

From: [REDACTED]@gmail.com <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Sent: 23 November 2021 14:16

To: [REDACTED]@parliament.uk

Cc: East Anglia ONE North <EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>; East Anglia Two <EastAngliaTwo@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@parliament.uk

Subject: Invitation from Sec of State to comment on EA1N/2 as per letter of 2nd Nov 2021

Dear Secretary of State

Unique Ref 20024108

I understand that I have one final opportunity to give you my views on these planning applications.

I am a resident of Aldeburgh with strong interests in tourism. I have registered my objections with you before so will not repeat myself but will just make 2 points.

1. Cumulative impact. Giving consent to these applications would undoubtedly open the door to many more such applications for on shore industrial development in support of the energy sector. This, in an area that is part covered by an AONB and SSSI. Together with the development of Sizewell C, the effect on the local economy – and this is supported by EDF's research (Scottish Power have not done any), could be a reduction in tourism visits of around 17% during the development period. Should all applications be approved, this could be 20 years or more. The tourism economy is currently thriving (unlike many seaside areas) and the local area depends on it. It may be impossible to ever recover the reputation of this wonderful area post development.

I fully support the wind farms themselves and believe that the off shore part of the applications should be approved but the onshore developments from Thorpeness to Friston refused. Scottish Power should be required to fully consider alternative (ideally brown field) locations and any increase in cost that might arise should be measured against the net loss to the local economy.

2. Access to site. The current proposal from Scottish Power is to access the substation site at Friston via the A1094 into Aldeburgh. This road is incredibly busy (over 9000 daily average movements in 2017 and vastly more at peak times). This road is twice as busy as it was 30 years ago as a result of the success of the tourism sector. The road is totally unsuitable for an increase in HGV activity and, yet again, this proposal demonstrates the applicants disregard for the local community in favour of the cheapest solution for their purpose. There

appears to have been no communication with EDF regarding a joint solution to the potentially crippling effect on local traffic and hence the reduction in tourism that the chaos would cause.

How can consent be granted without full consideration of the overall impact of all that is being planned for “the energy coast”? A local MP has stated that the local area could be supplying 30% of the country’s electricity should current applications be approved. Is this beautiful and successful part of the country really the best place for such industrial development? Surely there are many places where the reduction in the downside would greatly outweigh any increase in cost. This has not been evaluated.

Yours faithfully

Tim Rowan-Robinson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]