

EA1 (EN010077) ref: 20023553 + EA2 (EN010078) ref: 20023554

Nicola (Ning) Suzanne Fulford – [REDACTED]

## **Response to ISH3 – ISH4 – ISH5 - ISH6 & OFH6 held in January 2021**

Dear Planning Inspectorate team,

I fully support representations made by the delegates of SASES, SEAS, Save Our Sandlings, Councilor Fellows and all the other independents who made statements at the recent Issue Specific Hearings and Open Floor hearing held in January 2021.

What is worrying about the SPRs application and their representatives is that they are only interested in doing the bare minimum; relying on desktop surveys or noise and traffic counts that have taken place over a period of days, rather than weeks (or indeed understanding the impacts of the many local events that occur over the year that impact on road use etc...) - yet they were very quick to attack any reports presented by others making representations over the recent ISH's.

The applicant keeps referring to developments in Norfolk as a comparison for this application – they are not a like for like comparison; in scale (this application is considerably larger than the one in Norfolk); in location (this application is sited right next to a village and surrounded by listed buildings – not so in Norfolk) and the existing infrastructure that surrounds them (this application the site is surrounded by single track roads – in Norfolk the site is located next to A roads) – so effectively they are comparing a cherry to a watermelon and arguing they are the same...

### **Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Biodiversity and HRA**

No in-depth survey has been carried out by the applicant on the fragile cliffs or the Coralline Crag – we are expected to blindly trust the drilling equipment and expertise of a company that has been subcontracted by the applicant (and will need this job so will 'sell themselves' as being able to cope with anything that they encounter, but they bare none of the risk or responsibility) – the consequences for the seabed, cliffs and the concern of contamination of local water supplies from wells and boreholes should anything go wrong are, most likely, irreversible.

### **Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) – Onshore environment, construction transport and operations effects**

The matter of noise was not given enough time to be addressed properly – this is the legacy that the village of Friston will be left with and it is imperative that the correct scale is agreed upon prior to this application being given consent. I support Mr Turney of SASES's request for a further ISH to address this matter in more detail.

Roads: With regard to 'Cumulative impact' the applicants inability to understand their responsibility as to the current weight of traffic and the impact of local

events (eg: festivals, concerts, bank holiday weekends etc...) and what is yet to come (Thousands of houses currently being built in Saxmundham, Framlingham and Melton, to name but a few...) is extraordinary – they are behaving as if nobody else needs to use the local roads and the tourist destinations they facilitate – This is compounded by ‘peninsular’ roads from the A12 that are used to access the coastal resorts in Suffolk (such as Aldeburgh, Sizewell, Dunwich, Walberswick and Southwold).

### **Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5) – Social, economic, land and sea effects**

The economic dis-benefit to tourism as a direct result of this project puts into question this local region’s ability to survive or indeed ‘bounce back’ should this project get the go ahead.

How can it be right that the wind energy industry be given preferential treatment over the existing tourist industry on which the local economy relies? Mr Watkins, Mr Jordan and Mr Evans were given approximately 30 minutes to make what was effectively a party political broadcast for SPR and wind energy during an ISH, where there has been real pressure on time – I would like to object their use of the term ‘EA Hub’ which was referred to by the applicants representative - particularly when the applicant objected to Mr Rigby’s use of the term ‘Friston hum’ to refer to the noise the village will be expected to endure once the substations are commissioned. Also Mr Watkins laid claim to the RH Therese Coffey MP, who has in fact asked that this application be rejected.

### **Open Floor Hearing 6 (OFH6)**

Please also refer to separate response re: Friston House as a listed building sharing curtilage with the proposed site, where this is no mitigation proposed by the applicant.

As humans living in the house during the build:

- There will be no darkness for seven years – how will we sleep?
- Generators will be making noise through the night – how will we sleep?
- We will have to wear noise cancelling headphones – 6 days a week for 12 hour days for 7 years, possibly more... - what about our right to some sort of quality of life?
- Quite possibly have to wear respiratory masks due to dust and pollutants

Email reference: ASI1 - EA1 (EN010077) ref: 20023553 + EA2 (EN010078) ref: 20023554

### **Accompanied Site Inspection 1 (ASI1) – visit to Friston House (12noon)**

Please see a separate response regarding this.

Email reference: ASI1 - EA1 (EN010077) ref: 20023553 + EA2 (EN010078) ref: 20023554

### **Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) – into draft dDCO**