

**Response to EDFE 2nd Consultation On Sizewell C**  
**We request an acknowledgement of receipt**

**To EDFE by e-mail**

**We would like to make the following points**

**1) Consultation**

- a) We believe the 2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation time was inadequate.
- b) The information in the documents is also inadequate, in many areas it states there will be further information gathering. We cannot make a response on assumptions.
- c) Many of the maps in the documents do not have a legend.
- d) There are no contour lines on the maps so heights are difficult to calculate.
- e) A great deal of environmental information is missing, again we cannot make a response when all facts are not known.

**2) Layout of the power station**

- a) It is obvious that the site is far too small for the total project, even without all the accurate measurements of the footprint of all buildings, reactors, etc which will make up the permanent site.
- b) The site will be way forward of the Sizewell B sight line.
- c) It encroaches onto the marsh at the west of the site affecting more of the SSSI and therefore will have a knock on effect on other designations.
- d) The north of the site will be affected by the haul road to bring in equipment and materials by sea, this cannot occur without damage to the dunes and vegetative shingle.
- e) The height of all buildings including the reactor chimneys and the alignment of the buildings is not acceptable. This intrusion into the low lying coastal scene is wholly unacceptable and cannot be mitigated.
- f) This proposed development is in the AONB and on the Heritage Coast which must be protected from this type of industrial development.
- g) It is our belief that there is no mitigation or compensation for any of this situation, and it should be totally avoided.

**3) Coastal Process.**

- a) In reference to the size of the site and way that the original eastern most part of it has been extended beyond the sight line of SZB.  
We believe this risks coastal squeeze and adds to the potential for damage on a coast which is not predictable or stable, particularly with further impacts from climate change. This makes the proposal for construction of Sizewell C on such a vulnerable site a dangerous and unnecessary risk to what is already an uncertain coastal process. Add to this the unknown impacts of any off shore jetties, landing pad, and cooling water inlets and outlets and we are left wondering about all construction which may impede North Sea drift.
- b) With the possibility of sea water flooding and overtopping north of the site there is the potential for considerable damage and possible loss of property at Minsmere, Eastbridge, Leiston, Thorpeness and Aldeburgh, this is unacceptable.
- b) Some of the above may be avoidable by reducing the size of the development.
- c) No mitigation is acceptable.

d) Hard defences for coastal protection in this area of the AONB and Heritage Coast are unacceptable.

#### 4) Permanent Access Route lay up area etc

a) We would like to know why this route, which severs the AONB, has been chosen, it is the most damaging to the AONB that anyone could imagine. Adding to it the lay up area for equipment and batching plant etc and 5000 employees with thousands and thousands of traffic movements, cranes, earth-movers and it becomes an environmental disaster. This is not forgetting the light, noise, dust and all other pollutants so close to RSPB Minsmere and accompanying flora and fauna which occupy the designated sites.

b) Another major concern is the Access road crossing Bridleway 19 this is an ancient walk way and bridleway used for many generations for work and now it is appreciated by many for recreational use it has ancient oaks, and hedgerows which are species rich food and nest sites for many birds butterflies and other insects, Any disturbance to this area is pure sacrilege

c) This overall damage cannot be compensated for, nor is there any suggested mitigation, we asked at Stage 1 consultation for an alternative route to be considered which was less environmentally damaging. EDFE have tweaked the route but has made the situation even less tolerable.

As it is so damaging to the ecology of the area the Access Road should NOT be considered acceptable in its proposed position.

#### 5) Campus

a) This is of course linked to the Access road. Whilst we understand the need to ensure fewer traffic movements, by keeping the workforce campus nearer to the construction site it is still in the wrong place. As the Access road is in the wrong place, by creating a base for 2400 people introducing light, noise etc into an otherwise quiet dark area, exacerbates the problem and is unacceptable. There will also be an impact on Schedule monument Leiston Abbey and Pro Corda Music School

b) All of the above links to the Access road and is not acceptable.

c) Moving the campus in isolation to another site will create other problems.

