

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#); [secretary.state@beis.gov.uk](mailto:secretary.state@beis.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** PINS Ref: EA1N- EN010077 and EA2 - EN010078  
**Date:** 06 July 2021 17:43:47

---

**Planning Inspectorate Written Representation Ref: EA1N – EN01007 and EA2 – EN010078**

Bridget Chadwick reference numbers 20024947 and 20024988

[REDACTED]

Dear Examining Authority,

As our MP Therese Coffey has firmly stated, I am calling on the Examining Authority to reach a 'Split Decision' on the above application so that:

1. The offshore turbines are recommended for consent.
2. The onshore infrastructure is rejected in favour of full consideration of better locations for this infrastructure where the adverse impacts are minimised at a brownfield or industrialised site.

I wish to strongly support the move to offshore wind energy but there are numerous grounds for objecting to the way in which it is making landfall and being connected to the National Grid:

1. First of course is absolute disbelief that it is possible to consider locating an enormous energy hub in the middle of untouched countryside and cutting cable trenches and haul roads the width of dual carriageways (or motorways when adding the projects due to follow SPR's) through the middle of Suffolk's AONB, Heritage Coast and the rare and fragile environment of the Suffolk Sandlings – at a time when government ministers are 'vowing' that England's infrastructure projects will be 'nature positive'! So much for the promised 'net gain for biodiversity' just after the G7 summit agreed to "protect and restore 30% of the natural world by 2030" and the Environment Secretary, George Eustice, saying "If we want to realise the aspiration set out in Prof Dasgupta's landmark review to rebalance humanity's relationship with nature, then we need policies that will both protect and enhance the supply of our natural assets. This is what lies at the heart of the government's 25-year environment plan, and our **new measures to embed biodiversity net gain further in the planning system for major infrastructure, through our landmark environment bill.**" Far more to the point is the report by the government's own Environment Audit Committee (EAC): "The government's ... policies are failing to halt catastrophic loss of wildlife." And "the biodiversity crisis is still not being treated with the urgency of the climate crisis. The UK is the most wildlife-depleted country out of the G7 nations and, despite pledges to improve the environment within a generation, properly funded policies are not in place to make this happen." It is the Tory chair of EAC who said that despite countless policies to improve the natural environment, they remain "grandiose statements lacking teeth and devoid of effective delivery mechanisms". Government data released at the end of 2020 found public sector investment in conservation fell in real terms by 33% in five years. In other words, the grand promises and the 25-year environment plan are all just more HOG WASH?! – because "inadequate monitoring and a lack of compliance means the government is not delivering on them. Nature is still not being taken into account in policymaking and **more money is being spent destroying the environment than protecting it**" found the EAC report. And MPs are saying "Funding cuts and a lack of ecological expertise in government and local authorities is worsening the situation."

I have written in detail about the threats to the heathland habitat of the Suffolk Sandlings in my earlier submissions, about the importance of lowland heaths for biodiversity, and how **“open heathland is rarer than rain forest”**. But in addition all our open and relatively quiet countryside is a precious resource for wildlife. Suffice evidence this time around is that only yesterday I came across a smooth snake squashed in the road right next to a ‘Site access’ sign just outside Friston (see attached pictures). It could well have been killed by a car, but the point is it would have been part of reptile communities clearly living in the area, and so increasingly threatened by loss of habitat and additional heavy traffic. I rest my case.

2. To locate an Energy Hub 3 times the size of Wembley stadium in the midst of one of the UK’s most unspoilt and accessible nature-based tourism destinations will lead to the decimation of a thriving tourist economy, with an impact of up to £40 million per annum, the main revenue stream for the Suffolk Heritage Coast. Offshore wind will undoubtedly bring a positive national and regional economic impact and we welcome the regeneration possibilities for Lowestoft as a centre for the renewables industry, but there will be NO local jobs in the area affected by onshore development, only losses to the hospitality industry and cultural centres such as Snape Maltings and the hugely respected international Aldeburgh Festival.
3. It is unreasonable to put a substation in the heart of a medieval village, where noise, lights and industrial structures destroy well-being and mental health, if better site options exist. There are more suitable locations at industrialised or brownfield sites, where existing noise and light will mask to some extent additional light and noise, rather than impacting on a local community, school children, the elderly and perhaps most importantly the mental health of those who have chosen to live in quiet locations. Also, these locations provide an escape to those who want and need an escape from greater industrialisation – and it is becoming harder and harder to find it, hence its popularity as a holiday destination, never more so than under the current pandemic! The Energy White Paper ‘Powering Our Net Zero Future’ has said “We recognise the impact this is having on the coastal communities which host this infrastructure and will ACT QUICKLY to take the necessary steps to address the situation.... This will consider the full impacts on affected communities, particularly on the east coast of England ...”
4. National Grid itself, as a private company, has no interest in making it possible to avoid environmental damage by spending money on properly coordinated grid connections for the numerous wind farms that are either being constructed or due to be constructed in the near future. They have not engaged at all in these consultations, certainly not at community level or even with the County Council as far as I am aware, as we are unable to find out anything from them. They are using SPR as a Trojan Horse in order to shoehorn into the proposed site further development as we know Nautilus and Eurolink Interconnectors are also planned to connect here – and who knows what else? These hearings do not take into account the true scale of the ‘energy hub’ planned.
5. Similarly SPR, as a private company, is (a) doing all it can to avoid being part of the BEIS Review into less damaging solutions to connecting to the National Grid. And if the government does not take the steps necessary to protect our environment why would a foreign-owned company take responsibility for doing so?? (b) SPR’s engagement with local communities has been a farce, their roadshows nothing but PR stunts without any honest reflection of what it will entail to build this infrastructure or what the cable trenching will do

to Thorpeness cliffs, our AONB and Suffolk Sandlings – not a single photo showed the scale of trenches and haul roads or the honest size of substations and construction sites in the landscape. (c) Of course they also have no interest in taking into account the cumulative impact of numerous projects for traffic, noise and light pollution etc, and the consequent damage to our fragile environment and it's rare and threatened biodiversity, claiming there is "insufficient information to undertake the assessment requested" – when we can find plenty of evidence about them in the public domain. (d) We do not have any faith in the independence of surveys carried out – for example we know from residents close to the EA1 trenches and haul roads that traps laid in hedgerows to discover what wildlife was using them were **always** placed close to the road edge rather than the quieter side of hedges! etc. (e) Finally, they are using compulsory purchase statutory powers to gag landowners with nondisclosure agreements that **prevent any opposition** from those most affected – it is an affront to supposed freedom of speech and renders the Examination as patently neither fair nor transparent!

Bridget Chadwick













SITE  
ENTRANCE