find it extraordinary that the present Examination is proceeding not only with relatively little attention to the DCO application for Sizewell C nuclear power station but also with insufficient access to the plans of National Grid's various arms, which are surely also proposing to create 'infrastructure of national importance'. This special area of East Suffolk, protected as it is by designation as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, is facing the seismic trauma of cumulative damage by a string of energy projects which would be too hard to bear.

It is unacceptable for National Grid to refuse full cooperation with the Examination, whether for reasons of commercial confidentiality or not, since this would preclude full and proper analysis of the proposed onshore installations. National Grid must be required, by the Secretary of State or otherwise, to explain their proposals properly and publicly in the Examination. They must also be required to seek development consent in the normal publicly accountable way for any construction works they propose to carry out.

*Letter from Nicola Shaw, Chair of National Grid Electricity Transmission, to the Times newspaper, 3 November 2020

** Statement by National Grid Ventures in email to East Anglia Two, 9 March 2020