

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: FW: EA1And EA1
Date: 02 June 2021 09:08:14
Attachments: [Human Impact final.docx](#)

From: Liz Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2021 15:17
To: NI Enquiries <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: EA1And EA1

Important:

This email was sent to your old GSI email address. If you wish to continue receiving emails from this sender please update them with your current PLANNINGINSPECTORATE.GOV.UK email address. [Note that the email you are viewing defaults to displaying your @planninginspectorate address despite being sent to your old @pins.gsi.gov.uk or @infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk email address!]

Please refer to the PINS Intranet news item (safe link below) for more information about the Retiring of GSI Email Addresses

<https://intranet.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/news/retiring-gsi-email-addresses/>

Dear Sirs

At ISH10 Scottish Power Renewable endeavoured to submit their reasons for deciding that there was not significant impact upon the Human Health of the communities affected by the proposed construction and installation of EA1North and EA2

I wish to take issue with their reasoning and have in my attached document laid out some of the reasons for my view. Please can you accept this for publication on the website.

Regards Elizabeth Thomas

South Cottage

PINS Reg:20023648
:20023649

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Human Impact Final

01.05. 21

Elizabeth Thomas

PINS Reg:

20023648

20023649

My letter concerns the contributions by Scottish Power Representatives on Human Health during the Issue Specific Hearing 10. Times in the hearing are inserted for reference purposes.

It is regrettable the Applicant (Scottish Power Renewables) has not carried out more research into the area of Human Health and recognised the importance of how developments EA1North and EA2 will impact upon every aspect of the health of the communities in this area.

The Hearing only served to highlight the lack of knowledge the applicant has within the area of Human Health.

The Applicant failed to recognise the impact such a development will have on the local communities affected by the building of the cable route and the substations. Nor did they show they have taken responsibility for the future effects of such developments during the lifetime of the sub stations.

It is unacceptable that, from the outset, the Applicant failed to deliver an in depth document dealing with Human Health, conflating and burying this important area within other submission documents for their development thus serving only to fudge the effect of this development's impact on the discrete areas of Human Health i.e. emotional physical and mental well-being. It highlights the lack of consideration the Applicant gives to the health of the local communities here in East Suffolk favouring the socio economic enhancement of the larger conurbations .

1

25:00.29.15

Mr Innes focuses on the high level aspects of Human Health. His vigorous advocacy for wind power as the answer to national economic development underscores how the Applicant views this area of East Suffolk as dispensable in the pursuit of economic corporate gain.

2

Both Mr Pizzolla and Mr Innes recognize the lack of information and guidance available from regulatory bodies.

It is unacceptable they used this use as an excuse not to compile detailed information in the field of Human Health?

“documents which are specific to wind farms don’t exist re impact on Human Health”

If this is the case why since the inception of this project has the Applicant not drawn upon examples from other sources to compile a detailed up to date document?

Wylfa Newydd Project 8.19 Health Impact Assessment Report

Or indeed their own company Ibedrola who have produced several documents on the Impact of Wind Power developments on communities.

30.26

It is not acceptable that in 2021 Mr Pizzolla states a reason not to compiling a rigorous Human Health document for EA1North and EA2 is because other projects he was involved in did not require a document on Human Health.

If this is, as he states a *“developing practice”* All the more reason for the Applicant to ensure they have covered every area of the impacts of their development on Human Health, not only economic growth of the nation. Benefits of research in this field are available and have been an important inclusion in Suffolk Local Plan and Government policy.

20.39

Why in Mr Pizzolla’s view should the length of the project have a bearing on whether or not it impacts on Human Health? This is a nonsense.

Any project long or short has an impact on the lives of those affected by that project. Mr Pizzolla’s interpretation of Long or Short is a subjective statement and creates a flawed basis for decisions about the level of Human Health submission and resultant quality of documentation required for a project of this length and proportions.

32.10

“we aren’t one of those projects which are going to have a massive residual impact a lot of the impacts we are talking aboutwill be temporary or episodic”

The length of these projects will be in the region of 12 years and 10 hours of daily industrial activity. In addition there will be twenty years of living with a working substation within 200 metres of homes.

How can the Applicant justify this as temporary and episodic. Those living and working in the proximity of the project will not consider this as temporary or episodic.

30.26

“The Applicant has not done a health impact assessment for this type of development before “

This is no reason for not carrying out a Human Health Assessment now.

