

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Deadline 4 response from Aldeburgh Town Council
Date: 13 January 2021 23:47:24

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Re: SPR DCO for EA1N and EA2

Aldeburgh Town Council continues to object to the location of Friston for the proposed substations, and the local area for cable runs and landfall infrastructure. We are very concerned that the cumulative impact assessment does not take into account the other projects which we know have been offered connections. And we would request that the Planning Inspectorate fully examine the application for development of the National Grid substation.

We respectfully request Cllr Marianne Fellowes attends virtually to speak as our representative at the forthcoming ISHs 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The following is our response to the SPR application for additional land acquisition:

In general, the use of 'work number' and 'plot number' in the text was not supported by the maps which only indicated work number. Roads, streets, PROWs and buildings are not labelled or identified on the maps. This is extremely confusing and made it difficult to comment accurately without extensive additional research using other maps.

- A) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 7 with land reduced at plot 8 and new land taken to form new plot 8a to support trenchless approach.
Comment:
The map does not indicate the land to be reduced, and there is no plot 8 or 8a indicated. The area labelled work No 7 appears to be extended south and south-west to the road. It is not clear if this alteration may change water supply in the area or why this was not considered previously? The new land taken is very close to a property (unlabelled) and its access drive.
- B) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 15 with increase at plot 31 to facilitate temporary diversion of PROW E363/027/0 (previously not included) while temporary haul road is constructed (requested by SCC).
Comment:
Plot 31 and the PROW are not indicated on the map provided. This is an example of the applicant's failure to previously consider a diversion, made necessary by construction of the haul road which intersects it. ATC does not understand why a haul road is necessary to be located at this point – this further illustrates that the existing infrastructure/roadways are not sufficient to support this project.
- C) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 33 with increase at plot 130 to facilitate permanent diversion of PROW E363/027/0, reintroduce historic footpath & field boundary (requested by SCC).
Comment:
The map provided does not indicate the new location of the historic footpath and field boundary and the PROW is not labelled.
- D) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 33 with increase to plot 104, new plot 104a, b and c for new potential surface water outfall connection (in addition to original routing to be left in consideration).
Comment:
The maps show an increase to Work No 33 but plot 104 which is to be significantly increased, and new plots 104a, b and c (as mentioned in the Regulation 7 Notice) are not indicated.
ATC recognises that the applicant claims this new alternative route avoids the church & chapel ruins to the East of Woodside Barn Cottages, and the potential for surface water

to overflow along the track and over Church Road (which already floods) however we do not agree with this speculative change, and believe that the applicant should carry out further environmental and engineering studies prior to determining the preferred solution without additional land take.

The proposed additional land is very close to buildings. Does this change mean that the verge and track which borders properties and is the access route to properties will not be open for access by residents or the public?

We believe this is also an example of poor planning by the applicant and illustrates that more creative solutions are required if this site is ever to be considered appropriate for such a large industrialized project.