

Off Shore Wind Farms

East Anglia One North Offshore Wind Farm Project - Pins Ref: EN010077
East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm Project - Pins Ref: EN010078

Unique Reference: EA1N - AFP039
Project Email: East AngliaOne North

Unique Reference: EA2-AFP039
Project Email: East Anglia Two

Response to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy's Request for comments - 30th November 2021.

Dear Planning Authority,

I would firstly like to make the following statement:

Offshore Turbines for both EA1N-AFP039 and EA2-AFP039 - SPR's role and influence

We are fully supportive of renewable energy, and have no objections to the offshore elements of these DCO Applications with the proviso all installations are acceptable to stakeholders concerns over the statutory purpose of the AONB, its Heritage Coast and its associated impacted environment and coastal margins which will be significantly affected by current proposals, as presented by Scottish Power Renewables.

Both aspects of Offshore and Onshore development are intrinsically entwined and cannot be separated. As a result my support for offshore support is "conditional" upon the Entry Point NOT being at Sizewell or anywhere along the Heritage Coast that could cause damage to the crucial shingle banks that protects the land and cliffs from tidal surges. .

These applications have come at an unprecedented time for everyone, for consensus, as to the importance of reducing UK's carbon emissions to meeting the Governments 2030 carbon targets.

The good will of people across the country are completely supportive of this pledges and the many resolutions made at COP26 this year.

The pledges are not just about climate change and carbon but also about the people, protecting their environment, their habitat and all the other species who live within it -

A green future to be celebrated - but this is not happening here in East Suffolk.

Underground cable laying is a destructive carbon costly activity. Analysts are currently challenging the popular political concept that wind generation developments out-way carbon release costs.

East Suffolk is recognised as an area of environmental importance. If these onshore plans continue there will be habitat loss on a scale unimaginable. This highly protected East Suffolk coastal area will be destroyed, as will the lives of the people who have to live with the consequence of what is perceived as a Government's blatant decision to abandon its Green Environmental Pledges and convert the whole of rural East Anglia into an industrial landscape.

There is a simple answer to the dilemma. The brownfield redundant power station site at Bradwell, owned by the Chinese Government. However, I have been advised that SPR refused to consider this site as an alternative and only consider Sizewell, if they were to take part in this infrastructure development - this position was upheld by the powers that be without consultation.

To many this stance would be perceived as blackmail.

The Secretary of State for Business & Energy and his departmental advisors decision are wrong. A ready made Green Area of importance is going to be transformed in an industrial landscape. Annexation of a Homeland without the Consent of the People in it; where is the joined up thinking. Energy rules over the Environment - what do those pledges say about that.

The Human Factor - the People.

1. Local Economy and Loss of Identity:

This area is protected as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It already has a purpose. It has a thriving tourist industry. and a strong agricultural tradition.

It posses four "jewels in its crown. Each year, attracting thousands of visitors from across the world. These success stories have been created by people who lived here. Not governments.

Four success stories - all critical factors for tourism and a diverse and thriving local economy.

1. **Snape Maltings & Concert Hall and its iconic setting**, is a world famous Centre for Music. Its reputation is renowned as a venue for world famous musicians. Millions have visited it since its first concert in the 50's. The Aldeburgh Festival is an international event. Its presence now plays a key role in supporting the tourist trade in East Suffolk and the success of local businesses.

2. **Minsmere Bird Reserve**, is an internationally renowned bird reserve famous for its Avocets and rare species. Covering hundreds of acres of protected habitat and woodlands, thousands visit it annually for the peace and tranquility it offers - and time and space in the countryside.

3. **Thorpeness village**. This was created as a result of one man's "Vision for the Future".

It is unique and draws thousands of visitors annually as a vibrant fun holiday venue with its internationally recognised House in the Clouds and water attraction The Meare. For one hundred years it has been safely enjoyed by thousands of families and children, as a holiday by the sea.

4. **The seaside and coastal belt - stretching from Aldeburgh to Southwold**. This is a vital part of East Suffolk's attraction and identity as a place to visit and live. The unspoilt nature of its cliff and shingle landscape is openly available to those from all walks of life and offers visitors an unfettered experience of time spent by the seaside.

