

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Deadline 6 Submission by the Aldeburgh Society - Unique Ref 20023929 and 20023930  
**Date:** 24 February 2021 16:08:20  
**Attachments:** [Windfarms - AS letter to PINS 24-02-21.docx](#)

---

Dear Rynd Smith and Colleagues

We attach a further statement setting out our Society's continuing grave concerns over the planning of SPR's proposed onshore installations.

With our best wishes for a successful conclusion of the Examination.

Katherine Mackie, Chair  
Paul Bongers de Rath, Secretary  
The Aldeburgh Society

Paul Bongers de Rath

[REDACTED]

# THE ALDEBURGH SOCIETY

Registered Charity Number 262239 [www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk](http://www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk)



## OFFSHORE WINDFARMS EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH AND EAST ANGLIA TWO

### DEADLINE 6 LETTER CONCERNING SPR's PROPOSED ONSHORE INSTALLATIONS

The Aldeburgh Society has followed with keen interest the successive stages of the Planning Inspectorate Examination of SPR's proposals. Nothing we have heard or read has convinced us that the proposed substations at Friston and the associated landfall site and cable corridor via Thorpeness would be anything other than irremediably destructive of a fragile landscape, much of it located in a nationally protected Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The onshore proposals by SPR, in conjunction with National Grid, are totally unsuited to an energy project claiming green credentials. The cumulative effect of these proposals, taken together with the additional grid connections under consideration by National Grid and its agencies, and also in particular with EDF's proposed large nuclear power station development at Sizewell C, would be too much for this fragile area to bear.

In view of the above, the Society urges the Planning Inspectorate to split its consideration of the DCO applications as between the offshore elements and the onshore installations. In this scenario, the offshore turbines could be recommended for consent, provided that the relevant stakeholders' concerns have been met, while the onshore infrastructure could be recommended for rejection given the overwhelming weight of evidence regarding its damaging impact in the affected area. The applicant could then seek a solution where the adverse impacts would be minimised at an alternative (preferably brownfield) onshore site or through future undersea connections.

A 'split decision' as envisaged above would mean that no time is wasted with respect to the construction of the offshore turbines, with their welcome job creation prospects for the Suffolk Coast. There would then be the opportunity to rethink the onshore aspects of this project to fall in line with current government aspirations as expressed in the recent Energy White Paper:

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

An alternative approach could be for SPR to consider withdrawing its applications for the time being, pending the production of an alternative plan for the onshore elements. This would avoid the loss of time and potential waste of resources which refusal of the DCO would entail.

While the Society very much hopes that one of the approaches suggested above should be followed, it nevertheless needs once more to underline its belief that construction of this project would be damaging to the economic and social fabric of the historic town of

# THE ALDEBURGH SOCIETY

Registered Charity Number 262239 [www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk](http://www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk)



Aldeburgh. This is heavily dependent upon visitors from outside the area seeking to enjoy the special character of the coast and/or participate in the many cultural and social events taking place through the year. Clear evidence has been submitted to the Examination from the Destination Management Organisation, the Aldeburgh Business Association and Aldeburgh Town Council of the threat which potential traffic congestion and other disruption resulting from the construction process would entail.

The use by construction traffic of generally narrow country roads to access works sites located several miles away from a trunk route is a recipe for disruption. SPR's proposals for managing construction traffic are less than clear, and they deal only with HGVs and do not recognise the impact of the extra van and car traffic, and parking demand, which the project would bring with it. The Society has sought detailed answers from SPR about the projected HGV burden upon the A1094 road from the A12 to Aldeburgh, and its email on this topic is attached. No response has yet been received. We now request the opportunity to speak at the issue-specific hearing on **traffic and transport**.

The Society is also troubled by the prospect of intrusive noise from this development. We understand that any project of this kind would inevitably entail noise during construction, and this would need to be controlled as fully as possible. More concerning, however, is the prospect of a constant low-level hum emanating from the substation and the grid lines. Many visitors to the area refer to 'peace and quiet' and 'dark skies' as major attractions, which contribute positively to their relaxation and wellbeing. We welcome the fact that the Examination will include issue-specific hearings on both **noise and health and wellbeing assessment**.

The Society has also separately registered its concern over the possible use of Option Agreements involving non-disclosure agreements with persons directly affected by the construction plans, one aspect of which would be to require withdrawal of previously submitted objections. We welcome the reassurance given in the Examiners' letter of 22 February that these issues will be carefully considered. Non-disclosure agreements risk undermining the integrity of the statutory application procedure, hampering as they might the expression of honest and genuine opposition to SPR's application. The use of financial incentives is particularly worrying in this regard.

The Society is disappointed that East Suffolk Council has - without further consultation with the affected communities - moderated its position towards this development, and this despite the fact that its councillors for the affected area have given persuasive evidence to the Examiners about its potential destructive impact. We remain firmly of the view that SPR's proposed onshore installations - together with the cumulative effect of projected additional grid connections and the Sizewell C project - would be excessively damaging to our area, its natural and built environment, its inhabitants, its businesses, and its visitors. Green energy cannot be allowed to wreak such seismic trauma in our collective march towards net zero.

24 February 2021

# THE ALDEBURGH SOCIETY

Registered Charity Number 262239 [www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk](http://www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk)



## Extract from Email to SPR dated 15 February 2021

Very belated thanks for your email of 3 December. I regret to say that merely referring us to a document produced before the DCO application was finalised does not inspire confidence.

Our understanding now is that a significant share of the HGV traffic turning onto the A1094 from the A12 would travel up the B1069 to a works compound south of Knodishall. Some would then proceed onwards on the haul road, while others would transfer their loads onto other (articulated?) vehicles proceeding towards Aldeburgh. Presumably such vehicles would not be the same as the few articulated vehicles carrying abnormal indivisible loads and accompanied by a pilot vehicle which have previously been referred to as exceptional cases.

I am writing again, following further study of all the relevant materials and in particular of the Outline Construction Management Plan dated 15 December 2020, to request clear answers to the following questions:-

1. How many HGV trips are anticipated on the A1094 between the A12 and the turning into the B1069 in each direction, and over what period?
2. How many HGV trips are anticipated on the A1094 between the B1069 turning and the Aldeburgh roundabout in each direction, and over what period?
3. How do these trips relate to the revised figure of 10 return trips per day at the Aldeburgh roundabout referred to in your 'Developing Our Plans' document?
4. How is it that several interested parties are still raising concerns that 300 HGV trips per day would be using the A1094?

If our understanding of the proposals is correct, then although there may be unwelcome traffic delays affecting the A1094, there should be no routine HGV movements via Aldeburgh. This appears to conflict with the earlier statement that 'the total daily two-way movements (ie. arrivals and departures) are therefore reduced from 55 HGV to 10 HGVs at peak period'. We can find no explanation in the application documents of the reason for any HGVs other than the abnormal indivisible loads to pass through Aldeburgh.

While we accept that the exact timing and origin of HGV movements cannot be fully predicted this far in advance, there does need to be total clarity about the roads which they are, or are not, allowed to use and the approximate number of trips involved during the whole construction period. All of the above is based on the assumption that the construction of EA1N and EA2 may or may not be simultaneous, and that no account is taken of potential traffic movements generated by the Sizewell C project if this proceeds.

# THE ALDEBURGH SOCIETY

Registered Charity Number 262239 [www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk](http://www.aldeburghsociety.org.uk)



Since there will be an Issue-Specific Hearing on Transport on 12 March, for which material has to be submitted to PINS by 24 February, we shall appreciate an early response to our questions.

ENDS