

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Fw: Written Response Deadline 3.
Date: 15 December 2020 18:26:54

Subject: Written Response Deadline 3.

East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two.

PINS REF: EA1N 20023129

EA2. 20023173.

Deadline 3 Response to Representations made at Deadline 2.

These comments refer to both projects.

My WR was printed at 2.4 of Volume 4 Land Interests and I have these comments to make on the Applicants' response to some of my points.

1. In my WR I said that the land SPR wanted at Plot 10, which is used for grazing, had been described in the BoR as rough grassland without any mention of the stabling or horses there which will have to be moved.

SPR said at Deadline 2 that they do not know where that description has come from as it does not match the BoR or the Statement of Reasons.

The answer to that is on the map Figure 22.3.3a Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Results. I have attached a screenshot. The land is next to TN29a and although part of it is a paddock, all of it is marked on the map as SI which on the guide means Poor Semi Improved Grassland. If SPR are not aware of that, or now feel that that is not accurate, perhaps it could be changed. The paddock is in the top field of the area outlined in black.

2. In my WR I mentioned that horses are very nervous and easily spooked and that they will need special fencing. SPR have said that they will replace the fencing that I have installed at my own expense.

However, I believe that SPR have mentioned in their documents that where appropriate they will erect special animal sensitive fencing around their works for protection. As my grazing is directly next door to the Landfall site I will need that special fencing to be put up between the noisy works and my horses for their protection, as it is likely to be extremely disturbing for them. I believe SPR have a duty to commit to this rather than just replacing my own fencing, which is only suitable between Landfall site and my horses when there is no loud industrial work going on there, especially now that we know they may not be able to use the HDD they have talked about, so, that noise and vibration will be much worse for the horses to deal with.

3. The Applicants have not responded at all to my concerns about the suitability and safety of the tracks and bridleways for unshod horses when their vehicles have churned them up, whether I will be able to ride them out as I need, or if they are working with the council on a plan for bridleways as the British Horse Society says they should. If they are closing a lot of these tracks, are the horses supposed to be confined to their noisy fields for 10 years? If they provide new bridleways, are they going to be suitable for horses?

4. SPR have not answered my concerns about the effect of noise, vibration and light.
5. SPR have also not answered the important question about the copses and vital tree cover that provide shelter for my horses which they are planning to cut down. Also, if they do, that is going to make the soil more dusty on top of the sand and dust from the building works.
6. I am also extremely concerned that on access, SPR say that in respect of access to my horses, that " it is not anticipated that that these rights will be restricted , and the Applicants will endeavour to procure access during the course of its works".
This is not definite enough. What if they say I can't have access ? Are my horses to go without food or water? What if they need a vet or a visit from the farrier? I have to be able to arrange these things without being told by workmen that we can't have access.

SPR needs to address all these points properly. I don't see the point of being able to put these concerns forward to the Examination if SPR are going to decide to ignore half of them. Would the Inspectors please make sure that these important questions of animal welfare are properly addressed.

Beverley Strowger.

