

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** EA1N & EA2- Response to ISH3, ISH4, ISH5  
**Date:** 03 February 2021 21:53:57

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

### **EA1N & EA2- Response to ISH3, ISH4, ISH5**

We listened with great interest to the Issue Specific Hearings (19 & 21 January) and it is becoming increasingly apparent, as outlined by [REDACTED] (SPR) on costs that their submission has been expedited to avoid compliance with emerging policy as outlined in the Energy White Paper. Consequently the applicant's submission is unresolved in many areas from a general lack of understanding of the impact of the project to this coastal community, its culture & economy; ignorance and lack of investigation of the land fall area; confusion about the size of the cable trunking routes; impact on traffic; vagueness about the size and scale of the required infrastructure; lack of meaningful mitigation to the Friston community, etc.

The issue of cumulative impact is also not resolved. Sizewell C could represent the largest building project in Europe. How does this dovetail with the onshore SPR proposals for EA1N and EA2? What strategic thinking has been given to placing two of the largest infrastructure construction projects in Europe to be built concurrently adjacent to each other both affecting an AONB. All this in an area with poor road connection and an existing thriving coastal community.

Furthermore the addition of other projects will turn this part of the East Anglian coast into a massive energy hub hosting Sizewell C; SPR'S East Anglian Hub for EA1N, EA2, EA3; SCD1 & SCD2 Interconnections; NGV Nautilus Interconnector and Eurolink; Greater Gabbard extension; Galloper extension; and other National Grid projects. Decommissioning of Sizewell A continues and eventually that of Sizewell B will come on stream.

Does a thriving coastal community within an AONB need to be destroyed by such developments? A proper plan is required so that the adverse effects of onshore infrastructure for offshore wind power do not outweigh any benefit to the nation. This is the aim of the white paper and it's principles, being emerging policy, need to be applied to these applications for EA1N & EA2 otherwise this DCO procedure is a travesty.

What is before you is not just the assessment of the applications for EA1N an EA2 but the destiny of this coastal area transformed from a thriving rural coastal community into an industrial area. The current value of this community must be taken into account in evaluating the true cost of this project.

It is clear from the for the hearings, that the connection at Friston is driven by National Grid and justified by cost. Is money a sufficient reason for approving an ill-conceived proposal and accepting that the harm caused will be worth the benefit.

We urge the inspectorate to reject SPR's onshore proposals for EA1N & EA2.

Yours sincerely,

Mya Manakides & Luigi Beltrandi

[REDACTED]

20023260  
20023261

20023274

20023276