

From: [REDACTED]
To: secretary.state@beis.gov.uk; [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: East Anglia 1N EN10077 (20023073) and East Anglia 2 EN010078 (20023074)
Date: 30 January 2022 19:26:34

Dear Secretary of State,

Recent developments have made the Application to the Planning Enquiry considering the Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) proposal inaccurate and deceptive by omission in respect of the proposed onshore developments.

Throughout the Enquiry both SPR and National Grid (NG) have been “economical with the truth” by claiming that they had not agreed any further projects connecting to the proposed Friston substations but as soon as the Enquiry was completed projects were announced for Nautilus Interconnector, Eurolink Interconnector and now the Sealink Interconnector - all requiring further substations at Friston. These projects which total at least five new sites covering hundreds of acres should have been disclosed to the Inspectors who would have had to consider the CUMULATIVE IMPACT on Friston and the wider community faced with at least 5 seventy metre wide cable corridors stretching 9 km from the coast and a vast industrial complex next to a medieval village.

The proposed Friston site was chosen to meet NG’s requirement for connecting to the national grid network overhead power cables. Now it is proposed that instead NG connect to the Sea Link Interconnector running from Sizewell to Kent and not to the power lines at Friston. This would mean that power from all the various projects would travel by numerous cable corridors to Friston, causing enormous damage and disruption to the community, and then travel back to Sizewell by even more cable corridors which is plainly ridiculous.

There are perfectly good sites for the large industrial complex of substations promoted by NG at both Sizewell and Bradwell.

There is suitable poor quality land at Sizewell, partly owned by EDF, and a previous Enquiry confirmed that substations could be built on that part classified as an AONB. It has far more suitable road and rail connections to avoid clogging up local roads.

The alternative is to build at Bradwell where there is considerable land available, there is no large local population and there are facilities for bringing supplies by sea avoiding excessive transport on the road network. Now that NG intend to lay the Sea Link Connector it would take all the power from the site without needing new overhead lines.

Both sites would avoid long cable corridors devastating the local countryside, the destruction of valuable farmland, and the disastrous effect of building work and the installation of a major industrial complex, over 10 years or more, overwhelming the village of Friston.

Throughout the Planning Enquiry both SPR and NG ignored requests from the Inspectors to provide information on the scale and detail of the proposed hub which meant that the Enquiry could not judge the CUMULATIVE IMPACT of all the proposed developments.

In addition the whole onshore proposal has now changed with the proposal to use the Sea Link Interconnector rather than link to the national grid power lines.

I endorse the Rt Hon Therese Coffey MP’s proposal for a split decision which grants consent for the offshore infrastructure but the onshore application is rejected in favour of full consideration of better locations for this major industrial development. This consideration should be in conjunction with the Offshore Transmission Network Review.

A.N.Morley

