
From: louise fincham [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 5:27:45 PM
To: Secretary Of State (Kwasi Kwarteng) <Secretary.State@beis.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Scottish Power Renewables, East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two

Dear Mr Kwarteng and Mr Jenrick,

The decision whether or not to grant development consent for Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) EA1N and EA2 projects are currently on your desk.

A few last points I would ask you to consider:

You have recently asked for more information about various aspects of the planning application. One of these questions relates to the flood risk potential for the village of Friston which has not been properly assessed by SPR. The people most able to provide valuable information in respect of flooding are the landowners, these are the people who work the land and have owned it for generations. However, the landowners have been gagged because they have been forced by SPR to sign agreements that prohibit them from participating in the DCO hearings. You are aware of this fact but I feel the need to point out that the distortion of the whole planning enquiry continues as is obvious from the fact that the very people who would best be able to provide valuable information to the Secretary of State on this important issue are prevented from doing so.

Our local MP and your fellow cabinet member Dr Therese Coffey described the gagging orders used by SPR as an example of "sharp practise". I couldn't agree more. Dr Coffey is no doubt aware how powerful the opposition to SPR plans is in the local area. The Conservatives have already lost a local council seat and came within 2 votes of losing a second seat because of this issue. We did not vote to take back control from Brussels only to hand it to these foreign owned utility companies. They care not a jot for the English countryside, perhaps you don't either but you should be aware that your voters most certainly do. We are not a naïve bunch of NIMBYs, rather we are an intelligent group of campaigners who believe that there is a more efficient and cheaper way of co-ordinating and bringing offshore generated energy onshore.

I have no doubt that SPR have been lobbying the Secretary of State, saying that the project is "too far advanced" and that SPR have spent too much money on ground investigation work to call a halt to it now. This is nonsense. If SPR decided to spend money on a project that has not yet been granted development consent they took a commercial risk in doing so. It would be intolerable and distinctly shady if a company were to bully the Secretary of

State into making a decision because they have invested money in a project before it has been consented. The government needs to "take back control" when dealing with these foreign owned companies.

The government recognises that the spaghetti junction system of individual connection points for offshore wind energy is unsustainable and has set up a review. SPR were "invited" to put EA1N and EA2 into the Pathfinder project but they declined to do so. This is another example of the tail wagging the dog. The Secretary of State must simply insist that if companies want to be considered for these lucrative projects they must participate in the review. Please show some gumption when dealing with these companies.

Campaigning organisations have worked hard to show that there is a better way of doing all of this, please do not be bamboozled by SPR, stand up for the English countryside and for a better way of making green energy truly green.

Thank you for the time you are taking to give careful consideration to this issue, a split decision whereby consent is given for the offshore turbines but not the onshore infrastructure would ensure that there is no delay to the project and in fact it would speed up the overall scheme to generate more power from offshore wind, you really don't want a whole series of planning enquires like this protracted one for EA1N and EA2. A

brownfield site near the coast where all these projects can be connected to the grid is the obvious solution.

Louise Fincham

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]