

## Off Shore Wind Farms

**East Anglia One North Offshore Wind Project - PINS Ref: ENO10077**  
**East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm Project - PINS Ref: ENO10078**

**Unique Reference EA1N-AFP039**  
**Project Email: East Anglia One North**

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

Response to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Request for comments -  
31st January 2022.

Dear Mr Kwarteng

“What is being asked is - “is it fair and appropriate - and is it legitimate”

Thank you for your invitation to respond to these SPR Applications.

Firstly, I would like to make the following statement:

“We are fully supportive of renewable energy and have no objections to the offshore elements of these applications in general. However, the onshore aspect does have objections. It does not reflect the green principles of habitat and species protection the Government professes to uphold and progress to Net Zero”.

### **SPR Application Overview.**

#### **1. Cumulative Impact - Is it Fit for Purpose.**

The disgrace is that this dual application by SPR involves significant destruction and disruption of an important AONB, an Heritage Coast, Protected Heathlands, SSSI and a SPA, and a negative influence upon four internationally renowned attractions: Snape Maltings, Thorpeness Village, Minsmere Bird Reserve and Suffolk's rare shingle coastline. Furthermore, these SPR Applications are clearly not alone - there are many more waiting to follow - all part of a much bigger Agenda being driven by Government to meet so called “green energy targets” by 2030. There is nothing green about this ambition. The nature of what is proposed is overwhelmingly destructive and very industrial and completely alien to this green productive region. Wind turbines are a very inefficient way to generate electricity and weather dependant. No wind equals no energy. A huge part of rural Suffolk countryside is to be transformed into **the largest complex of industrial scale energy infrastructure in the UK** - without any consultation with the people who will have to live with it. This is unjustifiable and unfair.

#### **2. The Legacy - Agricultural Loss and Contamination**

This Government's plan will impact upon thousands of acres of good productive agricultural land along with its associated natural habitat, and will change a successful way of life that has endured for millennia. The degrading of land productivity and quality cannot not be evaluated money wise, but diversity and habitat and peoples perception of home can. The social impact will be incalculable. The scale of this vast project will be not dissimilar to the destructive transformation of landscape and the lasting legacy of the mining and steel industry throughout the North of England; where contamination after effects continue to this day. Not a legacy of which to be proud; and yet this could be the case with East Anglia. Cables do not last forever and will eventually biodegrade and contaminate the land quality, its aquifers and natural spaces. That is a fact; and will be East Anglia's enduring legacy should the SPR Onshore Applications go ahead.

Who ever is responsible for the decision to go ahead will not be forgotten as there is a connection with this application as I will explain later. To permit the region to be transformed into an alien industrial landscape at the expense of a recognised green area with a thriving agricultural and tourism industry will be a travesty.

Recent research shows this transformation into an Energy Hub could cause immense damage to one of the UK's most successful nature based tourism destinations by more that £40,000,000 per annum; without even taking into consideration the impact of multiple planning applications to follow. Who will carry the can for compensation of the losses caused by this? This area is a financial success story that cannot be ignored and should be applauded and respected.

2/.....

### **3. The Application: Is it fit for purpose**

SPR's Cumulative Impact Assessment was deemed profoundly flawed and did not take into consideration the issue of accumulative affects. With the Government's proposals to transform East Anglia into a vast Energy Hub now in the public domain and recognition that we now know there are "multiple applications" in the pipeline, the scene has now morphed into a "Multiple Application Project" in which SPR's dual Application is going to play a pivotal role - should permission be granted.

Accumulative Impact is a crucial factor when it comes to determining this decision and is of significant relevance when SPR's Applications comes into question. The Norfolk Vanguard Wind Farm DCO underlines the significance of this point and is highly relevant in the light of the Judicial Review decision in 2021.

SPR's Applications must now be viewed as being an "integral part" of all this. It will be the "door opener" for all the outstanding applications waiting for the UK Energy Hub project in East Anglia to proceed with this needless devastation. SPR's submissions do not stand up to scrutiny without an up to date assessment of the accumulative impacts of these multiple applications.

The granting of permission is without foundation in law and has to be refused.

### **4. The Solution - is simple -**

Energy Hubs and Substations and Inter-connectors are part of an industrial process. To damage valuable green habitat and agricultural land and thriving local economy, when there are alternatives contradicts all aspects of protection and environment conservation agreements as pledged publicly by this Government at COP26 and is totally at odds with Statements made on our behalf by our Prime Minister Boris Johnson.

The facts are that this "vision" is completely inappropriate for a substantial rural agricultural region that already has a vibrant and successful local economy.

**It simply is the wrong project in the wrong place - and that cannot be right.**

### **4. Alternatives: Brown Field versus Greenfield - Biodiversity challenge.**

**This region is an agricultural landscape with a vital role already** to provide abundant food for the nation.

It should not be used as a tool to facilitate London's energy requirements - 80 miles away - There are alternatives much closer to consider but have not been regarded. This is a disgraceful reflection on the part of the National Grid - and a dereliction of their legal duty to investigate all other options in depth. Redundant Bradwell Power Station and Grain are a case in point. As brownfield sites they are better placed to connect with the national grid and considerably closer to London. Environmental damage is minimal and will uphold Government's drive to utilise these overlooked spaces for large industrial projects such as this.

### **5. Influence on the Democratic Process and Planning System caused by Non Disclosure Agreements.**

SPR's Non Disclosure Agreements throughout this period of Examination have without doubt had been totally detrimental to the democratic process when it comes to planning hearings and has stifled many individuals from contributing in a fair and transparent manner vital information - that has definitely played into the Applications favour.

Unless there is Regulation of NDAs the planning process will become increasingly distorted and dominated by Corporates with the Non Disclosure Agreements to control and stifle effected individuals. The fact it is used on many essential public organisations such as the Environment Agency, as in the HS2 case, seriously undermines the Planning Authority's ability to conduct the process in a fair, transparent and democratic manner - and runs the risk of important information and knowledge being lost and denied public scrutiny.

This covert authoritarian use of NDAs by SPR has caused extreme distress to all those who are unfortunate enough to be involved in this SPR Application - if they do not sign up they are threatened with Compulsory Purchase, lose all control over their land or property, and receive minimal compensation. If they sign they are tied into NDA's and barred from speaking about anything to do with SPR for life.

**This simply is not good enough and makes a mockery of the whole planning process.**

**With all these failings, this Application cannot be accepted and should be refused.**

**I shall look forward to reading your decision and thank you for the opportunity to respond.**

**Yours sincerely**

**Wendy Orme**