

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [psrobertjenrick@communities.gov.uk](mailto:psrobertjenrick@communities.gov.uk); [beiscorrespondence@beis.gov.uk](mailto:beiscorrespondence@beis.gov.uk);  
[minister.kwartengcorrespondence@beis.gov.uk](mailto:minister.kwartengcorrespondence@beis.gov.uk); [secretary.state@beis.gov.uk](mailto:secretary.state@beis.gov.uk);  
[therese.coffey.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:therese.coffey.mp@parliament.uk); [matthew.hicks@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.hicks@suffolk.gov.uk); [steve.gallant@eastsoffolk.gov.uk](mailto:steve.gallant@eastsoffolk.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** The attempt by SPR to prohibit landowners from making any representation opposing the above application  
**Date:** 15 February 2021 12:46:35

---

## Important:

This email was sent to your old GSI email address. If you wish to continue receiving emails from this sender please update them with your current PLANNINGINSPECTORATE.GOV.UK email address.

[Note that the email you are viewing defaults to displaying your @planninginspectorate address despite being sent to your old @pins.gsi.gov.uk or @infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk email address!]

Please refer to the PINS Intranet news item (safe link below) for more information about the Retiring of GSI Email Addresses

<https://intranet.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/news/retiring-gsi-email-addresses/>

To PINS Examination team, for the attention of Rynd Smith, Lead Examiner

15th February 2021

Dear Mr. Smith,

It has been brought to my attention by SEAS that SPR have included a clause in the conclusion of their agreements with landowners, re acquisition of land for EA1N and EA2, which not only prevents the land owners from opposing the application but also means they would have to withdraw any evidence already given to the Inspectorate.

This clause states:

[REDACTED]

While it is obviously up to the individual landowner to sign any agreement they wish with

SPR, I consider it inappropriate for SPR to dictate the withdrawal of evidence already given, in good faith, to the Inspectorate. SPR will no doubt argue this is a normal commercial term, but in this case, it seems to me, that they are attempting, late in the day, to interfere in the planning process and intimidate the landowner into withdrawing a previously strongly held objection to the substations at Friston, while under the threat of the compulsory purchase of their land.

I have faith in The Examining Authority, and hope very much they will not permit SPR to use the leverage that it has in relation to the compulsory planning rules to undermine the investigation and waste tax payers and objectors time and money at such a late stage.

While the whole DCO process is weighted in support of the applicant I feel it can not be right that those with the most legitimate reasons to oppose this application by SPR to be apparently gagged in this way, and made to withdraw previous objections of all kinds because of financial pressure.

Please would you convene a special hearing to investigate and put a stop to this and reinstate any evidence already withdrawn because of the retrospective part of the clause to landowners.

Yours sincerely,  
Sally Sturridge.

Sent from Windows Mail