

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: EA1N & EA2
Date: 05 July 2021 18:29:53

Dear Inspectors,

When SPR introduced this project to this area our 1st thoughts were: *Who is coordinating these projects and where is the joined up thinking?* This was even before the site selection process started. Since then a lot has happened, some good, some bad.

On the positive side Government Policy has now embraced the fact that developments of this scale do need to be controlled, coordinated and implemented in such a way as to cause less harm than the good they are meant to provide. This is best summarised by Therese Coffey MP:

"The pressing need for renewable energy does not justify the failure to consider the government's environmental policy. This consistent directive is now echoed within the Executive, the Legislative and the Judicial arms of government. The onshore aspects of these projects, as they currently stand, fly in the face of the Prime Minister's 10 Point Plan, the Prime Minister's response to Duncan Baker, the BEIS Review, the Government Energy White Paper, the Dasgupta Review and nearly every report written on Network Transmission in the last 10 years. It is now irrational to say that the policy environment is not one of greater offshore coordination to protect our environment."

With regards to the current DCO application for EA1N and EA2 a split decision as per the Triton Knoll Windfarm Decision could grant permission for the wind turbine aspect of the project whilst withholding permission for the onshore and grid connection. This would allow for a suitable site to be presented that fulfills the White Paper's aspirations for onshore development. In this way the pristine coastal community that would otherwise be dangerously harmed would be safeguarded without causing delay.

When the site selection process was completed and the Friston site was chosen we could not understand why the bulk of the development was to be in the area between the village and Grove Wood and why if any consideration was to be shown to the village was it not proposed as far away as possible. It didn't take long to realise that this was to allow for further development to take place. We now know that 7 to 8 projects are being considered for this area and will all require connections and infrastructure. Should the EA1N & EA2 on shore application be successful the obvious location for these further developments would be Friston. The cumulative effect of these has not been taken into consideration. With the preliminary investigation works currently underway in Friston the scale of the EA1N & EA2 proposal can now be clearly seen and felt. The area is vast, the proposal huge. This infrastructure will completely dominate the area; undermine and destroy its nature. The site investigation works on their own make the area look like a natural disaster has occurred. It is unimaginable what the implications of further developments would be.

Every aspect of the on shore proposal that seemed wrong to us at the outset has been proven so. Nothing that transpired throughout the hearings gave us any comfort that SPR ever had an understanding of: the delicate nature of where it was making land fall; the biodiversity of the area it wants to pass through; the village it hoped to construct upon; the individuals and businesses in will effect or the overall implications to the successful coastal community it plans on disrupting.

Issues such as traffic, flooding, noise, mitigation, economic disruption, biodiversity, environmental damage, light pollution, etc, etc have not been successfully dealt with and that is because both the landfall site and the location for the sub-stations is fundamentally flawed and as such these issues can not be satisfactory resolved. Indeed to try to deal with the flooding issue at Friston an additional site, yet further into the village setting has had to be utilised and still the issue remains unresolved.

Mr Ines for the applicant continually maintained throughout the hearings that the developer has followed the rules pertaining to such applications: that the scheme doesn't need to be designed; that the cumulative implications of other proposals for the area do not need to be taken into account and that in general SPR has ticked all the boxes it is meant to and that until it comes to the time to actually build the thing they really will not have to have a full understanding of it or it's implications and that this is all within the rules. This type of procedure is simply not good enough when it come to an area such as this part of the Suffolk Coast, an AONB delicately balanced with a thriving coastal community.

I trust that you will see the logic in a split decision that will allow for the off shore development to proceed whilst an appropriate brown field or industrial site is agreed on. New technological advances and government guidance should allow this new form of low carbon energy to help power the nation without causing greater harm than good.

Thank you for all the on line services you offered us during these difficult times. Though we would have very much liked to address you in person, the fact that the hearings were either streamed live or recorded so that we could hear them afterwards meant that we could follow every aspect of the hearings. This was really useful to those of us with access to such services.

I trust you will propose a split decision and as such save this precious environment so that the scheme does not cause greater harm than good.

Yours sincerely

Mya Manakides

20023260

20023261