Disruption of this coastal stretch by energy companies will stop all this and deprive thousands of people of something they have valued and treasured over the years.

Who will want to visit an area by the seaside that has become part of a vast "industrial vision"?

People from all walks of life visit Suffolk to get away from such places. Tourism is its greatest asset. Remove it and the local economy will crash. This will have huge negative impacts upon areas such as Leiston and Saxmundham whose population by and large service and maintain the substantial holiday and tourism industry and the many local businesses - whose survival is vital for the whole area. **The impact will be job losses.**

SPR's grossly understates the impact this application will have on the local economy and people.

2. Environmental Impact.

Every aspect of SPR's conduct regarding the environment contradicts legislation in place to protect sensitive and rare landscapes. This application involves a significant Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a designated Heritage Coast and high status protected environments such as SSSIs and SPAs. SPR's route drives straight through them all. This blatant disregard for the environment is in breach of the laws to protect it. Vital assessments by SPR have been neither independent or robust. Important surveys involving habitat, listed rare species and biodiversity have not been adequate and carried out at the wrong time of year or even in the wrong type of habitat or day. This is both incompetent and devious and demonstrates clearly the Applicant has little regard for the environment or the rules and regulations that protect it. It further demonstrates the weakness of the Planning Inspectorate to stand up and insist upon the necessary high standards required when it comes to upholding Planning Laws and Regulations in place to protect our environment. It is my concern the Planning Inspectorate has failed to exercise his duties and has been seemingly overwhelmed by the enormity the task and volume of evidence against it.

Neither Government nor Planning Inspectorate seem to consider the wealth of environmental concern to be significant. The Entry Point chosen by SPR approved by Nat Grid and Secretary of State is clearly wrong. Nat Grid carried out NO feasibility studies on other alternatives down the coast or Bradwell Power Station - none of which impact upon a protected and fragile landscape.

The decision to use Sizewell is wrong - due process has not been given to alternatives sites.

3. Cumulative Impact.

We know now it is part of a Grand Scheme.

This has now morphed into a significant issue with the Government's announcement to turn the whole of East Anglia into a vast industrial centre covering all aspects of energy creating processes - and now includes gas which we were all told was **not carbon neutral**

Cumulative Impact has become a much larger issue than the single issue of SPR's application, who are now mere facilitators to setting a "precedence" by opening the door for it all to begin.

However, there are considerable concerns emerging regarding SPR's cumulative impact assessments be carried in a full and appropriate manner, or visual assessments, as is required. There are still outstanding concerns regarding the River Hundred area and its surrounding protected landscape and whether it is appropriate to have such disruption so close to a site which provides vital habitat for bitterns and other very red listed species. Noise and light is of a concern.

The cumulative impact upon "biodiversity" in the whole area has not been adequately assessed. Disruptive activity from underground drilling in very wet areas will have considerable impact upon the overall environment and fragile aquifer running throughout the entire route area. I am not aware of any in-depth analysis to assessing the impact on the aquifer being carried out over a sustained period of time. Surveys should record a period of time in order to acquire sufficient knowledge regarding fluctuating water levels, molecular structure, microbes and bacteria etc etc. The current Cumulative Impact Assessment lacks detail and demonstrates once again due process has not been carried out to the high standard required when dealing with an area of such sensitivity and importance, and involving so much water.

Finally, the accumulative impact upon the lives of all those affected who live within the large working area and surroundings has not been assessed. To say it is minimal is rubbish. This is rarely mentioned, but the impact upon the people who have to live with the consequences will be considerable through noise and night lights and general disruption to their daily lives. SPR's national reputation is not good and has been commented upon as having a Mafia style approach to the communities they are working in. This quite rightly does not encourage local cooperation or support - and why should it, it their Homeland. SPR should be there by consent.

4. Non Disclosure Agreements:

In principle Non Disclosure Agreements can be a useful tool when used fairly and is of benefit to both parties. However, this is not the case with SPR's Application in East Suffolk.

Aggressive Use of Non Disclosure Agreements, particularly when involving large Government Initiatives is a national disgrace - this information should be in the public domain and available for public scrutiny. It undermines public trust in major infrastructure projects and is used throughout the country, including the Government owned HS2 Company. These secretive agreements are commonplace in all major infrastructure projects and open to abuse by unscrupulous contractors. There is NO regulation, and are now being seen as a tool to coerce people into unfair agreements heavily favouring the Applicant at the expense of those affected who have been silenced by them.

