



To The Planning Inspectorate  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
BRISTOL BS1 6PN

For attention of: Mr Rynd Smith, Lead Member for examination of East Anglia One (North) and East Anglia Two Development Consent Orders

Dear Sirs,

**Re: Issue Specific Hearing ISH 16, Substation Design and Flood Risk Issues**

**Deadline 11** Prior to ISH 16, I read with dismay the continuing disinterest by NGET for their part in the arbitrary decision to site a completely new substation at Friston for the purpose of servicing the onshore element of the East Anglia One (North) and East Two wind farms proposed by Scottish Power Renewables (SPR). Here, I refer to the email from lawyers Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP on behalf of NGET and published on the PINS website on 21/05/2021 in anticipation of ISH 16.

Following the proceedings of ISH via live streaming (for which PINS are to be congratulated!) it became clear to a lay person like myself, that the NGET substation should have been the subject of a separate NSIP DCO Application. As a separate applicant, NGET should have been required to justify from the outset:

- why a completely new NGET substation is required?
- why the only viable site bordering the North Sea is at Friston?
- why the size of the proposed NGET substation is so large?
- why such an elaborate switching network requiring subterranean circuit-breaker cable sealing ends is required to connect just the two SPR substations?
- why all major switching requirements could not have been undertaken at Bramford, given that this the major substation is directly downstream of Friston and there is no need to transform voltages or direct power to other parts of the 400 kV grid via “T” sections branches.

It is now clear that the workings of the Connection & Infrastructure Options Note (CION) process is opaque to the public at large and thus provides NGET with a form of “planning permission” outside the NSIP route. This process undermines the proper scrutiny of the proposed NGET development by yourselves and disadvantages us as local residents. In attempting to answer questions posed by the Inspectorate at ISH 16 regarding, *inter alia*, the siting of the NGET substation, impact upon local pluvial drainage arrangements, choice of AIS or GIS switchgear, landscaping, I feel that SPR, as promoter of the NGET substation, but with no design or managerial control of the enterprise was left floundering.

The promotion of EA1(N) and EA2 projects by SPR is predicated upon the build of an entirely new NG substation at Friston, (*sine qua non*). The siting of permanent industrial structures at Friston with the attendant risk to the village of unwanted noise and flooding, plus all the damage that arises from the construction phase are traceable to this decision. As such, I ask that a full forensic assessment of the NGET site selection process form part the Inspectorates decision making process regarding the DCO for EA1(N) and EA2.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Thomas – RR-804