

**From:**



[East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)

**Subject:**

Invitation from the Secretary of State to comment on EA1N/EA2 as per letter of 2 November 2021

**Date:**

30 November 2021 15:50:45

---

My Ref: EA1N – AFP 128; EA2 – AFP 130

## The Secretary of State (BEIS) The Rt Hon Mr Kwasi Kwarteng MP

Dear Sir, I am a resident of Friston, Suffolk, and am opposed to Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) Application for the onshore infrastructure associated with its proposed EA1N and EA2 windfarm projects.

Throughout the Examination process my main concern has been, and still is, the issue of **Flooding**. Friston village, in my 30 years experience of having a home in the area, has always had, and I believe always will have a flooding problem. Why? **Simply because contour lines do not lie and water runs downhill**. Consult any Ordnance Survey map and one can see that one of the lowest points of the village is the crossroads at the Old Chequers pub, the lowest further point from there is via Low Road and onto a field (near the A1094) – the Aldeburgh to Friday Street Road.. Excess water can take **no other route** – water cannot run uphill!

The site of the proposed SPR substation complex is, as I have already stated, is also at one of the highest points in this area. In an earlier submission to the Planning Inspectorate I described the immediate topography of the area as like “an elongated giant bowl, or saucer tilted on a North/South axis”. The centre of the village is the only direction for the excess water to take. What I find disturbing is that SPR are aware of this, hence their attenuation plans: ie to build two water collection reservoirs to manage the excess water problem caused by building on the site. – the natural ‘blotting paper effect’ of the land once lost to concrete, building structures and roads would create run off problems and an immediate run off problem – concrete does not absorb water!

What is not generally appreciated is that in the ‘Friston bowl’ excess water arises from **all** points of the compass: North, East, West and even in small measure from the South of the village. The vast majority of this water ends up in the culvert which passes under the road at the Old Chequers crossroad. This then continues along a covered section in Low Road, it ultimately ends up in a field abutting the A1094. I must reinforce that in living memory this culvert and the covered sections on Low Road have **never** been cleaned out. The open ditches are not well maintained and many are overgrown with plant material.

In my experience, contractors and builders often put forward attenuation plans that are flawed and devoid of substance, indeed how some of these have got past local and national planners defies logic, but they have! (Building on Flood Plains are classic examples). SPRs Attenuation Reservoir Collection Plan is another such example, it is lacking in facts and hard data, indeed it is my recollection, that during the Examination Process SPR eventually conducted some investigations but they were considered to be lacking in data and detail. Even at this stage there is insufficient local information on the precise location of the site, the capacity of the reservoirs, if there are to be additional buildings on the site (eg converter stations), the capacity of the effluent pipe – too many unknowns.

My conclusions are that the proposed site of SPRs substations, and that of National Grid, is totally inappropriate. It will exacerbate the existing flooding situation, add to this the effects of Climate Change and its associated extremes of weather – the situation - flooding will only get worse, but to what degree we do not know. The best case scenario is that a few more properties will be flooded to a greater depth causing more damage to buildings and possessions. The worst case scenario is a lot more properties will be flooded to an even greater depth, which will not only result in damage to buildings and possessions but could result in loss of life. Should this be the outcome there would undoubtedly be a major outcry and protest, one driven press and social media. Planners and decision makers would be held to account for their action and/or their inaction. Undoubtedly legal action would follow.

One of the common mantras of the good Leader/Manager is the comment to subordinates: **“Don’t bring me problems, bring me solutions!”** On this theme I ask the question “is there a way forward?” The answer is “Yes, move the substation complex to a brownfield site where there already is a substation – Bramford, where there is not an issue of flooding and is some distance away from a residential. Alternatively, move the proposed substation site further to the North West, outside of the ‘Friston Bowl’ and away from the inadequate current and inefficient hotch-potch of a water management system, towards a natural water course ie the Fromus River, which then connects to the Alde/Orford Esturine Complex, which is a massive body of water connected to the sea. Such an alternative substation site would then be situated in a less-populated area: in the parish of Sternfield, but there it will also impact the lives of villagers. Of course, another alternative would be to move the proposed site nearer to the coast. To my mind, to select Friston as the site for the substation development is the worst option.

To conclude, I ask that, as we need to move towards non-carbon energy options, you consider giving consent to SPRs offshore infrastructure, but **do not** give consent to their onshore infrastructure at the arable greenfield site immediately abutting the medieval village of Friston.

Yours faithfully,  
Mike Lewis.

