



To The Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng MP  
Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

29<sup>th</sup> November 2021

Dear Secretary of State

**DCO Applications by Scottish Power Renewables for proposed East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia Two windfarms**

As an interested party I am writing in response to the request for information dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November. I have read the response submitted by SEAS and agree with what is said there. I wish to emphasize the following points.

1. SEAS has expressed the concern that BEIS has not identified or recognized the unethical conduct of SPR in buying-off potential objectors and preventing them from participating in the planning investigation. I have to endorse SEAS's objection. The SPR substation site extends to our garden fence. The works will take place literally within metres of our home. The effect of this will be utterly devastating. SPR and National Grid, together, failed to disclose to the ExA the full extent of the planned works and therefore to address the cumulative impact of constructing a massive energy hub at Friston. It is no coincidence that within days of the investigation finishing we learned of the full extent of the succession of works that are in fact planned for Friston and which of course have been known about for months.

Throughout this whole inquiry SPR's approach has been unethical. SPR paid off objectors using their agents to tell them that consent was inevitable and that if they did not accept SPR's payment they would be paid far less when SPR later exercised statutory compulsory purchase power. Many complained to the ExA of being bullied by SPR. SEAS objected strenuously to the ExA which issued a decision expressing real concern about SPR's conduct. SPR promised in response to the ExA request to provide full information. But they never did. They deliberately withheld information and evidence.

The overall effect of SPRs conduct has been to cause real harm and prejudice to the evidence that the ExA was able to collect. Some of the wealthiest and most influential of all the potential objectors were silenced. So far as we are aware the ExA did nothing about this. We do not even know if they have addressed this in their recommendations.

This is the context in which we received the request for information. None of the most directly landowners will now respond because they are subject to an agreement which prohibits them from giving evidence or assisting the Secretary of State.

One of the most unfair aspects of this inquiry was the fact that SPR was given multiple chances to keep putting in evidence when they knew full that we – the affected parties – were starved of resources. The approach you now adopt just makes the process ever more unfair.

How can the Secretary of State therefore send out a request that simply perpetuates and condones that gross unfairness?

You will I am sure be aware that the affected parties are preparing for judicial review. The fact that the Secretary of State has decided to ignore this issue of ethics will certainly be highlighted in that judicial review if consent is given.

2. The second matter I want to refer to concerns information that has come to light that SPR has tendered ecological surveys as evidence which it claimed was independent expert evidence but which it is now believed came from a company that is associated with SPR. BEIS must investigate this. If as we understand this is correct then it must cast doubt on the impartiality and reliability of evidence that SPR has put in during the inquiry.

The Secretary of State should require SPR to provide details of each and every expert it has instructed and find out what links that person or body has with SPR.

3. The launch of Nautilus and NGV's confirmation that the Eurolink interconnector will be coming forward, provide firm evidence of what many of us already knew, namely that the proposal for the NGET substation which is part of SPR's applications for EA1(N) and EA2 is the foundation of a massive energy hub to be dumped in the heart of the Suffolk countryside at Friston.

We as a community have always argued that Friston is the wrong site for this large scale industrial development and indeed that East Suffolk as whole is the wrong place. The coast is fragile, the cliffs at Thorpeness are unstable, the countryside rural and littered with small villages and heritage sites. The rural nature of the area will be devastated by the substation/converter station infrastructure and the vast number of cable corridors criss-crossing this small area, squeezed in between villages, farms and homes. To say nothing of the impact upon our nature based tourism economy. These projects bring minimal long term benefit to our communities with no long term jobs or investment to mitigate the losses.

Supported by our local MP, The Rt Hon Dr Therese Coffey MP, we call on you to reject SPR's plans and make a split decision to consent to the offshore turbines but reject the onshore plans. Full consideration could then be given to better locations where the adverse impacts are minimised at a brownfield or industrialised site.

Yours sincerely

Fiona Cramb