



SPR EA1 NORTH AND EA2 PROJECTS

DEADLINE 13 – FINAL SUBMISSIONS

Interested Party: Mrs. Christine Ive **IP Reference Nos:** 20023417 and 20023433

Date: 1 July 2021

1 - **Friston** is a small dot on the map of This Green and Pleasant Land. A calm, tranquil place. The Church stands proud overlooking the village; houses and cottages by the village green; clusters of houses along the narrow lanes and tucked away in secluded squares. **BUT for how much longer** if the proposed development by Scottish Power Renewables and National Grid is consented? The village will become just another industrialised area comprising of hideous metal work and unsightly tall buildings.

2 - As far back as June 2018 when we attended the first of Scottish Power so called Public Information Days, we voiced our concerns which clearly went in one ear and out of the other side. Written comments were submitted all to no avail. Some of the points raised then and in subsequent representations to PINS Examination process are still outstanding which is highly unsatisfactory. Now after an extensive and extended public enquiry **there are still major issues unresolved.**

3 - **The safety of village residents and visitors is paramount.** We must be able to move around the area unhindered whether it be walking, riding bicycles or horses or driving the car. The volume of traffic has already increased enough to make it uncomfortable walking down our quiet lanes. We have experienced large vehicles clearly having difficulty negotiating the narrow twisting lanes with the inevitable damage to verges and hedges. The area is just not suitable for the type and number of vehicles proposed for the development and in addition to other scheme related traffic ie white van man and worker transport to and from the site. However, the Applicant has still not undertaken a road traffic survey which is alarming.

4 - **Another major issue has always been flooding.** This has been rehearsed many times during the enquiry but Scottish Power have not put forward a convincing/workable solution. They appear to be unable/unwilling to grasp the nettle on this. Over the weekend of 18/19 June we experienced severe flooding where water entered some properties. To concrete over 30 acres of farm land will only exacerbate the problem and potentially lead to even more flooding.

5 - **This area is popular with tourists** yet the Applicant claims tourism will not be affected to any large extent. We beg to differ. Would you take a holiday in an industrial area one that hitherto had been quiet, calm, unspoilt with lots of country walks, big skies and where wild life abounds? Seriously one does wonder whether the Applicants have ever visited this area or if as suspected everything is based on desk top surveys.

6 - **There is an urgent need for the Applicant to improve their communication** with all residents. Currently their advice of Investigation works is sent out at the end (18:02) of the day in question. Not only that but who is actually supervising the work? Because of the configuration of the village, it is difficult to navigate, the proliferation of road signs, and



restrictions has resulted in frustration and a feeling we have been taken over. Added to which, the workforce does not appear to appreciate that this is a deeply rural area. More care and consideration for others would not go amiss, not least when they are destroying our environment.

7 - We used to say we were a village the world forgot but not anymore. East Suffolk Council in particular see us as “Cash Cows”. It was not entirely a surprise when they changed their stance from opposition to ‘neutral’ but the timing was ill judged.

8 - Effectively we have been dumped. So, who now has our interests foremost in their sight?

9 - The current, extended enquiry closes on 5 July. Then in September we have consultations with National Grid Ventures relating to the Nautilus Interconnector.

10 - **How much more are we expected to endure.** And yet cumulative effects have been dismissed.

11 - **In summary the Site Selection was deeply flawed from the outset. At this late stage it is most alarming to see the number of serious issues which are still to be resolved. Additionally, the number of decisions to be taken post consent. This is highly unsatisfactory. There is absolutely no trust in the Applicant to a) keeping us fully informed and b) allowing sufficient time for full consideration of their proposals**

The final decision rests with the Secretary of State WHO SHOULD REFUSE CONSENT OR CONSIDER A SPLIT DECISION.