14th April 2021

PINS Ref: EA1N - EN010077 and EA2 - EN010078

My Ref ID Nos: EA1N 20023910 and EA2 20023912

Dear Examining Authority,

DEADLINE 9 Submission

As we approach the final stages of this protracted process, I would like to make the following four brief observations:

During the hearings it has become crystal clear that the damage that SPR's proposals will have on the East Suffolk environment, economy and people will be massive and quite disproportionate to the benefits of the project. The real tragedy is that the proposed damage and destruction is entirely unnecessary; while it may be of national importance that the offshore windfarms are connected to the grid, the connection does not have to be at Friston. As has been said many times during the hearings, for example by our MP Dr Therese Coffey, there are alternative, and better, locations.

SPR has consistently failed to address the matter of the cumulative impact of the many additional projects that are proposed to come to Friston, should SPR succeed in its application, or of the additional impact of the probable construction of Sizewell C. I understand that SPR takes the view that there will be no cumulative impact; this is obviously absurd.

SPR's proposals involve the destruction of woodland and hedgerows. The Woodland Trust has just published a report: *State of the UK's Woods and Trees*, Woodland Trust, 2021. As reported by the BBC (https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-56738428) "If threats to woodland aren't tackled, the UK's ability to tackle climate and nature crises will be "severely damaged", the charity warns". In short, SPR's proposals run counter to almost everything the Woodland Trust says we should be doing to protect and improve our priceless woodlands.

I therefore add my support to the positions of Dr Coffey, SEAS and SASES, that you recommend to the Secretary of State a "split decision" by which the offshore turbines be consented but that the onshore infrastructure be rejected, and that better locations for the grid connections be considered at a pre-industrialised or brownfield site where the adverse impacts may be minimised.

Yours faithfully



Nicholas Winter