



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Addendum Annex A: Copies of all consultation responses - Part 1 of 2

Revision: 1.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

January 2021

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Looking at your 178 page Consultation Document of November / December 2020 it appears that a huge area of Suffolk is going to be turned into chaos for 12 years or more by this project should it go ahead. I believe that a whole new re-think is required

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The current train service is far from reliable. Any increase in the number of transport vehicles would disrupt this poor service further.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The unknown behaviour of changing sea levels cannot allow you to guarantee that this beach will continue to be accessible for the duration of the power station's use.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

please see above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The proposed infrastructure is so massive that costing this operation accurately cannot be guaranteed. The whole financial price of the scheme is far and away more than any of the alternative ways to generate the same amount of electricity

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

see my last comment

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

You have probably already dismissed my views as the misguided idea of this new plant is clearly influenced by those committed to nuclear power. If you haven't binned this already then please read on.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

please see my previous comments

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

please see my previous comments

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Again, all these suggestions fail to avoid the horror that is being planned for this part of Suffolk

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

please see my previous comments

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know X

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

please see my previous comments

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Keeps roads clearer for residents.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

If passenger timetable to change remember people who have to get to work.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

If we do not want so many lorries on the road, sea landings are required.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As previous.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I think we need electricity and EDF have tried hard to make the building if Sizewell C as painless as possible, so I hope permissions will now be given.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Totally opposed to this site. I moved here [redacted] yrs ago mortgage free to be nearer the countryside and for a quieter life than the town offered. My home is [redacted], so the park and ride which might as well be in my back garden has not only made me feel ill its effecting [redacted]. The joy of sitting in my beautiful garden will be gone, and I will no longer be able to hang my linen out due to the pollution, and the noise will be intolerable, and the light pollution and noise will not bode well for a good night's sleep. To mention just a few issues and I assure you the list goes on. Once the P&R work commences my home will be rendered worthless, so I hear you will pay today's market value so I will not loose out. Perhaps one of your site managers would like it ? A lifetime of saving and mortgage free for what? EDF to come along and totally take the next 10/12 years away and devalue my home makes me physically sick . By the time you are finished I will probably be 6ft under. So a very very sad state of affairs. Now let's see if you really do care. Bet I don't hear a thing from you!!!! I do live in hope Thank you [redacted]

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The Suffolk coastline is crumbling so why on earth would you think increasing sea transport? HGVs thundering up the A12 on narrow roads, through villages will increase noise, pollution and traffic volume making village life along the route utterly miserable.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am totally against the building of Sizewell C but anything you can do to mitigate disruption, noise, pollution, damage to infrastructure and the environment I suppose is a plus.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As already stated, the Suffolk coast is crumbling, whatever you do will damage the coast.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

How can you even consider this as a viable option?

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Madness.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Whatever you do will endanger the SSSI and should not be allowed.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

How long do you think it takes for an environment to become an SSSI, whatever mitigation measures you take will not compensate for the loss of habitat, flora and fauna. It will take decades to recover by which time the Sizewell C will be decommissioned but then what happens to the nuclear waste?

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

What about the wetlands you will be destroying?

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Presumably this will have some chemical content and discharging excess water onto the beach will contribute to coastal erosion of our fragile coast.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The boundary changes are not specific. You talk about net loss of trees presumably you will replace the ones you remove by planting new ones. Mature trees support a massive, multiplicity of habitats and take decades to reach that size. Any new trees you plant will not be mature until after Sizewell C has been decommissioned. That is not a justification for cutting down trees when we need every one we have to retain carbon. Raising sea defences will not halt erosion or if it does it will only be temporary.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Evakeen the words 'Coronation Wood development area' scream out that this wood of 229 century old trees will be destroyed for possibly no reason. As said previously, to replace such an ancient woodland would take at least another century by which time Sizewell C will no longer be viable - what a disgracefully pointless loss of habitat. Whatever you do to Sizewell A cannot make up for all the destruction.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Any changes you make to existing infrastructure will do nothing to mitigate the impact of HGVs hurtling through villages on narrow, single highways will do nothing to improve the lives of the residents living along these routes. The worst thing about this proposed development is that you will destroy the areas of Suffolk involved in its creation, taking 12 to 14 years to do so, then the reactor will only be viable for 60 years and without having any safe ways of storing spent nuclear waste at the end of its life. The government has said today that money will be spent in renewables. If the money it will cost to pay for this extravaganza, few people want, with technology moving at an ever increasing rate the investment needs to be in renewables.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Semi retired gardener

