

Gary Waple, Snape Resident

Good morning, my name is Gary Waple and I live in Snape; our house is on the A1094 road, which will turn into a gridlocked car park because of increased commercial traffic over a period of a **minimum** of 12 years, should the Applicant's proposals for building substations at Friston proceed.

For the record, I utterly reject the Applicant's proposed plans for the landing of renewable offshore wind energy onshore at Friston via Thorpeness beach, resulting in the unnecessary destruction of virgin coastal countryside.

I also support the UK government's objectives of reducing the UK's carbon footprint through green energy initiatives. And I support plans for wind farm energy generation. But we also need to ensure that we deliver green energy cleanly.

I also commend previous oral submissions that have expressed disappointment at the holding of the oral submission hearings virtually instead of waiting until live meetings could have been held in due course, especially given the BEIS Review that might overtake this process anyway.

As I have already submitted my written submission **within deadline 1**, I shall not do more now than provide a short summary of the points I have submitted:

1. The Applicant's proposals to damage irreparably an area of unspoilt countryside, including an AONB, is completely unacceptable. This proposed damage denigrates the green credentials of the offshore wind farm energy generation and taints the whole project as 'dirty' energy, as whenever end-to-end processes are not significantly green

from start to finish of a process, the green credentials of the whole project must fail.

2. My dismissal of the Applicant's proposals are supported by, and influenced by, our local MP's oral submission, that of Dr Thérèse Coffey, also the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, who has concluded (*and I quote*): 'the impact of this proposal on the countryside, vital habitats, heritage assets, the amenities of local residents and tourism means I that I formally object to these DCO applications and I urge the Planning Inspectorate not to recommend them to the Secretary of State'.

3. The likely rippling effects from the time substations are proposed until final completion and then onwards during their operational lifetime will bring about adverse ecological, economic and health impacts for untold numbers of years to come, which could have easily been avoided if the Applicant had heeded Dr Coffey's advice (*and I quote*):

'Throughout the consultation stages, I have suggested alternatives to Scottish Power Renewables, including the proposed nuclear brownfield site at Bradwell, which would have meant less onshore cabling and substations in a

more appropriate location. SPR have chosen not to pursue that, which in my view would have made their applications acceptable and are instead proposing a 32-metre wide cabling corridor across 9km of sensitive landscape with large substations on the edge of Friston village, without adequate landscaping’.

4. Added to this, not a single oral submission at any of the hearings to date has expressed a single phrase of support for the Applicant’s proposals. Perhaps, hardly surprising but nevertheless a condemnation of the **‘stupid vandalism’** that these proposals will cause if this outdated point-to-point system is used.

The Applicant’s proposals must fail any common-sense test of what is allowable, when all are convinced of a perfectly acceptable alternative brownfield solution that would not spoil an area of outstanding and fragile beauty in the British countryside irreparably. That this has been endorsed by the area’s MP, who is also a senior UK Government Minister of State, gives me hope that common sense will prevail in the end, even if in short supply thus far.

THANK YOU