

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Submission of Oral Case Issue Specific Hearing 2 on 2nd and 3rd of December 2020: Onshore Siting, Design and Construction
Date: 13 January 2021 09:40:36

EN010077 & EN010078

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to take issue with Scottish Power Renewables [Submission of Oral Case Issue Specific Hearing 2 on 2nd and 3rd of December 2020: Onshore Siting, Design and Construction](#) in which they have argued that additional projects, widely perceived to be connecting to the Grid at Friston if this current Application is consented, should not be included in their Cumulative Impact Assessment.

I am calling on the Examining Authorities to uphold their pledge to take all additional projects into account by:

- 1 Insisting Scottish Power Renewables & National Grid undertakes a full Cumulative Impact Assessment of all known projects**
- 2. Undertake a rigorous examination of this Cumulative Impact Assessment and satisfy themselves that the projections are realistic**

The examiners cannot fail to have been aware of SPR's embarrassed and embarrassing refusal to admit to the massive 'elephant in the room' namely the super energy hub which everyone knows about, planned by SPR and National Grid for Friston.

It is deeply regrettable that two major companies such as SPR and National Grid should appear to be trying to mislead the authorities about the extent of their ambitions whilst being given substantial protection by their DCO application by denying information which has been in the public-domain for sometime and pretending that these matters have not been under discussion for many years.

It is also deeply regrettable that you appear to be unable to insist that National Grid should attend and answer questions about their ambitions as even SPR admits that National Grid is the driving force behind the scheme and the additional substations are being allotted by National Grid embarrassingly failing to hide behind the SPR application. If their ambitions were not so frightening, it would be a farce.

Failure to insist on honesty at this stage will result in any decisions being challenged at a later stage.

The Cumulative Impact Assessment should include not just the sites of the additional substations but the landfall site and perhaps most importantly, the cable corridor. How many times will a 9 km cable corridor 60m+ wide be dug or redug? [Appendix One of SASES Response to ISH2 Action Points](#) which looks at projects with actual or potential Grid Connections at Friston shows an ADDITIONAL 8 CABLE TRENCHES to be dug. It must be emphasised that all the primary stakeholders in this Examination including The Rt Hon Thérèse Coffey MP, East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council, Aldeburgh Town Council, Natural England, SASES, SOS and SEAS believe that the effects of these projects and associated impacts should be fully considered within this Examination.

The failure of SPR and National Grid to be honest about their intentions, is already having an impact on the local economy. Businesses and individuals are reluctant to invest in their own buildings and infrastructure because of the uncertainty of what is

going to happen to East Suffolk, when logically the lock-down periods should be being used to carry out improvements and major repairs.
Confidence will be lost in the Examination should the Planning Inspectorate not bring SPR & National Grid to account on this issue.
Kind regards

Piers Sturridge