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Delivery by road and rail possibly quicker than sea

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Frequency of trains should be at the sites descretion

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I don't have a problem with this

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Bulk loads by sea would save many lorry loads

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Maximum handling facility has to be the answer

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I am happy with these proposals

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I don't think s/c will have such a bad impact on wildlife as people fear

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Sounds like solving 2 problems in the long run

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I don't see a problem with this

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All these changes are obviously necessary

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Totally agree

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All these changes are needed

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The more traffic taken off the roads the better

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again the more that is delivered by sea the better

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Whilst bypassing the two villages it would seem sense to extend this new bypass to also include a bypass for the narrow road through Little Glemham and link the new bypass into the existing A12 dual carriageway near Lower Hacheston.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

In principle I like the idea of transporting more material by sea but I am concerned about the effects on coastal processes of any form of landing stage. Will landing bulk materials on the beach interfere with access to beach walking. Walks from Sizewell to Minsmere are very popular.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I don't see why the passenger timetable would need to be changed. What length of trains are envisaged? At what points is the track dualled?

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

I think the principle of Net Environmental Gain as propounded by Dieter Helm and other should apply. It is for independent environmental experts to determine whether the proposals meet this aim.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

I am concerned about pollution incidents. In my view it is essential that independent experts and interested parties eg RSPB, SWT, Dept of Environment, etc examine the plans and look for potential areas where pollution may happen. They should then agree necessary monitoring equipment and an agreed independent party to monitor and maintain the equipment. Penalties for pollution should be punitive. It should never be worth allowing a pollution incident to happen by EDF or a sub-contractor because they know beforehand that it will be quickly found out and punished (bad publicity and heavy fines)

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I am concerned about the basis for design in relation to climate change. I will send my thoughts about this topic by letter or email.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The number of HGVs must be reduced as far as possible and more use made of the sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

More train journeys will reduce the number of HGVs.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The use of beach landings will reduce the number of HGVs.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See above.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The most cost effective option should be used.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

It has many advantages

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Replacement is welcome

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Not sure of the advantages of each of them

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Good idea

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Except for tree retention these changes seem reasonable

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Not sure of the implications of both of these

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These reductions of land needed are welcome

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As previously mentioned

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

[REDACTED] The congestion and danger caused by lorries entering and leaving the FMF via the A1156 has been grossly underestimated, as anyone who actually passes that T-junction daily will confirm. It is VERY disappointing to see NO mention of the consultation with local astronomical societies concerning light pollution on 01/05/2019 in Leiston.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I don't travel by train much but I think it unfair to change (which I'm sure means reduce) the passenger timetable. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the increase will be preferable to more lorries on the road.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

There will be a visual impact of construction anyway so best to maximise BLF usage if it reduces road freight.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

My answer to this question is based upon the reduction in HGV movements. By virtue of the volumes involved, moving aggregates by sea rather than rail must, I would have thought, have cost advantages and would also be the better option from the environmental viewpoint.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Options a) and b) - both options are appropriate, EdF to establish their preference. Option c) - Since the timetable changes are not specified, there is date, duration and time-of-year indeterminacy in this proposal in relation to the "peak of construction".

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Entirely appropriate. The proposals enhance the flexibility in the use of the BLF to include those items not currently included in the Construction Plan. For example, construction schedule / critical programme path needs may require off-site construction and sea delivery of large component modules to mitigate / reduce hours expended "at-the-work-face", thereby shortening the overall construction schedule - a SZB lesson learned experience.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

My answer is a repeat of Qu. 1. By virtue of the volumes involved, moving aggregates / soils by sea rather than rail (particularly during the early months of the construction schedule) must, I would have thought, have cost advantages and would also be the better option from the environmental viewpoint

