

From: [REDACTED]
To: secretary.state@beis.gov.uk; [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: PINS Ref: EA1N: EN010077 and EA2: EN010078
Date: 30 January 2022 15:07:57

Dear Madam or Sir

I write in compliance with the imminent deadline of 31st January 2022 as set out in the DBEIS letter of 20th December 2021 and in connection not only with the onshore infrastructure proposed by East Anglia ONE North Limited (EA1N) but also East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm (EA2) and other proposed and mooted onshore infrastructure activities in the area, including but not limited to Nautilus Interconnector, Eurolink Interconnector and Sea Link Interconnector.

I should start by affirming my firm belief in the need for the country to work towards 'net-zero' as far as 'carbon' emissions are concerned, and that renewables such as wind and solar power generation, and also nuclear power, can play an essential role towards achieving that aim.

However, as with any large infrastructure project, damage and disruption will inevitably occur, especially but not only during the construction phase, and these real and substantial downsides must surely, at the very least, be properly weighed against the sometimes somewhat speculative benefits (the wind doesn't always blow, the sun doesn't always shine, for example).

And the overarching issue in the case of EA1N and the other infrastructure projects vying for use of this part of the Suffolk countryside is the cumulative effect of them all – Cumulative Impact Assessment of course being a legal requirement of the Planning Inspector's Examination procedure.

For example, whatever EA1N's response to the SoS's request for an update on the Great Crested Newt District Level Licencing scheme may be, it will only address EA1N's activities. The outcome may be acceptable, in isolation, but when combined with all the other infrastructure activity threatened for the area, the total demise of this particular creature seems a more than likely outcome.

More serious is the inevitable Cumulative Impact in other ways – for example:-

- Multiple cable routes cutting through at least one AONB, one SSSI and one SPA. I understand that EA1N and EA2 alone require a massive 'cable corridor' some 70 metres wide. Assuming the other mooted projects all 'plough their own furrows' as it were, the resultant devastation will be even greater.
- As if that wasn't enough, the substations for EA1N and EA2 alone are scheduled to cover over 12 hectares, an SPR site of over 40 hectares is scheduled to dwarf the medieval village of Friston, and only recently announced interconnectors will apparently each require a 4 hectare site with converter stations over 24 metres high.
- The peace, rural nature and abundance of wild life in this part of Suffolk generates substantial tourism income to the region, estimated by the relevant DMO to suffer by up to £40m pa if just EA1N and EA2 proceed as intended by SPR, and inevitably an even greater loss of tourist-related jobs and business if the other projects referred to above are included.

It appears that, despite requests, SPR have consistently failed to address this absolutely key issue of Cumulative Impact, or at best argue that there isn't sufficient information to carry out any assessment – a stance which simply isn't credible, merely self-serving.

The adverse consequences of not even seeking to mitigate the Cumulative Impact of these multiple projects will outweigh, permanently, any possible benefits to the region – they will, in short, have a catastrophic and permanent effect on this fragile part of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths and the people living and working within it.

But above all, there are alternatives to this wanton destruction of such a sensitive region of the country. There are much more appropriate 'brownfield' and industrial sites for the onshore infrastructure, and if SPR and the other potential developers were required to work together so that, for example, cabling is combined offshore to minimise the destruction of habitat onshore, that destruction and much other damage could be substantially reduced.

I would urge that the Inspector splits the planning decision: *grant* consent for the offshore infrastructure by all means, but *reject* the proposed onshore structure pending a thorough review by Ofgem/BEIS of the alternative sites and alternative cabling options.

Yours faithfully

David Argent