#### 6) Bridging the SSSI

a) All we can say is the access road is geographically and ecologically totally unsuitable and is not sustainable.

b) By crossing this pinch point of the Leiston Beck, and water courses with any manmade device is just asking for trouble, and it will have the ability to impede the water on both Sizewell Belts and Minsmere Levels. RSPB Minsmere, Leiston Sewage works, and Eastbridge all depend on the integrity of the many water courses that are situated in the Minsmere Valley.

c) Knowing as we do that climate change, sea-level rise and more frequent heavy rainfall will need careful management. Restricting or increasing the water flows is far from satisfactory and in fact is downright foolhardy.

d) This must be avoided. We cannot see how this can be mitigated or compensated .

This is of course once again linked to the access road and again is not acceptable.

#### 7) Soil Management Borrow Pits etc

a) This is off the scale of stupidity, has this really been thought through, or was it cooked up on a whim. Please think again. Sorry to be so blunt but local people and habitats deserve better.

**Yet again it is linked to the Access Road and is not acceptable.**

#### 8) Visitor Centres Are we having one for SZB and one for SZC ?

a) Visitor Centre at SZB is not part of this consultation however.

We anticipate an Application to SCDC to move the existing SZB Visitor Centre off the SZC land north to Coronation Wood. This is unacceptable as it is in the AONB, trees would be felled and lose the existing screening for SZB.

b) Visitor Centre SZC

We do not agree with any of the suggested sites. If we are to have a visitors centre it should be close to Leiston and not in the AONB.

**c) EDFEs suggested options for the Visitors centre are about the promotion and propaganda surrounding Nuclear Power, NOT about benefiting business and facilities in Leiston itself, something which they profess to be undertaking.**

#### 9) Rail Lines

a) If the existing Rail line is to be used in the first 2 years of construction then people on the route, must be given all the facts and allowed to take part in discussions.

b) The rail crossing on the B 1122 must be automated and possibly realigned, and the existing line upgraded to ensure a legacy remains for the future of Leiston and the surrounding parishes.

#### 10) Green Rail Line

a) Whilst we understand the need to get as much traffic off the roads as possible this line runs to the construction site cutting another scar into the AONB.

We object to this suggestion.

**b) If this route does go ahead we do not expect the Westward Ho! / Buckleswood Road to be stopped up to traffic, but demand that automated barriers are installed. Stopping up this road will cause many problems for businesses, farms and local people who use the road on a daily basis, it will also impede blue light services who use satellite navigation to attend events.**

c) It is also an area notified for bats, great crested newts and many other species of wildlife, including Barn and Tawny Owls, Green and Greater Spotted woodpeckers

If this route is used there must be additional hedge planting on either side of the tracks to allow a corridor for wildlife and to shield the countryside from intrusion.

d) We note that there is no mention of Wood Farm, Westward Ho. Leiston IP164HT as being a Grade 11 Listed Building, yet there is a mention of Fishers Farm, Abbey Lane, both are equidistant from the proposed green rail line.

Why the omission?

**e) If this route goes ahead we expect wildlife and local peoples' needs to be met in this instance. If a crossing, hedges and respect for the countryside is not included then we find the Green Rail route unacceptable,**

**We also have grave reservations about the Crossing on the B1122 and the subsequent intrusion into the AONB.**

**NB** We have added further on our concerns about the lack of reference to Listed buildings at Item 14.

### 11) Lay up area Buckleswood Road

This is an unsuitable area for plant, machinery and storage of equipment creating light, and noise in a very rural site on the outskirts of Leiston. It is adjacent to Buckles Wood, which is a County Wildlife Site and is the remains of ancient woodland, that once covered a much larger area of Leiston.

### 12) All footpaths affected by the Green rail route.

a) These are all ancient walk ways and part of an interwoven series of paths, most with connections to Leiston Abbey, churches, and farms. Little thought has been given to how best to consider these paths, which are still well used, some are to be stopped up and some diverted.

