

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to SPR's Planning Applications  
**Date:** 31 January 2022 22:58:45

---

Dear Sir/Madam

Further to the request by the Secretary of State for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy for further information, I wish to register objection to the above applications.

1. The Friston substation and associated onshore cabling associated with these applications will devastate a precious Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and create a massive blot on the Suffolk landscape. Whilst I support the enhancement of renewable energy supply, it can surely be achieved using brownfield or pre-industrialised areas closer to the coast.
2. The hearings to date have not taken into account the true scale of the energy hub planned for Friston. I understand that if SPR's plans are approved a network of additional substations will be built on the site over the next 10-15 years. National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) has recently confirmed their intention to connect a new interconnector, 'Sea Link', (formerly known as SCD1) into the 'Sizewell Area'. The purpose of Sea Link is to take the power brought in by EA1N/2, Nautilus and Eurolink from Suffolk down to Kent to distribute within the Thames Valley where it is needed. This is the sixth confirmed energy project in the Thorpeness - Friston- Snape area, others being National Grid Substation, East Anglia One North (EA1N), East Anglia Two (EA2) and Nautilus. Cumulatively these will devastate rural communities, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and tourism vital to the economy of the neighbouring region.
3. From the outset SEAS (Suffolk Energy Action Solutions) and others have submitted evidence into the Examination that Friston is to become a huge energy hub and have challenged National Grid to admit the true scale of this Hub. Their failure to present the full picture into the Examination is deliberate obfuscation. The Applicant has failed to carry out a robust Cumulative Impact Assessment of these additional projects, claiming that *"there remains insufficient information to undertake the assessment requested."* This argument is not credible when one considers the evidence in the public domain on these projects. As a result, Cumulative Impacts have not been properly assessed within this Examination. Cumulative Impact Assessments are a legal requirement of the Planning Inspectorate's Examination procedure. The confirmation of Sea Link Interconnector's plans to connect into the area is further evidence of the creeping plans to industrialise the region.
4. The adverse impacts on the environment, communities and the local economy are not understood by SPR. Notably they have failed to understand the fragility of the cliffs at Thorpeness and the existential threat to the village of Friston. They have also failed to

understand the tourism appeal of this part of Suffolk and its vital importance to the local economy.

5. I am extremely concerned that ScottishPower has failed to acknowledge and assess 'protected species' at the River Hundred. The cable trench route, which cuts across the River Hundred, will sever the wildlife corridor for protected species including otters, water voles and bats. Independent surveys must be carried out at the correct time of year. Without this crucial information, the Secretary of State surely cannot consent to these projects.
6. The assessment used to justify the selection of the Friston site was flawed being deliberately designed to come up with an answer to a decision that had already been made. The heritage value of listed buildings that surround the site were not given adequate weight. The local community has no faith in the independence of the surveys carried out.
7. SPR has used compulsory purchase powers to gag landowners. They have prevented landowners from participating or being able to give evidence to the Authority. Opposing voices have thus been silenced compromising an Examination that is supposed to be fair and transparent. SPR seems intent upon destroying this part of Suffolk by rushing through plans without proper consultation or regard for the environment and affected communities.

Wind power is an exciting and positive prospect, but locating these two projects with more to come, on a fragile protected coastal area will result in the destruction local ecology, severe damage to tourism and the local economy and is not acceptable.

Would you kindly acknowledge my concern as an Interested Party.

Yours faithfully

Cameron Wheeler

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)