

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Support for SEAS campaign complaint in respect of SPR's use of non-disclosure agreements  
**Date:** 16 February 2021 17:35:16

---

Correspondence in respect of:

- 1: EA1N - project EN010077: my ref ID: **20024381**; and
- 2: EA2 - project EN010078: my ref ID: **20024383**

Dear Mr Smith

I have seen from the Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) website that a formal Complaint Letter has been sent to you regarding ScottishPower Renewables' (SPR's) 'Option Agreement', entered into with certain landowners and others, and its implications for those signing it.

I wish to add my support to SEAS' efforts to lodge a complaint with and add disagreement to SPR's use of non-disclosure agreements within their Option Agreements and that my email be included within Written Representations for Deadline 6 (24/2/21).

These non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) are undermining the integrity of the statutory application procedure. The risk is that Examiners are not hearing the voices of many people affected, because these parties have been encouraged to sign NDAs believing that the outcome of this Examination is a foregone conclusion, largely because of its NSIP status. There is also pressure on everyone concerned to get on with it and there are, of course, financial incentives to sign these agreements before compulsory action is taken.

Like many, I am outraged at the contents of this Option Agreement, in particular, the fact that it requires parties, commonly at clause 16, to withdraw any previous opposition they may have already made at Examination hearings or in Written Representations, and provide evidence of such withdrawal, and actively support the Applicant going forward.

In a fair, democratic and open society, it is important that all people can speak freely. I believe that the actions of SPR, in requiring NDAs, dissipate the true extent of the opposition to SPR's plans and it is therefore a substantial flaw in the DCO process. These NDAs are unfairly shifting the balance of the debate in favour of the developers and given the immense resources that they have anyway to throw at this process, local communities are even further disadvantaged.

Separately, I understand that EDF has not felt the need to include an NDA in their equivalent Option Agreement relating to Sizewell C and compulsory acquisition of affected land. So, what is that SPR hopes to achieve other than an undermining of the planning process for and green credentials of offshore wind energy. Clearly, SPR seems to have decided with utmost complacency that transparency in its

dealings with the DCO process is not a requirement.

I fervently believe that the ExA has a responsibility to address this very serious issue. It cannot be ignored. I am in total support of SEAS in bringing this matter to your attention and request immediate action to stipulate that all NDAs be removed in any documentation because all they do is impede the planning process.

Following the submission of [REDACTED] at today's hearing (16/2/21), I want to comment at this time also on the submissions by [REDACTED] in respect of the effects of the Applicant's proposals on the Wardens Trust, of which he acts as Chairman of the Trustees. As far as I am concerned, any threat to the fine works that the Wardens Trust provides should be considered an immutable red line.

It should be a matter of profound national disgrace if any organisation such as the Wardens Trust is placed under existential threat because of planning considerations, not least because of the three decades of service that the Wardens Trust has provided from its current location. This cannot and should not be allowed.

The care services that the Wardens Trust provides are essential because mainstream health and social welfare services cannot provide them adequately. The loss of any social capital inherent in the threats to the Wardens Trust should come with a huge burden of responsibility and nothing I have heard from the Applicant has justified any acceptability of the Applicant's onshore plans. For this reason alone, the Applicant's onshore proposals should at the very least be dismissed without merit.

For the record, I remain committed to supporting plans for offshore wind energy but in so doing, the process from wind power generation until connection to the national grid must be 'green' from end-to-end. I do not support SPR's plans for the location of the electricity substations onshore at Friston, a mediaeval village set in unspoilt countryside in coastal Suffolk, when alternative brownfield sites exist nearby that should be used instead.

The added threat to the Wardens Trust cannot be justified and so I suggest that the Applicant's proposals in respect of their onshore substation facilities at Friston naturally fail any reasonable tests for consent.

Yours sincerely

**Gary Waple**

[REDACTED]