

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Fwd: Invitation from the Secretary of State to comment on EA1N/2 as per letter of 2 November 2021
Date: 01 December 2021 08:13:28
Attachments: [clip_image001.png](#)

[REDACTED]

Date: Tue, 30 Nov 2021 at 18:39
Subject: Invitation from the Secretary of State to comment on EA1N/2 as per letter of 2 November 2021
To: <[REDACTED]@parliament.uk>
Cc: <[REDACTED]@parliament.uk>

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

Dear Secretary of State, I am writing regarding the proposed **Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) and National Grid EA1N and EA2** infrastructure.

Throughout the Examination process, indeed from the first we, villagers of Friston, heard of SPRs proposals for the development of substations we have had grave concerns. Following SPRs initial Consultations our concerns were considered to be solely those of the visual and auditory impacts of the infrastructures on our village. I must confess that in the first instance this may have been the case but very soon, when we started uncovering the layers of what the construction and operational effects would be, it became clear that there were more urgent issues for us, as villagers, to consider.

The issue of **Flooding** became one of our gravest concerns. Friston regularly experiences flooding: heavy rain results in water running off the fields leads to blocked drains, flooded roads and homes. The Friston river/watercourse with runs from Church Road towards the centre of the village is nothing more than a dyke, filled with weeds and foliage - which is poorly managed by the Environment Agency - it is clear that it will not be suitable for run off from the proposed substation site. Following discussions at a Consultation event, SPR reneged on their promise to send a flood engineer to visit the proposed site - this has shown the villagers that lack of concern SPR has for the villagers! Indeed they only did some survey works post the Examination period - surely a consideration about the possibility of flood risk, on land which is to be built on, should have been part of initial site survey prior to a site being selected! I would like to thank the work of SASES, who employed experts in several areas of concern, for highlighting the short-comings of SPRs planning paperwork. Please excuse my lack of technical language, I am not schooled in the

law and language of infrastructure development, but as resident of Friston, and indeed Suffolk Coastal, there are key issues which have become clear which will impact us greatly.

As a resident I am still concerned about the loss of **footpaths** available to the village, and indeed I must include in all topics I mention, residents from all areas affected by the construction works including: Thorpeness, Sizewell, Aldringham et al. The roads in the area are narrow country lanes - they are used by walkers, cyclists, horse-riders, they are not suitable for HGVs - there is a serious risk of injury indeed even loss of life!


Much of the economy of this part of Suffolk comes from **tourism**. You will have already been made aware of concerns by major businesses in the area. Fears are around the probability of **increased traffic** on the roads, the loss of the **dark night skies**, the increase in **noise** from the construction and operation of the proposed substation. We have been made aware that our fears do not rest solely with SPR/National Grid's EA1N & EA2 plans, as the **cumulative impact** of other proposed infrastructure projects which will come to Friston if EA1N and EA2 are consented will destroy this area as a place for people to live, retire to and holiday in. I haven't even entered here into a discussion about the proposed Sizewell C project just a few kilometres away!

I have included an extract from the **East Anglian Daily Times** to remind you of what the residents and visitors to this part of East Anglia are going to have taken away from them should Scottish Power Renewables be given consent to desecrate the land with the onshore infrastructure associated with its EA1 North and EA2 Projects:

"Suffolk beauty spots ranked among best in UK



Published: 3:55 PM November 25, 2021

Suffolk Coast and Heaths has been voted the 9th best Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in a Which? poll. - Credit: 

Two of Suffolk's areas of outstanding natural beauty are among of the best in the UK, according to a recent survey by consumer experts Which?.

Suffolk Coast and Heaths, and the Dedham Vale areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONBs) were voted for by 5,812 Which? Connect members.

People voted based on their own experiences of the destinations for their scenery, walks, wildlife, peace and quiet, visitor facilities, food and drink, tourist attractions and accommodation.

There are 46 AONBs in the UK and the Suffolk Coast and Heaths — which covers 441sq km, taking in Sizewell, Woodbridge and coming down to the River Stour — ranks 9th on the list.

Suffolk Coastal Heaths received a 82% score from the consumer experts, with three stars awarded for its scenery and tourist attractions, four stars for its walks, five stars for wildlife and four stars for peace and quiet, visitor facilities, food and drink and accommodation."

Like most people in our country, I am in favour of the UK developing Renewable Energy. On the surface it would seem that the proposed EA1N and EA2 projects are 'green' projects, but the truth is they are not! If you grant consent East Suffolk will lose hundreds of acres of **arable green land**, there will be the knock on effect of the loss of **wildlife and biodiversity**. Currently the Government is outlining the importance of open green spaces for the **mental well-being of people** - yet if this project is consented residents will lose this

- what a contradiction!

It is evident that SPR, as a commercial company with Shareholders who want to make a profit from their investment, are prepared to put money before people: they are prepared to destroy what local people need to get what their Shareholders want. They are not concerned with saving the planet, but saving money. If there was a cost/benefit analysis completed for this project the benefits are all SPRs - there are no benefits for the people most affected by the proposed project.

I would like to join with many others who are calling for you to consent to the offshore infrastructure of SPRs EA1N and EA2 project but refuse consent to the onshore infrastructure. SPR must be made to build on a site which does not suffer from regular floods, they should not be allowed to build on green land, they must be made to find an alternative site, away from a village and peoples' homes, to a site, probably a brownfield site, which will result in a more truly 'green' project.

Yours faithfully.
Marie Szpak

Pins Ref: EA1N - 20024475; EA2 - 20024476