

From: [REDACTED]
To: East Anglia ONE North; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: EA1N and EA2 - objection to extension of the examinations
Date: 14 April 2021 19:40:16

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: Fwd: EA1N and EA2 - objection to extension of the examinations

My unique reference number 20023726

Dear Inspectorate,

I would back the letter of objection to the extension of the examinations for EA1N and EA2 sent by SEASand SASES and others, unless it is for the sole purpose of giving the examiners more time to consider evidence already given.

It is most unfair to expect objectors, both individual and businesses, who will be most affected by the multiple energy projects, and who have already been overstretched, to compete with Scottish Power Renewables and National Grid, both with seemingly huge resources, for a further three months. It gives SPR, with its deep pockets a huge advantage. It is also unclear why the Inspectorate would want to collect even more evidence if it needs more time to consider what it already has.

SPR will no doubt do its best to negate any evidence produced against its plans, by whatever means it can, whilst ignoring any genuine concerns.

Concerns such as the Cumulative effect of all the separate projects creating a huge and devastating effect on Coastal Suffolk, both on the landscape, wildlife and on the local economy which relies on tourism.

EA1N, EA2 and the National Grid have obviously been planned for 10 years or more at some level, but times have changed. No one could have foreseen all those years ago the popularity and investment into wind power, and the Cumulative effect of all the

projects to come ploughing their way into poor little Friston, industrialising the East Coast of Suffolk and wrecking the Tourist industry. Holidaymakers do not want to sit in lorryjams (9 separate projects plus possibly Sizewell C) ,stare at concrete and listen to heavy duty machinery.

It would be a real scandal to allow this when there are good alternatives such as Bradwell and Bramford which SPR may not want to but could easily afford to use.

These are the reasons why a split decision would be best and allow for Offshore work to go ahead and onshore solutions to be part of the upcoming BEIS Review.

Yours sincerely,
Sally Sturridge

Sent from my iPad