

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DEADLINE 6 Submission
Date: 24 February 2021 20:14:51

PINS Ref: EA1N- EN010077 and EA2 - EN010078

My Ref ID No 20024324 and 20024325

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' so that:

1. **The offshore turbines are recommended for consent.**
2. **The onshore infrastructure is rejected in favour of full consideration of better locations for this infrastructure where the adverse impacts are minimised at a brownfield site, sites such as Bradwell as Dr Therese Coffey has consistently proposed or Bramford which was the original planned location for the onshore infrastructure.**

As an Interested Party, I have participated throughout the course of the Hearings and it 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 our 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 at a brownfield site.

These Applications have come at an unprecedented time of consensus around the importance of offshore wind 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 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 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.

In the light of Thursday's High Court ruling on Norfolk Vanguard windfarm where the reasons for squashing the Secretary of State's decision was "cumulative

impact" and that it had not been fully assessed, I believe that there is even more need to urge a 'split decision' as a constructive way forward.

Kind regards,

Susan Osben