

From: 
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: EN010077 and EN010078 Offshore Wind Farms - Deadline 6 submission
Date: 24 February 2021 08:39:54

My reference: My Ref 20024140 and 20024137 - Deadline 6 submission

Dear Examining Authority

Since this planning hearing started two significant reports have been published which should have an important bearing on business and planning decisions in the future and indeed on National Infrastructure Projects.

The first report, which was commissioned by HM Treasury is *The Economics of Biodiversity – the Dasgupta Review*. The second is the United Nations report *Making Peace with Nature*. Both these reports have a significant bearing on this planning application and I would ask that the Examining Authority take these reports and their recommendations into consideration when making a decision on this application as together these reports set out a road map for how we should take Nature into account in our choices and business decisions.

In essence both reports highlight how we have been at 'war with Nature' as evidenced by the loss of biodiversity across the entire world. Referring to the Dasgupta Review, fortunately the main 600 page report has been summarised into a 100 page abridged version and indeed further into a 5 page Headline Messages version. I ask that both these reports be considered as part of this written submission.

The underlying messages of the Dasgupta Review are:-

- 1. Our economies, livelihoods and well-being all depend on our most precious asset: Nature.**
- 2. We have collectively failed to engage with Nature sustainably, to the extent that our demands far exceed its capacity to supply us with the goods and services we all rely on.**
- 3. Our unsustainable engagement with Nature is endangering the prosperity of current and future generations.**
- 4. At the heart of the problem lies deep-rooted, widespread institutional failure.**
- 5. The solution starts with understanding and accepting a simple truth: our economies are embedded within Nature, not external to it.**
- 6. We need to change how we think, act and measure success by:**
 - (i) Ensure that our demands on Nature do not exceed its supply, and that we increase Nature's supply relative to its current level.**
 - (ii) Change our measures of economic success to guide us on a more sustainable path.**
 - (iii) Transform our institutions and systems – in particular our finance and education systems – to enable these changes and sustain them for future generations.**
- 7. Transformative change is possible – we and our descendants deserve nothing less.**

The report concludes that we have failed to reflect the impact and cost to Nature in our consumption and calculations of worth, value and prosperity and as a consequence we now run the risk of destroying complete ecosystems around the world.

My question therefore is, whether, within this application, the wider impact on Nature has been fully

and explicitly taken into account in determining the optimum solution to the way of producing wind energy, delivering it to shore and transmitting it in to the national grid?

Have the costs been included of utilising Nature's sea, the air, the land and causing the destruction of wildlife habitats and prime arable land plus the effect on people of the loss of amenity and open space, in particular across the Sandlings and at Friston. Or has the developer assumed that the use of and destruction of these aspects of Nature come for free?

The Dasgupta Review requires us all to put Nature at the heart of our lives and at the front of business decisions. Where there is a viable alternative which protects Nature and the environment then it proposes that we should adopt that option. In the light of this, one has to conclude that SPR has failed to do this otherwise the cable routes would be delivered through existing connections or via a ring main and the required substations would be built on brown field sites not valuable arable land. Clearly even applying these principles does not prevent damage to our environment entirely but where there are viable alternatives that have a lesser impact than the proposals in this application, then we should chose them. The decision by SPR to do what is proposed under this application relating to coming ashore at Thorpeness and building the substations at Friston is evidently one of cost and convenience and is not the optimum solution for Nature. Indeed it wilfully destroys Nature and with it risks starting a chain of development that will further Nature's destruction and lead to long-term destruction of this region's biodiversity.

If wind farm energy companies wish their 'product' to be seen as 'green energy', it must be green from the point of production to the point of domestic use. This application fails on so many accounts to put Nature at the heart of its considerations and therefore must be dismissed.

Yours sincerely

Alan Collett