

EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
EastAngliaTwo@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

5th July 2021

PINS Ref: EA1N - EN010077 and EA2 - EN010078

My Ref ID Nos: EA1N 20023910 and EA2 20023912

Dear Examining Authority,

DEADLINE 13 WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

As this is the final deadline for submissions, I would just like to summarize briefly my principal concerns about SPR's EA1N and EA2 proposals:

Catastrophic effect: SPR's proposals will have a catastrophic effect on people and the environment along the cable corridor, in Friston and more widely across East Suffolk, on businesses related to tourism, for example. Additionally, these proposals will only be the beginning, with other connections seeking to be made at Friston.

National Grid: the absence of NG from the hearings was lamentable. NG is the "Organ Grinder" in all of this as they dictate where SPR can connect to the grid. Their refusal to face the people of East Suffolk, either in public meetings or during the Examinations, means that their decisions cannot be tested in public debate. Doubtless, they would prefer the simplicity of a command economy, where they would be untroubled by planning hearings. In my view, NG's unwillingness to justify their decisions in public is itself sufficient reason for SPR's proposals to be rejected.

Flood risk: Friston is at risk of flooding even without SPR's misguided proposals. The ditch that runs through Friston, erroneously referred to by SPR as "Friston Main River", is a small village ditch that is generally dry and often (as it is today) choked by nettles and other vegetation. It beggars belief that it should form a central part of SPR's proposals for drainage of this massive infrastructure project.

Cumulative Impact: as we have heard during the hearings, if implemented the EA1N/EA2 proposals will result in many other connections being made to the grid at Friston. The cumulative impact will be intolerable and devastating on local people and the environment over years, or probably decades, of construction and of the resulting infrastructure in perpetuity. In addition, this will be happening at the same time as the likely construction of Sizewell C. A civilized society should not be contemplating inflicting such damage and suffering on this small area of Suffolk, especially when there are better alternatives available.

Split Decision: in her contribution to ISH17, our MP Dr Therèse Coffey said: *"In short, in order for the Applicant's proposals to adhere to the emerging government policy of greater offshore coordination to protect our environment – which has been backed again at the highest level in Parliament this month - then the onshore aspects of these projects must be rejected in favour of a grid connection which offers the capacity to integrate multiple projects without having a devastating impact on local communities and our precious landscapes."*

I wholeheartedly agree and therefore add my support to the position of Dr Coffey, SEAS and SASES and others that you recommend to the Secretary of State a "split decision" by which the offshore turbines be consented but that the onshore infrastructure is rejected, and that better locations for the grid connections be considered at a pre-industrialised or brownfield site where the adverse impacts may be minimised.

Yours faithfully

Nicholas Winter