From: To: East Anglia ONE North, East Anglia Two

Cc: EAN1 EA2 ENO 10077 ENO1078 Subject:

Date: 25 March 2021 23:22:29

Dear Mr. Smith and the Planning Inspectorate team,

My Unique Reference 20023726

Thank you and you all for the patience, good humour and even handedness you have shown over the past months dealing with EA1N & EA2 Planning Inquiry.

Participating in the hearings, it quickly became apparent that one learnt more from what SPR & NG did not say or refused to say than what they actually did say. As has been apparent through the whole process from public consultation to last week, the SPR/NG case has been poorly conceived, poorly informed, poorly consulted and ignored or misrepresented anything that did not support their case.

Whether this is arrogance, subterfuge or incompetence it is hard to determine but it does seem at best immoral that companies using the protection of DCO should be able to be anything less than open and honest.

According to the government ministers the project has been in the planning stages for ten years but they have failed to answer a substantial number of the most obvious questions. To be prepared to fund a project in excess of £2billion and not have completely researched and costed the project is difficult to believe.

Evidence from other NG substation projects around the UK has clearly demonstrated that once the initial connection is made to the grid, further projects are pushed by NG to link at the same place (Necton, Norfolk & Horndean/South Downs NP Sussex). At least in these cases they waited until they had completed the initial projects before trying to link further power infrastructure to the site unlike Friston where they are already pushing further connections. Crown Estates have huge ambitions for leasing windfarms around the coast and the shallower waters of the Channel and North Sea are ideal and so they will want to sell off more sites.

Despite their reluctance to admit it, the cumulative impact of the projects planned for Friston is staggering, notwithstanding the £20billion plus Sizewell C&D project running alongside them. Equally disturbing is that there is no apparent integrated plan for cabling, construction, or siting of the substation and infrastructure.

SPR & National Grid, having failed to make a convincing case for their choice of site, except for the fact that they can expand it exponentially to house a myriad of further substations and industrialise a substantial area of East Suffolk with no regard for the local businesses and population, I believe that Therese Coffey our MP has made a very strong case to the inquiry for the concept of a split decision, allowing work on the wind farms at sea (stage one) to go ahead without delay while turning down onshore development of substations. This would give government and the power companies time for look at better

solutions and new technologies and to formulate an integrated scheme with realistic delivery options and reduce the destruction of the countryside.

It is extraordinary that the SPR legal team should suddenly announce on the last day of the Inquiry that NG might have found another suitable site for part of the planned projects. It is questionable whether this is a reality or a ruse considering their failure to discover it sooner.

With thanks

Piers Sturridge