From: [redacted]
To: East Anglia ONE North; East Anglia Two
Subject: Your reference EN 010077 and EN 010078
Date: 27 January 2022 11:51:48

My ID. 20023190 and 20023191

Your letter dated 20 December invites interested parties to submit their comments on responses on file relating to your consultation letter of 2 November.

The volume of responses demonstrates the huge concerns in the community about Scottish Power's proposals. Some of them make shocking reading and demonstrate the total disregard shown by Scottish Power to residents views and indeed wellbeing.

The cable route is flawed and I would highlight the Alde and Ore response showing that at the very start of the cable route, drilling under unstable sand cliffs is likely to cause major environmental damage. I would also highlight the response on behalf of Elspeth Gimson that shows the appalling impact on Ness House, just a short distance further down the cable route. It also flags the highly unsavoury practice by SP of using non disclosure agreements to prevent issues coming to the attention of the Planning Inspectorate.

There are a couple of issues that I think are of fundamental importance in considering the SP proposals

First, the impact on the environment. COP 26 emphasised not just the global warming crisis but also the environmental crisis. And in response the government announced the ambition of protecting 30 per cent of the UK land area from development. Much of the area impacted by the SP proposals is already designated as AONB or SSSI. How can it possibly make sense to destroy currently protected land if one is seeking to greatly increase the amount of land with protected status?

Second, the SP proposals are just the tip of the iceberg. Last autumn a 'consultation' was held on the Nautilus Inter-connector that is also seeking landfall on the Suffolk coast and various alternative locations for landfall and for the substation siting were proposed. All of these would cause further damage and destruction to our precious countryside. Since then two further schemes have been announced but 'consultation' has not yet happened. And as we all know there are ambitious plans for many more windfarms off the Suffolk coast.

If all these schemes come to fruition the Suffolk coastal area as we know it will be turned into an industrial wasteland with the tourism based economy destroyed.

I therefore consider it essential that in taking decisions on the SP proposals that the cumulative impact of all these schemes is taken into account. Something that SP has avoided discussing during the consultation process.

There seem to be two main alternatives to what SP proposes. Either one finds a brownfield site at which all these schemes can make landfall and which is strategically placed for connection to the national grid. Alternatively, or in addition, develop the offshore transmission network that I understand is the subject of government strategic planning

Meantime, as our MP recommends, the offshore part of the SP proposal should be accepted but the onshore part refused.

Thank you for consideration of these matters

David Gordon

[redacted]