

The Council:

1. strongly supports cable undergrounding to minimise permanent landscape impact.
2. strongly supports future proofing, as in documents 7.1(para2.3-8) and 8.1(para3.5), for the reasons in document 5.1(para3.9).
3. strongly objects to the cabling route through Little Bealings (Preferred Option Cable Corridor (POCC) in document 6.2(d)Consultation Appendix39). Alternative Onshore Cable Corridor A (AOA) in Appendix39 is the appropriate cable route because:
 - a. AOA can avoid Queech Wood; a new comparison of woodland impact is required.
 - b. HDD would not be required.
 - c. The Appendix39 comparison of POCC and AOA is fundamentally flawed in assessing only environmental impacts and giving nil consideration to the impact on the two communities of Great and Little Bealings. No communities are affected by AOA. The Council maintains that considerable weight must be attached to this factor. POCC crosses two of the three roads which serve Little Bealings. The comparison is further flawed:
 - i. Impact on agricultural land is temporary; weight should not be attached to it
 - ii. 3.61km of POCC land is an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) against only 1.67km of AOA land
 - iii. Environmental Stewardship Agreements are an invalid basis for land quality comparison. Stewardship schemes close in 2014.
 - iv. Analysis of public rights of way as part of the local transport network is omitted.
4. strongly objects to HDD construction in Little Bealings (Work No26) because:
 - a. it has consulted with its residents in closest proximity. One prefers trenching: the work will be quicker, and less noisy/disruptive. Another prefers HDD only if this allows tree retention; this is uncertain - no trees are to grow on top of the cable corridor.
 - b. Hedgerows will be replaced.
 - c. The working width corridor is significantly wider, increasing environmental impact.
 - d. 24 hours working increases noise, vibration, air and light pollution for the community; agreed noise levels will be exceeded (document 7.1, Summary (para5.8-27)).
5. strongly objects to a CCS at Playford (Work No28) because:
 - a. The proposed traffic route fails to acknowledge that the Suffolk Strategic Lorry Route is one-way.
 - b. The Council deplores the lack of Traffic Management, Access Management and Travel Plans; without them the conclusion that Playford is the appropriate location for a CCS is invalid. The site has been chosen wholly for reasons of expediency and without knowledge of local traffic movements or due regard to traffic impact.
6. considers document 7.4.8 wholly inadequate in failing to assess construction traffic impact on Holly Lane which is crossed by the cable/haul road. Assessment relating to The Street is irrelevant.
7. deplores the applicant's refusal to fund professional advice for the Parish Council.
8. is aware the applicant has refused compensation for the intangible adverse impacts of the development on community life. Impacts include travel delay/disruption and disruption to quiet enjoyment of the countryside (eg noise, air and light pollution and visual impact). Community funding is a prerequisite of consent.
9. requires involvement in preparation of a Local Impact Report.