

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia Two](#); [East Anglia ONE North](#)  
**Subject:** EA1N and EA2  
**Date:** 05 July 2021 22:48:09

---

Dear Inspectorate

2002 3274

2002 3276

I reiterate my objection to the proposals by Scottish Power for the landside development and specifically on the siting of the Substation Development.

1. Cumulative development the site chosen for the substations clearly offers the scope for development of further emerging proposals Nautilus and Eurolink the impact and extent of these is unknown at present and has not been considered. Quite apart from the proposed development of Sizewell C.
2. A predetermined flawed site selection process for the location of the substation development, disrespectful to the public, all of the sites chosen were incapable of supporting in terms of size such a development apart from that at Friston. From the submissions at the hearings it is apparent that National Grid had predetermined the connection point to the grid at Friston prior to the consultation being undertaken by the applicant making an absolute mockery of this DCO consultation process.
3. The physical scale of the development has only now become apparent as Scottish Power have been now forced to carry out ground investigation by the Inspectorate no attempt was made to set out the proposals on the ground prior the information provided during the consultation has clearly been produced to disguise and minimise the truly massive scale of the development. I sincerely hope that the Inspectors have had the opportunity to visit the site whilst the investigation works are being carried out to confirm with their own eyes the scale of what is proposed.
4. The proximity of the development to the village of Friston will have a transformative negative impact on the village with no benefit to its inhabitants. The redline boundary of the development has been extended to arrive on the onto Church Road opposite the village church.
5. Given the proximity of the development to the village of Friston there is no space for effective mitigation with landscape.
6. Impact on the economy both locally and across the coastal area large proportion of which relies on tourism the cumulative impact of these projects must be considered.
7. Ancient footpaths used by the villagers and rights of way will be destroyed
8. The impact on the setting existing Listed Buildings including the Grade 2 \* village church will be irreversible
9. Given the proximity of the substation development to the village of Friston the impact of noise from the transformers onto a tranquil village setting which cannot be mitigated
10. The impact of flooding to the village of Frison which has not been resolved at the hearings and will continue to be an issue as parts of Friston are prone to flooding from rain run-off.
11. Well being of the inhabitants has and will continue to be adversely affected.
12. Traffic impact. The cumulative impact of the various proposed developments has not been properly addressed.

13. A piecemeal approach to connections to the grid independent developers all proposing individual connection to the grid with the accompanying infrastructure requirements necessitating an inefficient use of land.

I ask the inspectorate how can it be that within an area no more than a few square miles in size serviced by very few roads but with a thriving coastal community within and adjacent to an AONB two of the largest construction project in Europe are being considered for approval to be built concurrently (quite apart from the emerging projects). How can it be possibly construed that the benefit of these combined projects will out way their harm? The inspectorate must make its decision cognisant of the cumulative impact of all these projects something that the applicant has not fully taken account of in their submissions.

All these points and many others have been discussed at the hearings and in the main remain unresolved. I strongly believe in and support that a split decision should be made by the Inspectorate allowing the offshore parts of the development to go forward but to refuse on the landside part of the development. This until BEIS review has run its course as this is investigating and promoting proposals to minimise the impact of offshore wind power on coastal communities. As there is emerging government policy in respect of an integrated energy transmission systems from offshore windfarms and the Inspectorate must take account of this in reaching its decision.

Yours faithfully

Luigi Beltrandi