

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION FOR SPR EA1N and EA2 PROJECTS (DEADLINE 9)



Interested Party: Margaret Knight **PINS Refs:** 20023569 and 20023571

Date: 14th April 2021 **Issue:** 1

Dear Mr Smith,

As a concerned resident of Friston I watched and listened to all hearings online from the preliminary meetings to the final ISH on 19th March 2021. At the end of this process, I was left with an overall impression that the site at Friston had been chosen at random by a pin on the map exercise and that all the resulting construction work is being fitted round the issues that have been raised in other words reactive not proactive something quite astonishing from a company the size of SPR.

The announcement on the day before the Easter break that the examination process has now been extended to July and without consultation with Interested Parties was unbelievable. It is unacceptable that this has now allowed SPR to try and catch up on its research and information to address the considerable issues surrounding its proposed development. It seems that this unprecedented extension has moved the examination in favour of the Applicant who have substantial resources to provide the information which should have been produced at the outset. For the residents of Friston this will extend the stress and anxiety further with the knowledge that no decision will now be made until next year.

This lack of consultation was compounded last week by the positioning of caution road signs for site access being placed on Grove Road, Church Road and Church Lane as well as on the B1121. A four-page notice giving details of the ground testing work to be carried out was placed in Church Lane on the bank next to the road so to stop and read it is quite dangerous. I saw all of this whilst out walking and many residents had also come to see these signs of which there had been no advanced warning. This shows total disregard for the community and village activities. Had this been the day before there had been a funeral at the church and this would have caused distress to the mourners. After several complaints these have now been miraculously removed.

However today 14th April more road signs have been put up in Grove Road indicating a new site access along a footpath which is very narrow at that point so if diggers are to traverse this footpath untold damage will be caused not only to the footpath but the hedge which should not be disturbed during the bird nesting season i.e., now! Again, all this has been done without any warning to residents and no communication from SPR whatsoever. We were told in the last hearings that SPR were allocating a Communications officer to inform and communicate all of their proposed activities but so far this has not been implemented even though we now have the name of the person tasked with communication, [REDACTED]. Again, this shows total disregard for the residents of Friston and their welfare. What is more disturbing is that the work they are trying to carry out should have already been done before the DCO. It seems that the original deadline of 6th April was seen by SPR as the green light for them to start work and they had contractors lined up ready to start at that point. To have called them off would have been costly so it is going ahead to satisfy their own interests.

The impression is that the village of Friston and its residents do not exist and SPR are riding rough shod over the whole area. Every day now something new appears indicating that work is being started which is causing stress and anxiety daily. Many residents of Friston sometimes walk their dogs near Sizewell and are seeing activity of works being started in that area and diggers being delivered. Even a construction out at sea was part of the proposed testing for the seabed. No information or advance warnings have been given and consequently this is all very, very worrying to all residents of this area who wake up every morning wondering what new activity will be inflicted on them by SPR.

The investigations have occurred after the end of the hearings, but I would also like to mention two major points of concern from my perspective.

Light and Noise

These have not adequately been addressed and calculations of noise have been made on desktop calculations and it became obvious from the relevant presentations of the Applicant that not one of them had ever visited the site. The terrain and landscape have a significant effect on the transmission of sound in that sound travels a long way in this area due to the flatness of the landscape and despite what SPR said buildings do not act as a sound barrier.

The effects on Light were not really addressed. There are two streetlights at one end of the village and some distance apart. It is completely black at night and so the night sky is something quite spectacular, a feature which is extremely attractive to us residents and to tourists. The light emitted from the proposed construction works and subsequent operation would make this area seem like a city suburb and lose its attraction and tranquillity. The calculations for this should be revisited and mitigation considered.

These two aspects are major concerns and should not be treated lightly in particular in view of the proposed working hours which have now supposedly been reduced to 8am to 6pm. However with the proposed allowance of one hour each side of these times to allow for deliveries and arrival of contractors it is back to 7am to 7pm so there has been no change on that by SPR. On top of this there is proposed Saturday morning working. This is unacceptable for the residents of a quiet, peaceful village and to the many tourists who holiday in the village and the area. Here again is an example of the total disregard by SPR of the community.

Traffic and Transport

I found the ISH on this subject very disappointing and seemed biased toward the Applicant. Whilst a substantial amount of detail has been submitted by Interested Parties this was not fully explored at the hearing due to lack of time. However, SPR could give lengthy presentations quoting all their desktop calculations which were done on averages and taken from certain times of the day and certain months of the year. This shows a lack of understanding of the area, its population, employment, events, and tourism. The roads here are narrow and unsuitable for the type of transport to be used for the proposed development and these roads could not sustain the substantial increase in traffic movement. Agricultural equipment frequently moves along these roads at all times of the year so what chance do the residents have to arrive anywhere safely and indeed on time. Accurate real time investigations and research should be done to reach a considered decision.

In summary SPR's approach to this whole proposed development is arrogant and has no regard for the community, all disguised in the name of Green Energy.

Whilst I have no objection to the offshore development recommendation for refusal should be made for the onshore development as proposed. There are other sites which should be explored, and which have a lesser impact on local communities and the environment.

Should this be allowed to go ahead the village of Friston will die and be swallowed up in an industrial wasteland that threatens to engulf this Heritage Coast.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Knight