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Given the additional BLF is temporary and will be removed at the end of construction, the driver for the final choice of option should be that which EdF best suits their construction strategy. It appears to me that both Options 3 and 4 give EdF the greatest flexibility in the use of the BLF and caters for "unexpected" events and problems during construction. I am sure they would wish to draw on their Hinckley C experience in forming their final option.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

A well thought out change to the original proposal, having much habitat and environmental benefit

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Not qualified to make an informed opinion, albeit EDF's proposal sounds logical

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Needs stakeholder management, particularly with your RSPB neighbour

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

The drainage pipe should be extended across the beach as far as possible, to the mean high watermark, with temporary safety and protection fencing around it to dissuade the "crazies" in this world. Consider a temporary bridge over to allow beach access. Maybe consider enhancing any bridge concept to embrace a project viewing area - SZB experience tells that the project will attract much public curiosity. A good stakeholder management concept, I think.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

c) Tree Retention - supported provided EdF sticks to their proposal All options are "fine tuning" to the original DCO

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1 - makes better use of land usage

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All 3 options appropriate - fine tuning of the DCO

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

none, recently retired, but as I have completed a career in shipping and ports and been , I would appreciate your consideration of my sea transport suggestions.

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

transport mode priority should be 1 sea, 2 rail, 3 road

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

favour option which maximises bulk movement by sea, MY MAIN POINT IS nearly all rail and road transport should be replaced by a pier and small ship mooring arrangement to allow a roll on roll off facility. all traffic would be trucked to local existing port facilities with feeders to the Sizewell facility. this should be able to handle 500 movements per day. possible use of barges with a 100 vehicle capacity. 2 to 3 barges could maintain a 24/7 operation. Unaccompanied operation ... run about 6 hgv tugs at the sizewell site. contract with the port for experienced manpower, management and possibly equipment. This would overcome a huge swath of objections and I suggest would be the cheapest option. weather and ship/barge mooring concerns could be overcome with expert design planning and management.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know

Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

██████████ if you want to talk to me.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

University Lecturer (retired)

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I support a a maximum possible amount of materials to be kept off the roads, as HGVs are already the bane of our environment. However, I am concerned about the impact of transport by rail on our local rail services.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

A fifth train would be a good option provided Network Rail can provide an efficient, reliable service. A timetable would have to be very carefully planned, following passenger consultation.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I do not know that area of the coast well enough to object, as I believe sea transport to be the best option on offer. Local residents' opinions will be paramount. must be

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See above, Q.3

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

As this is a proposed temporary pier, the optimum would seem to be a combination of high capacity with medium length.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Appropriate if temporary.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Inappropriate

Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Don't know

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Context - despite your willingness to increase rail usage - which makes some sort of environmental sense - you are limited by rail network connections to a relatively small number of rail journeys which look as if they are going to be at night, which is going to cause a lot of sleeplessness in Saxmundham and Leiston. Taking traffic off the road is to be encouraged but considering the total amount of materials to be carried, any reduction enabled by increasing rail, still leaves far too much traffic on the road. The Sea solution is theoretically the best idea but your experts have already identified potential problems in building a jetty and piling, for the coastal tidal transport of undersea sediments.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

as suggested previously, the increase in rail traffic is the best environmental solution but restricted by difficulties. Day journeys are much more favourable to night journeys. I fear that timetable changes are the least problem. There is the pinch point at the Saxmundham junction, but only 1 passenger train in each direction an hour. There have been scare stories of long freight trains waiting to join/leave at Sax, and blocking the road / level crossing. Bigger problems await when the freight trains try to join the national network near Ipswich, where there is a lot of traffic, and you will be competing with future increases in rail freight to/from Felixstowe container port

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

You ask me for my views, but by describing your 4 options that you are still consulting on, you don't seem sure yourself. All options involve some sort of piling and/or dredging which may have effects on the hydrological profile of the sea, which are to be worried about. Compared to the scale of destruction of the landward site and nearby flora/fauna, this seems to pale into insignificance

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

water level control is a crucial factor, and it is good that you are now considering some kind of sluice arrangement to control levels and divert excess to the sea. The appearance of the bridge does not concern me, but the water level control does.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Ludicrous. As 'compensation' do you mean (a) this will be somewhere that these creatures/plants can be translocated , or (b) just an equal amount of land somewhere else in Suffolk that we can set up a similar environment, and pay you back for what's lost.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

