

Offshore Wind Farms

EAST ANGLIA ONE NORTH

PINS Ref: EN010077

and

EAST ANGLIA TWO

PINS Ref: EN020078

Issue Specific Hearings 14 (ISHs14)

Post-hearing submission

Personal statement on

HABITATS and BIODIVERSITY

River Hundred Woodland

By Kinna Mosely

from

SEAS (Suffolk Energy Action Solutions)

EA1N – EN010077 / SEAS ID no 2002 4494

EA2 – EN010078 / SEAS ID no 2002 4496



1 I am writing to give a final statement after attending the hearings on behalf of SEAS and I write in response to Issue Specific Hearing 14 as well as in general to the whole case.

2.1 [REDACTED] stated last Wednesday that we must go back to their ornithological surveys which they did at the start which he claimed to be founded on respectable RSPB data. I raised my hand at the time to reply that, as far as we're aware, the RSPB have not surveyed the area in question! I had my hand up to respond to this and other comments during the hearing but we were not given the chance to speak and instead asked to submit in writing, which I'm relieved to hear will carry equal weight as explained on the day. Thank you.

2.2 He also explained how they'll be offering appropriate mitigation and that risks have been considered. Yet, as we've been presenting and discussing through these hearings - we've given evidence that effective and sufficient mitigation of this site is not actually possible for the biodiversity-rich and mature site of the woodland at the River Hundred crossing. As a result it feels like our responses and evidence have not been taken into account by the Applicant. We have also given evidence that strongly suggests this is a W6 wet woodland site; in any case it is a protected site and a priority habitat.

3 We gave evidence that the ecological surveys and assessments have not been sufficient or accurate, yet the applicant has responded that we should refer back to their previous findings, which we had already challenged.



River Hundred 22-3-21 showing slow flow and regrowth of bank vegetation

4 Throughout the hearings their ecologist often responded that suitably-qualified ecologists had made standard assessments. We have little faith in these surveys. For example, there is no way of surveying that rare meadow orchids are present if visiting in February (we provided photographic evidence that they are present in the wet meadow with grazing cattle on the other side of the river). Another example is that the applicant's ecologist mentioned teasel had been seen on the woodland site, yet in the three times I've visited the site since these hearings began, I've spent significant time and done professional assessments of the flora, fauna and biodiversity of the site, yet I've never once seen a teasel there (their seed heads remain present throughout winter and they're a common, easy plant to identify). I did find burdock near the lane, which also has tall, dry, brown, spiky seed heads throughout winter, perhaps they had mistaken that for teasel? (Please understand, I'm of course not accusing, and I respect their qualifications — I am simply sharing my own questioning

as I've been baffled by the data provided by the applicant on many occasions which has not felt thorough or sufficient). We have advised independent surveys, yet, from [REDACTED] response for us to go back to their initial data, I therefore conclude that appeal and requests have not been sufficiently taken seriously enough by them up to this point.



River Hundred 22-3-21 Gentle flow; aquatic vegetation regrowth in and along the river, sustaining aquatic invertebrates and bankside animals

5 From my own professional assessments I have checked and re-assessed my data multiple times and each time concluded that this is a W6 wet woodland (classified by the presence of wet rich soil with mainly Alder and Willow with Poplar, and Nettle and Cleaver ground cover). A W6 is a priority habitat, rare for this area, particularly in its richness of soil and abundant with rare biodiversity which must be protected. I stumbled across a Snipe on two occasions at the wood. I have been working at woodlands and gardens across this part of Suffolk for five years, almost every day, and this has never happened before — it was a special occasion for me and a treasured sighting. Residents have also witnessed nightingales and woodlarks — birds now so rare that in my nearly 20 years of working with nature I have not directly experienced them. They are on the brink of extinction! Mitigation will not be sufficient to support them (and, in fact, there is no mitigation



River Hundred 22-3-21 Old Alder copse, well away from bankside

proposed for this woodland). I hope this gives a better idea of how special this spot is. Not only is it unusual: naturally regenerating itself as a mature wilded habitat (most woodlands are not self-regenerating due to deer damage of saplings), but IF this site is compromised at all, it will have direct devastating impact its neighbouring SSSI. We provided the DEFRA impact map of this area to support this with our Verbal Submission.

6 There is no planet B, habitat destruction has led to the environmental crisis we are in. We all need to preserve what little is left and improve upon it for future generations. I support and champion wind farms, yet there are better, more sustainable ways to go about building them, which simply must be insisted upon. I still, to this day, cannot understand why a protected area such as this has been considered for this project when the entire coastline of the country can offer more suitable



sites for stations and works. Brown-field sites would be a better alternative than destroying wild nature which has taken nearly two hundred years to establish itself. This area is of immense benefit to the community, to our local economy in terms of tourism, to vital biodiversity and to the health of our country in sequestering carbon, and as a self-regenerating wilderness so vital for rare species on the brink of extinction, where they can survive.

7 The Applicant said that there was no other site or route possible, yet a) from my own assessments I do not believe this to be correct and b) they have still not responded to the option of microtunnelling as an alternative. I hope with all my heart that the current, protected status of this site will be honoured, otherwise whats the point of this status? I do hope that this project will not be allowed to happen here and that a better site will be found which will not impinge on rare biodiversity. I would fully support that. I hope that Scottish Power will adopt clear and more sustainable methods which are more respectful towards nature, and that they will join us in protecting it. They are so brilliantly championing the cause towards providing sustainable energy, I do hope their energy, methods and construction will match that cause through their actions and pave the way, in right practice, for our country.

Many thanks, with kind regards,

Kinna Mosley.