

ENO 10077 + ENO 10078

S Fulford

EA1 20023661

EA2 20023663

05/07/21

S Fulford

Friston House

Final submission

I would like to add my support for the submissions tendered to the ExA by SASES throughout this hearing and in particular the closing submissions regarding flooding and noise.

I would like to draw attention to the behaviour of the applicant regarding requests to enter private land for reasons of survey but insistence that data collected is unavailable to the owner for scrutiny. That may be a right but it is clearly unconscionable.

██████████ denied SPR the right to, amongst other rights, take sound measurements on the grounds that it would not make that data available at the time. ██████████ was subsequently the location of a sound survey in cooperation with SASES. A site SPR now object to.

██████████ has two ponds that an initial survey, with permission (2021), was carried out by SPR through their agents to establish the presence of aquatic wildlife including Greater Crested Newt. This would be established through water analysis. Again this data was not shared even though requested by ██████████.

A subsequent request for six further site visits was thus denied.

The 36 acre curtilage of Friston teams with wildlife from Buzzard to Sky Lark, pond life that ranges from Otter to Greater Crested Newt. The park is unfenced which allows Fallow, Roe and Muntjac deer to roam freely from the wider environment.

Friston could not be a more rural and unspoilt corner of England.

In spite of the applicant describing the noise environment as merely average it is indisputably extraordinarily quiet, particularly at night.

In the words of the ExA "The Friston Hum", although perhaps an unguarded moment recorded for posterity, will be remembered as a moment of candid truth which the applicant cannot quite accept. Describing the EA1 site as silent from the bridleway during daytime is a mark of extraordinary callousness whilst insisting on levels of "hum" (32db) at the nearest receptors that will be unbearable in context of the overall silence of Friston Village at night.

I remind the ExA that during this process ██████████ was informed by an employee that we would need double glazing.

At the early rounds of consultation the visualisations of the substations showed most if not all of the equipment housed in enormous attenuated buildings. Clearly an acknowledgement that noise would be an issue to the environment of Friston. This appears to have been swept away in the confiscation of this application. We are now to expect air cooled technology with the noise that inevitably is associated with it.

In the event that Friston becomes an “Energy Hub” which is clearly the cumulative ambition of this application the inscription “No or Negligible Impact” should be inscribed in the testimony of the loss of rural habitat in England and in memory of Friston Village.

I implore you to reject this application.

S N Fulford

██████████