The Raynesford Report heavily criticised widespread use of NDAs and the lack of transparency. Using the HS2 Company, a publicly owned government company as an example, Raynesford stated they had a "corrosive sense on the part of the public that planning is no longer protects their interests". He went on further "NDA's take the realm of local consultation out of the equation and wherewithal to consult on these complex projects were stymied often at an early point in the project". In 2021 after further requests to the Information Commissioner the HS2 list was released. Many key organisations who normally play a vital role in providing important information needed for public scrutiny, such as Environment Agency, Health & Safety Executive, British Survey Society, County Councillors, Local Councils, key businesses etc - the list was substantial. All had been silenced by NDAs. And it still goes on now as we have seen with HS2 in North and SPR.

The judicial and democratic process has been distorted - and valuable information withheld

SPR's use of NDAs has been a shattering experience for many on the cable route. People have been threatened with "compulsory purchase orders" and withdrawal of all rights to compensation if they refused to sign. These agreements last a lifetime and once signed the affected party has to make a public statement withdrawing all previous comments against SPR, and one is instructed to post an "apology" on the PI website. All rights to talk about the application or concerns are in breach of the agreement and if breached will be subjected to Court Action. The Right to Freedom of Speech is clearly being challenged here. Such were the threats contained in the document and the rights SPR claimed over your property was tantamount to theft in all but name. Having been caught up in this scenario as a matter of principle we did not proceed. Compensation was withdrawn, and we are free to express our concerns.

The consequences are the use of NDAs has enormous power in determining any large scale application involves "cooperation" from the people; and is easily open to abuse if you are not top dog. The Government and Planning Inspector have been weak in addressing this matter and made no attempt to allay the general public's concern about their use or define the rules of engagement - for example what is acceptable and what is unreasonable. The public have a right to clarification and to hear the full story. It is a fact that many of those signatories to NDAs have done so under duress. They do not support SPR's Application yet had no option but to sign the NDA for fear of compulsory purchase and loss of control over their property. Is this fair or just? The answer is NO.

All this demonstrates the current situation is not fit for purpose. NDAs have given SPR a huge advantage at the expense of the people - and well as a big leg up to Government's proposed new development to turn East Anglia into the Energy Hub for Europe, if armed with a weapon like NDAs to shut down unfavourable dialogues.

The judicial and democratic process is distorted and has been blighted by eSPR's excessive and aggressive use of NDAs. The natural course of justice is now in great danger. Regulation is seriously needed to re-establish a status quo where everyone is treated as equals. If NDAs are to be respected and fair for all parties there has to be clearly defined Rules of Engagement.

As it stands at the moment it is a very unfair, and un-level playing field at the moment.

5. Water - protection against contamination.

This much overlooked subject has not been addressed even though it plays a critical part.

Water is important and protected in law. Contamination of water is a criminal offence for which you can be fined or imprisoned. SPR has made no meaningful suggestions as to how they propose to mitigate against a contamination incident which has a high rate of occurring.

The soil is light and sandy and the aquifer beneath is protected by a thin fragile coralline crag. It will not tolerate repeated vibration from large heavy drilling machinery and the toxic chemicals used in the process will seep through this fragile crag into the aquifers. The coralline crag is porous as we discovered when we had two hundred outdoor pigs surrounding our pastures. In under six months water filters at the well head started recording very high levels of copper. The Environment Agency became involved. The cause was pig urine seeping down through the light sandy soil and crag into the aquifers. Copper supplements are part of their diet. Water protection is critical. Contamination of fresh water supplies is against the Law and, as we have seen recently with the HS2 prosecution, very costly. Chemicals used to facilitate this drilling are highly toxic and will seep into the aquifers quickly. Many households depend on water from wells fed by these aquifers - as do many irrigation schemes vital for agricultural purposes and watering livestock and the multitude of out door pig herds found in this area.

What is being proposed will cause an Environmental Disaster. This has been acknowledged as inevitable by representatives of energy business supporting this action. It is simply wrong and in the wrong place and should be withdrawn without further to do.

Yours sincerely Wendy Orme