

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: EA1N Project - ENO 10077 and EA2 Project - ENO 10078 Invitation from the Secretary of State to comment on EA1/2 as per letter of 2 November 2021  
**Date:** 30 November 2021 15:57:02

---

The Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng MP.  
Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Dear Secretary of State,

>>>

>>> This is a last minute plea to you.

>>> Please use your influence and advise the government not to allow SPR and National Grid to wreck the beautiful and extremely popular coast of Suffolk from Southwold down to Woodbridge by covering the area in substations, trenches, concrete and construction traffic for years to come.

>>>

>>> It has become increasingly obvious to anyone following this process that once National Grid has built its substation at Friston, while hiding behind SPR's applications for EA1N and EA2, it will naturally follow that Energy Companies will link up to it. Whatever promises or hints at other locations are made, none are enforceable once permission has been granted. The same applies to National Grid's plans for Nautalis or Eurolink, and they will still want their substations in the area even if the onshore part of SPR's application fails. Now we know there are many more such projects in the pipeline and all for this area.

>>>

>>> As Crown Estates and government have huge ambitions to expand wind power, which most people agree is a good idea, they should be made to give urgent consideration as to how they achieve this. While the upcoming review, promised by government, will look at the possibility of Offshore solutions to delivery of Energy, such as Offshore Ringmain etc, projects such as EA1N and EA2, with all the possible other Energy links may fall through the net, Indeed Mr. Kwarteng, you indicated a reluctance to consider those projects already in the pipeline but maybe this was before the true scale of what was to be meted out on East Suffolk became apparent.

>>>

>>> It would be a disaster for the Suffolk Coast, ANOB, Wildlife and areas of special scientific interest etc, and importantly would put a wrecking ball through the local economy, which relies on tourism and its spinoffs. Southwold, Walberswick, Blythburgh and Aldeburgh are all important and thriving little gems. This has all been documented by SASES, SEAS, Aldeburgh Council and Snape Maltings among others and submitted to you.

>>>

>>> As far as I can see SPR and National Grid have not laid out their true ambition for the scale of industrialisation to be visited on the area, we are now also threatened with huge Hydrogen storage facilities, if and when the National Grid substation is built and there is a palpable lack of trust in what they plan next locally. There should be far more serious consideration given to the brownfield sites available, such as Bramford and Bradwell. Simply preferring to go with the most convenient and cheapest option (for National Grid and SPR) and ignoring the disastrous Cumulative Effect of their projects on the local area should not be allowed and so we are appealing to you not to throw East Suffolk under the bus but to protect all the beautiful towns and villages that will be ruined, as well as Friston, all the rare wildlife locally, many of which are protected species and the local ANOB and areas of Special Scientific Interest.

>>>

>>> This was well articulated by our local MP with a scientific background, Dr. Therese Coffey.

>>> The concept of a split decision seems the best option, allowing work on the wind farms at sea ( stage one ) to go ahead without delay while turning down onshore development of substations etc which would give time for government to properly consider delivery options, hopefully avoiding wrecking the countryside, which they now say they wish to protect.

>>> You specifically asked about flooding in Friston, and as a local who regularly drives down Grove Road, where the site entrances to EA1/2 are sited, I know very well it is subject to continual flooding because of the run off from arable fields and even regularly unpassable. I hope you will not mind receiving yet another, slightly repetitive letter, but we have to do everything we can to prevent what we see as the destruction of this area.

>>> Since the Judge at the Judicial Review in Norfolk on the Cumulative Effect of Energy construction onshore quashed consent for Norfolk Vanguard, we are hopeful that we in Suffolk also have a strong case to prevent the proliferation of energy projects which threaten us and with proper advise the government can be helped to make the best decision.

>>>

>>> Yours sincerely,

>>> Sally Sturridge.

>>> Unique Reference Number 20023726

>>> 