This disregard of the effects of EA1NAnd EA2 development in all its areas is a reflection of how little value Scottish Power Renewables place upon the people in the communities of East Suffolk. In their view we are dispensable.

3

It is extremely worrying for the future progress of this development and reflects a complete lack of professionalism when both the Applicant’s “experts” present conflicting views on Human Health data and indeed suggest it is a reason not to produce a thoroughly researched document.

35.33

Mr D Smith

“We liaised with Public Health England and they were content with the methodology and indeed their representation suggests they are happy with what we have done”

1.11.07

Mr Pizzolla

“when we consulted with Public Health England ...we got very little response”

What confidence can we have in the conclusions the Applicant has reached if they are drawing upon such weak guidance to reach their conclusions. Using this feeble argument to shore up the effect of the Applicant’s development upon the health of the people who live in East Suffolk leads the Applicant to the conclusion:

1:14.06

“No significant Impact “

I must assume the conclusions on which the Applicant’s findings are based, are founded on their own interpretation for the Applicant’s own benefit and not based upon credible data. Simply they have made up the results to suit their own ends.

4

1:16:59

Of concern is the reliance on the application of the Rochdale Envelope as a basis for the applicant’s reasoning as to how the project will progress. It appears this has been used as a means not to deliver a robust Human Health assessment.

“so there is an element of outline and there is an element of progression throughout the project”

This may be acceptable within the area of construction when dealing with reordering bags of concrete or cable drums but not in the area of Human Health. A few spoiled bags of concrete can be replaced but the damaged mind of a resident living next to the development is a different prospect.

5

Ms Young

1:23:53

“As we refine the design we’re able to make more commitments and refine further”

It is not acceptable the communities affected should be in a “wait and see” situation they need to understand now what is planned not through a piecemeal drip feed process. What confidence is there in a contractor who at the outset admits to “making it up as they go along”

Have they presented all the facts to enable the ExA to make a decision? If this project is accepted will The Applicant throw out any previous submissions and work from a completely different set of rules using “It is an emerging process” as the get out clause for destruction of the health and well-being of this area?

To say it is an evolution is unacceptable leaving communities unsure and anxious.

Ms Young speaks at length about the many public meetings held, iterating at length applauding Scottish Power on how well the Applicant communicated with organisations, assuring the ExA how the communities have been part of a discussion. That is only her view.

Dispelling anxiety and uncertainty we've been very mindful of that

Addressing uncertainties at a public meeting does not eliminate concerns or anxieties. The Applicant has made a grave error assuming because things have been presented to the community it has allayed fears or worries.

6

Conclusion

For all this applauding of communication on the part of Scottish Power the evidence of the disregard the Applicant has for the communities and the lack of communication became evident as from the coast to Friston there was sudden appearance of road management signs early in May. The resultant high levels of uncertainty and distress experienced only served to highlight the concerns the residents have about the working practices of the applicant within the community. Residents had suddenly to deal with traffic restrictions, requirement for unplanned diversions to carryout daily commitments , alteration to work schedules.

This uncertainty continues as the countryside is dug up in swathes from the coast to the proposed site. Resultant traffic, personnel and heavy plant, litter our beautiful countryside restricting pedestrian and vehicle access. Is this what is referred to as *"an emerging process and dispelling anxiety and uncertainty ?"*

Is an email only a matter of hours prior to heavy plant movements closing the roads classed as an acceptable means of communication with the communities?

Where and who is the promised Mentor Liaison Officer?

At this time the residents experience for real blocked footpaths, roads littered with signage, damaged vehicles due to blown over signage. It is unacceptable that the Applicant can suggest the impact on Human Health is "not significant and anxiety is perceived and not real". It is very real and significantly affecting our daily lives now while the project is in examination and any decision has been made.

The ExA must challenge Scottish Power Renewables on their findings that the Impact of their Development

Not significant

Anxiety is perceived

Not real

The EX A must insist a robust and thorough document on the Impact on Human Health is compiled and includes detailed studies into the emotional physical and mental health of the communities not restricted only to the wider economic health.

It is evident Scottish Power Renewable hold these communities in small regard and any fine statements about how well they have dispelled anxieties are all empty words. It is quite apparent the Applicant will renege on any commitment made and ride roughshod over our communities with total disregard for the health or wellbeing of anyone in them .