



Offshore Wind Farms

EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH

PINS Ref: EN010077

and

EAST ANGLIA TWO

PINS Ref: EN010078

**SEAS Response to the
APPLICANTS RESPONSE on TOURISM**

SEAS (Suffolk Energy Action Solutions)

Unique Ref. No. EA1(N): 2002 4494

Unique Ref. No. EA2: 2002 4496



info@suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk
<https://www.suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk/>



SEAS Response to the APPLICANTS RESPONSE to TOURISM

1. Tourism Appendix 30.2 Literature review presented by the Applicant.

SEAS disagree with the conclusions drawn by the Applicant.

The Applicant has once again presented irrelevant data in an apparent attempt to conceal the paucity of their own research. The case studies they have suggested bear no resemblance in size, complexity or disruption to the situation in East Suffolk. Apart from being offshore windfarm infrastructure, there is absolutely nothing comparable between them and the accumulative impact of a £27 billion-pound mega energy hub over five square miles in rural Suffolk.

Their arguments to show the impact on tourism as minimal are misconstrued. They claim that the impact of projects in the nine areas was minimal as the tourism employment had increased over the period 2009 – 2018 but forgot to mention that the UK average had increased by 19% which suggests that there is a negative effect of between 10 and 11%. This demonstrates substantial damage to tourism and the local economy. Oddly they take the start point as 2009 the year that the financial crash became fully apparent and tourism was at a low.

Deloitte's report for Visit Britain¹ shows that a new fulltime job is created in tourism for every increase in spend of £54,000. The DMO and Aldeburgh Town Council concur in the calculations in their well-researched reports that the tourism economy will suffer by £28-40 million/annum which suggest that local job losses as a result will be between 520 & 740.²

NB The financial loss was calculated on the assumption that there would only be EAIN, EA2 & NG substations plus Sizewell C & D.³

The Applicants have failed to present a credible tourism impact study because they know that it would be indefensible. Attempts to brush over the situation with false comparisons and manipulated data are at best unhelpful.

¹ https://www.visitbritain.org/sites/default/files/vb-corporate/Documents-Library/documents/Tourism_Jobs_and_Growth_2013.pdf

² https://www.tourismalliance.com/downloads/TA_408_435.pdf

³

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/adhocs/12467employmentbyageindustryandoccupationuk20102015and2019>



East Suffolk is a delicately balanced, economically viable, exceptional part of the countryside. It is a balance of quiet lanes, rural landscape, huge skies, beautiful coastline, vibrant villages and seaside towns. It attracts people because of its fresh air, open space, tranquillity, local produce, artisan producers, and artists.

For the Applicant to pretend that this massive infrastructure project, focused on a small area with its towering structures, over ambitious transport schemes, lack of investment in the infrastructure, armies of workers, destruction of AONBs, heathland and woodland will go unnoticed by the millions of visitors and will not destroy their perception of this area is simply ludicrous.

Our conclusion is that the Applicant has failed to provide any recent study conducting research here in Aldeburgh and the directly impacted neighbourhood of Thorpeness and Snape amongst visitors, tourists and those working directly or indirectly in this sector. Their case studies are irrelevant and they have failed to provide any quantitative assessment of the risk to businesses.

2. The Socio-Economics and Tourism Classification Note SZC CIA

Table1. Sizewell C reports that there will 400 caravan pitches but the Applicant is talking about 600.

The Applicant accommodation assessments appear to assume that no visitors would require beds and they can distribute them to their workers and SZC!

Hinkley Point has shown that many long-term workers are moving off site to find accommodation as they prefer their own privacy, more space and freedom to the HPC 'barrack' hotels.

3. Volume 17 – 1.17 Socio Economic Effects

1.17.6 The Applicant's analysis of TripAdvisor reviews looks at the concept of the public's reaction to offshore windfarms, but does not address the visitor's reaction to delays or the chaos created by the development of onshore substations. This should not be confused

Piers Sturridge
17.11.2020