


From: 
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Written Representation
Date: 27 October 2020 13:37:29

My references 20024137 and 20024140

Dear Sirs

I have considered the application by SPR for substations to be located at Friston and to dig a cable trench from Thorpeness. Whilst in principle I support the installation of off-shore wind farms, I am not in support of any aspect of the on-shore proposals.

The proposed development site stretching from Thorpeness to Friston is an area of peace and quiet where wildlife can live undisturbed in a protected area. Regardless of what mitigation is proposed, the impact on wildlife will be severe as you cannot simply compensate for the loss of habitats or wildlife corridors and expect the wildlife not to be harmed.

I have listened to many of the Open Hearing presentations and they are united in their opposition to the proposals by SPR to locate their substations at Friston and cause considerable damage to parts of our Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These presentations were very polite and reasoned but for many of us who run conservation projects in the region in support of the *Suffolk Wildlife Trust* and the RSPB, I do think the committee should be aware that behind this veneer of politeness is a growing anger at companies who irresponsibly start to unravel all the environmental work that people have undertaken over many years.

So I would like to make some observations that I would ask be taken into account when making a decision on this application.

First, the Prime Minister announced on Tuesday that by 2030 our lives are to be powered by wind and putting aside the question of whether this is technically achievable, what is to be commended is that he said this power will be delivered ‘**without guilt**’ and ‘**without damage to the environment**’. I trust that in the light of this statement, SPR and National Grid will withdraw their application in support the Prime Minister’s commitment, as clearly their proposals cannot be delivered without damage to our local environment.

Second, Boris Johnson recently signed the *Leader’s Pledge for Nature* and set out his ambitious plans for preserving 400,000 hectares of our country’s open spaces. Again, I think it is clear to us all that the impact of this application is not compatible with these aims.

And third, the Natural History Museum recently published its *State of Nature Report*, which shows that, of all the G7 countries, shamefully, we are at the bottom of the league for preserving biodiversity. It is abundantly clear that this proposed development would cause yet further biodiversity loss.

It is against this background that we openly criticise other nations for destroying the world’s rainforests but if we, in our quest for low-carbon energy, were to permit this development and its consequent destruction of arable land at Friston and damage to the Sandlings, Thorpeness cliffs and Suffolk’s legally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty then, as a nation, we could quite rightly be accused of gross hypocrisy.

And I don’t think I’m being too melodramatic when I say that this land forms part of Our Rainforest and therefore it **must** be protected. A further point to note is that the Government’s guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land states that its aim is, and I quote, ‘*to protect the best & most versatile agricultural land & soils from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposal.*’ and my understanding is that the land upon which the substations would be built is classified as BMV land and so, surely it needs to be protected?

In this era of global food shortages, rainforest destruction, biodiversity loss, covid-19 and the evident need for people to be able to enjoy open spaces for the benefit of their physical & mental health, the Prime Minister is right to say that we should not be allowing the destruction of our environment in the pursuit of green wind energy.

Furthermore, it is a gross misrepresentation by the companies concerned to promote wind energy as green, if, to enable it to be delivered, they consciously allow the destruction of large areas of our precious landscape.

And of course the fact is, and in my view this is the key issue, there are realistic alternative means of feeding SPR's offshore energy into the national grid that would totally avoid this permanent environmental damage.

Yes the alternatives may be less convenient and Yes they may be more expensive but this is the price we have to pay if we are to protect our country's biodiversity and the health of our nation.

Put simply, the need to protect Suffolk's valuable environment is infinitely more important than convenience & profit and therefore I urge the Planning Inspectorate to dismiss this application and demonstrate support for the Prime minister's aim to deliver wind energy **without damage to the environment**.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area, obscuring the name and any handwritten notes or dates.