

From:



[Redacted] [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)

Subject:

Invitation from Secretary of State to comment on EA1N/2 as per letter of 2 November 2021 (EN010077 & EN010078)

Date:

26 November 2021 15:56:48

The Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng MP,

Secretary of State for the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Dear Mr Kwarteng,

We understand that interested parties have been invited to comment on certain issues in relation to the examination process for these projects. We should like to comment as follows:

Flood Risk

As you know the proposed infrastructure development is in the vicinity of the village of Friston. We are personally aware of a series of flooding incidents in Friston in October 2019, which at the time caused damage to several properties. A Suffolk County Council investigation report on one of those flood incidents suggested that it was a 1 in 40 year event, caused by significant rainfall. It also suggested that farming practices increasing the run off rate and volume of water, were a contributing factor to the flooding. That report made no reference to the impact of climate change. Neither did it make in its recommendations, any provision for climate change or the impact of massive onshore cabling and infrastructure development.

It is absolutely clear to all of us that climate change is happening. It is a reality. The Environment Agency is clear about making allowances for climate change, but do their recommendations go far enough. Given the huge scale of the cable corridors and the onshore infrastructure for EA1N, EA2, Nautilus and other proposed projects for this area, we fear that this ill-considered development could place Friston and our other local communities in peril of further flooding events. Further, we should not forget that landfall for this project is proposed at Thorpeness, where it is feared that subsea cable work could threaten the fragile landscape in that area. With climate change and rising sea levels, it also has the potential to become a community in peril of such an event. Some of the applicant's consultation process have been shown to be woeful. Whilst we don't have the expertise to challenge their flood risk assessments, we don't have much confidence in their ability to manage them effectively either.

Inadequate Cumulative Impact Assessment

On the subject of a woeful consultation process, we feel compelled to comment further on the applicant's ability to firstly, adequately consult effectively with all communities

affected by the proposed infrastructure development. Secondly, on their failure to adequately consider the cumulative impacts of not just their development proposal, but others that impact too, namely Sizewell C, Nautilus and Eurolink. Huge destruction of protected landscapes, including AONB. Destruction of biodiversity, disruption to wildlife, local communities, tourism and the potential for traffic chaos.

Traffic

Our statement relating to the potential for traffic chaos is based on our personal use and knowledge of the road networks in this area and the challenges that they can present. There will be a frightening number of additional HGV vehicles and works traffic on these roads, not just from the applicant's infrastructure development, but potentially from Sizewell C and the other proposed projects. These additional vehicles will be contributing in no small way to the very climate crisis that the energy technology associated with such infrastructure is trying to solve. We have noted particularly during the pandemic a substantial increase in vehicle movements and traffic volumes. The trend toward staycations is to be commended for climate and economic reasons. We don't see this trend changing. East Suffolk is already a popular tourist destination, still growing in popularity. We doubt that the applicant's impact assessments made any such provision for a sudden change in visitor numbers and additional vehicle movements on our roads, beyond those that they expect to make as a consequence of their own development proposal.

It should be further noted that many of the local road systems here are simply not suitable for too many large HGV's. We are an agricultural area, with numerous large vehicles already on the move on a day to day basis. Deep ruts appear on the roads edge and verges, where large vehicles are having to move aside to allow the passage of other such vehicles. These ruts are a nuisance and a potential hazard and danger to other road users. One such road where this repeatedly happens is the A1094, a proposed route for the applicant's HGV and works traffic and a much used road by locals and visitors. It may be an 'A' road, but we don't consider it fit for purpose in terms of its capacity to cope with large vehicle movements. It is only one road among many in this area that will struggle with the consequences of a massive infrastructure development, on an industrial scale. The additional HGV and works traffic burden placed on our major roads is expected to encourage other vehicle drivers to seek alternative routes. Minor roads, routes through our villages and quiet roads will become the routes of preference, causing further disruption to our countryside and local communities. It is not a happy prospect.

Split Decision

We are not adverse to wind energy. We commend it. **YES**, to the turbines. **NO**, to the onshore infrastructure in this area. We ask you once again to consider a split decision and move toward a more suitable brownfield or industrial site for the location of the onshore infrastructure. The energy infrastructure proposed for this part of East Suffolk is on an industrial scale. It is ill considered, ill advised and would be hugely damaging and disruptive in so many ways.

We fear with the pressures of climate change, our growing, greener energy needs and the

government ambitions to meet its own carbon emission targets that decisions may have already been made with regard to East Suffolk's energy industrialisation. If it's not too late let's not forgot, 'when nature is undervalued, bad choices can be made. Let's make a better choice, **brownfield or industrial site**.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Lesley Swann & Mr John Swann

