

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** DEADLINE 6 Submission  
**Date:** 24 February 2021 16:05:30

---

PINS Ref: EA1N- EN010077 and EA2 - EN010078

My Ref ID Nos: 20024381 and 20024383

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to respond to [Action Point 2, The Planning Balance from Open Floor Hearing 6](#)

I call upon the Examining Authorities to recommend to the Secretary of State a 'split decision' in respect of the DCO for EA1N and EA2, with the result that:

1. **The offshore turbines are recommended for consent.** Please note that I am fully supportive of renewable energy and have no objections to the offshore elements of the EA1N and EA2 DCO applications **provided that** all installations are acceptable to all stakeholder concerns over the statutory purposes of the AONB affected by these proposals, in particular taking account of recent concerns expressed by Natural England at the Seascapes hearing on Thursday, 18 February, ISH-8; **and**
2. **The onshore infrastructure is rejected for consent,** in favour of full consideration of more appropriate and suitable locations for this infrastructure, where the adverse impacts are minimised within an existing brownfield site, such as at Bramford or Bradwell.

As an Interested Party, I have participated throughout the course of the Hearings and I think one thing has become clear, that the adverse impacts of this particular onshore site location substantially outweigh the benefits of the application when taken as a whole. The impact on the Suffolk Heritage coast, our fragile countryside environment and the local communities and economy would be devastating, but importantly, needlessly devastating. There are alternative sites available, which could avoid this destruction by their virtue of being brownfield sites, suitably industrialised for this sort of infrastructure.

These Applications (EA1N and EA2) have come at an unprecedented time of consensus around the importance of offshore wind energy in reducing the UK's carbon emissions and meeting the government's 2030 offshore wind targets. They have also come at an unprecedented time of consensus around the acutely detrimental impacts of radial connections, which these Applications propose. There are still 9 years to go until the Government's 2030 offshore wind targets. There is plenty of time for ScottishPower Renewables, National Grid and the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) to get this planning Application right, **without** jeopardising these important targets.

A 'split decision' would mean that no time is wasted with respect to the pace of

construction of the offshore turbines but would give the opportunity to rethink the onshore aspects of this project to fall in line with current government aspirations. No regard should be given to anything other than an end-to end solution that preserves the green credentials of these projects in their entireties.

To quote from [The Energy White Paper](#):

*"We will safeguard our cherished landscapes, restore habitats for wildlife in order to combat biodiversity loss and adapt to climate change, all whilst creating green jobs."*

*"To minimise the impact on local communities, we will implement a more efficient approach to connecting offshore generation to the mainland grid."*

These are the important matters to address and clearly the Applicant's solutions for industrialising the countryside in coastal Suffolk fails these tests miserably.

With kind regards

**Gary Waple**