**This is unacceptable, destroying as it does some of Leistons' precious heritage. If the Green Route is to proceed much more work needs to be undertaken, with local people, to come to a better solution**

### 13) Temporary caravan accommodation and lay up area

a) What is temporary? All mentions of temporary in the document could be anything up to 15 years ?

b) If this site is to be used for workers we suggest a crossing point on the C228 road should be constructed to enable safe access to the Sizewell Sports and Social Club.

c) If the remains of the land are to be used for off loading materials from the existing rail line at the onset of the construction, then all residents surrounding the area should be consulted as to what are their needs.

d) Much more consideration needs to be given to Lovers Lane U2822 if it is to be a haul route from the existing rail line to the Construction Site.

e) The culvert under Lovers Lane which connects SSSI to the Aldhurst Farm Habitat must be re-built and consideration given to mammals etc crossing the road at that point.

### 14) B1122/ A12

a) Junction of B1122/ A12 should be considered in conjunction with the A1120/ A12 junction. The A12 Yoxford junctions must be considered jointly, traffic backing up on the A12 from the south to the B1122 junction will impede the A1120 junction.

The A1120 is an important tourist route from the A14. Many visitors to the area, especially to Aldeburgh, Thorpeness etc use it in preference to going via Ipswich.

b)The B1122 proposed alterations do not go far enough, much more could be done to improve the road for all users.

Until we have a clear picture of how much use will be made of the rail and sea traffic it is difficult to make a complete response.

**c) Although EDFE are not consulting on building a new road from A12 to Sizewell, it has been suggested by others.**

**We are totally opposed to this notion. It would create yet another permanent scar in East Suffolk. This time it would be permanent. New roads more traffic.**

**NPS EN1 refers**

### 15) Listed Buildings and the Historic Background

a) Leiston -cum- Sizewell Parish is well known for having a great deal of history throughout the ages, much of which is still unknown.

This is not reflected in EDFEs documents or given any status or importance.

Only some of the Listed Buildings are mentioned albeit the map in the major document pinpoints most of them. To us this is a sad omission.

For instance St Peters Church at Theberton which is Grade 1 is on the B1122 no reference is made to how it is to be protected from traffic and vibration.

This goes for all listed buildings which may be affected by road traffic, rail traffic and construction, or by affecting their settings with the possibility of damage to their fabric as many have little or no foundations.

These are a precious heritage and must be considered in much more depth and protected.

b) The same goes for the archaeology; the area which is to be disturbed is full of history.

This must not be lost.

There must be a complete record of all archaeology of the areas which are disturbed and kept in paper form for posterity in Leiston.

**I refer you to a book called “From Flint Knappers to Atom Splitters” by Daphne and Kenneth May ISBN 0-9540870-0-3.**

### 16) General Comments

EDFEs’ SZC development is totally unacceptable to us, for all the reasons stated above and many more which we have not included.

The whole SZC project and all its accompanying developments is too large and intrusive for this unique corner of Suffolk. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation Document is no consolation as it gives us more reasons to fear the worst as many issues are not dealt with and some are just glanced over.

This area is precious to us by taking a bulldozer to it before our very eyes is outrageous, the destruction of such a wide area of our parishes with the many designations and amazing history cannot be justified.

We hear from the people of Hinkley that even at this early stage of Hinkley Point C construction, lives have been turned upside down, road building and traffic being the main issues. We do not want this to happen here. It is stated that the build programme for SZC is for 10 to 12 years and that some of the disruption will be temporary but 10 to 12 years of disruption is not acceptable.

When built the EPR reactors, their chimney stacks and all accompanying buildings cannot be anything other than big ugly blots on the landscape. The fact that they are nothing like the SZB dome will make the SZC, 2 reactor outlines, in the long distance views even worse. Added to this will be the permanent storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel in more ugly buildings. None of this is a legacy which we wish to leave for future generations.

Sadly we consider that carrying out the EDFE Programme of work to construct Sizewell C for over 12 years will bring far more disbenefits than benefits, and the parishes will be damaged and unrecognisable by 2030.

We consider there is no overall mitigation or compensation for the SZC project that will bring enough benefit to the area, in fact quite the reverse, nothing can compensate for the disruption and stress to lives, and loss of an area which many of us love and appreciate and which is a wildlife rich habitat, which cannot be replaced and will be lost forever.

Joan Girling and Mike Taylor  
Residents of Leiston

