From:
To: East Anglia Two; East Anglia ONE North

Subject: Offshore Wind Energy - East Anglia One - EN 10077 and East Anglia Two - EN 10078

Date: 24 February 2021 21:21:23

Dear Sirs

- 1. I am happy to support the application for offshore wind turbines on the grounds that renewable energy of this sort makes sense, and putting it out to sea does the least damage to the beauty of Suffolk.
- 2. I am completely against the on shore infrastructure being put into the middle of a beautiful rural setting that is so famous for tourists to come to. It makes no sense to mount the wind farms out to sea if the applicants are then going to destroy the local tourist economy by building huge and unsightly infrastructure buildings in areas of natural beauty when brownfield sites are not only available, but would bring employment to areas that need it, rather than destroying existing tourism and beauty.

The applicants have obviously not done their research until after completing their applications, and this shows that they do not have any care in what they are doing, and are only looking for the solution that they think will be the cheapest for them, despite the enormous cost to Sufflok. They have given no thought to the damage they will be doing, nor are they at all interested in the people who live in the area as they would never propose the number of Large Lorries that will descend on roads that have clearly not be surveyed, as they are completely unsuitable for such mammoth trucks. The road to Aldeburgh is used by cars and cyclists alike, and is scarcely wide enough for the traffic which uses it now, but the thought of two large trucks passing each other in opposite directions on roads with high banks on either side of the road, and cyclists using the roads will inevitably result in accidents which are likely to be fatal, and when that happens I would like to know who will take responsibility for the deaths. I should point out that there are no pavements on this road, so there will be nowhere for cyclists to escape to if two trucks and a cyclist meet in the same place, probably on a corner of what is a road full of blind bends. Anyone who uses this road into Aldeburgh regularly will know how totally unsuitable it is, and must ask themselves how could the applicants seriously expect this to be safe?

I am aware that there are those who wish this part of Suffolk to be the energy coast, and whilst that might have a positive ring to some, it is completely unnecessary for it to be at the expense of the tourism and beauty of Suffolk. It is possible for the two to coexist, but only if the planners take a sensible and brave long term view, and put the infrastructure where it does minimal damage to Suffolk, and provides maximum employment close to the areas that need it.

Finally please note that the loss of income to the area due to the disruption is supposed (according to the applicants) to be made up by the purchasing power of the workforce at the sites. These two incomes are totally incompatible, and the money being lost through the damage being caused to tourism cannot be simply made up by different income, as the businesses of the area are based on tourism, not construction. This application, if allowed in the current suggested site will ruin the area for generations.

Please, please make an enlightened decision, and ensure the infrastructure is put into a brown field site which would benefit from it rather than destroying Suffolk as we know it.

Michael Turner



The above information is confidential to the addressee. Unauthorised access and use is prohibited. Internet communications are not secure and therefore this Company does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us by replying to this Email as soon as possible and then delete this Email from your computer. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use is prohibited and may be unlawful. Fuller, Smith & Turner P.L.C. Registered Office - Pier House, 86-93 Strand on the Green, London, W4 3NN. Registered in England Number 241882.