It amazes me that you consider creating additional wetlands for birds during construction, when the noise and the piling etc will be enough to frighten them off.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Raising height of sea wall is a good idea - will it surround the plant. SZA B C will become islands periodically in the next 50-100yrs. 'no additional net loss of trees' - does that mean whatever is cut down will be replaced?, yet the other area will lose 3 or trees which cannot be replaced.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

1. don't think you own SZA land, so not sure an agreement can be made. Much of SZA has been removed and all that is left is secure / radioactive for the next 50/60 years. 2. Coronation wood should not be cut down / developed until the go ahead for SZC is approved - not until then

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

First, although I agree with bringing more material by Rail I am concerned that the track Ipswich side of Woodbridge is in small sections and that we hear passenger trains travelling over the joints. This really needs to be continuously welded rail to minimise disruption particularly in view of the plan to run trains at night. Normal passenger services on this line should not be changed to accommodate the freight movements, given that the existing timetable is designed to dovetail and thus connect with services on other lines from Ipswich

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I've not seen an appropriate place to add a final comment, so have included it here: Even if movements are increased by rail and sea the A12 still requires upgrading at Glemham and Farnham to cope with the extra demand. The residents deserve a bypass.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The more that can be delivered by sea would, in my view lessen the impact on local roads and railways.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I would prefer to see sites which connect in order to allow wildlife to migrate over as large an area as possible. In other words joined up sites.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name
[REDACTED]

Email
[REDACTED]

Address
[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
Yes No X

If so, which?
[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:
S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Anything that disrupts the already infrequent service on the East Suffolk line will create more traffic in the local area and completely defeat the purpose of the extra train

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

A further beach landing would be disruptive to seal life and hinder long shore drift adversely affecting areas further along the coast

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

It is completely impossible to replace lost SSSI areas. Adding new sites is of course positive but it is a distortion of the truth to suggest it's possible to replace areas with unique biodiversity by creating new habitats

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Any new habitats must not be detrimental to existing areas and new water storage areas will destroy the delicate balance of the existing ecosystem

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

This is just polluting the sea with industrial run off

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

As stated before new trees do not provide 'replacements' for ancient woodland with their unique ecosystem developed over hundreds of years. It's misleading and untruthful to state that opening up new nature reserves will in anyway replace areas that have been completely destroyed.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Any destruction or changes to habitat are inappropriate but clearly not using an area is better than destroying it

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I don't support Sizewell c being built in any circumstance.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Lots of trains thundering through the night for 12 years is a nightmare and not appropriate when this area of Suffolk is absolutely silent at night now.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The results of a coastal consultation haven't been published and therefore it's not possible to know if bringing equipment in by sea is safe, environmentally appropriate.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All inappropriate as the area hasn't been properly surveyed.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

You shouldn't be building any roads or bridges on areas of SSSI areas. Animals and their habitats that have been established over the years would be destroyed and disturbed. Animals don't just move they find the right habitat and you would be destroying years of work by Minsmere.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

As explained before. There is no compensation for destroying habitats. The same animals won't move to these places as they are established where they are for a reason!

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

No. This surface water will affect the fragile beach environment . There are lots of endemic beach plants that would be affected.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Non of the proposals are appropriate. You can't just cut down 100 year old trees and plant others to compensate. These trees are home to also rats of creatures which will lose their homes. Also big cranes etc working on the beach will be an eye sore and spoil the views along the coast.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

██████████ and the proposed bypass although needed would be going through quiet , peaceful countryside again destroying habitats, making it really noisy and busy. Roundabouts on this part of the A12 would cause huge tailbacks .

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The construction materials that are planning to be transported are all in the name of something that is not environmentally sustainable in the first instance, whether or not they are being transported by either rail, road or sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The freights that are planning to be transported are all in the name of something that is not environmentally sustainable in the first instance, whether or not they are being transported on four trains per day, six days a week, or getting a fifth train involved at the peak of construction.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The deliveries that are planning to land on the beach are all in the name of something that is not environmentally sustainable in the first instance. We've got to look at the long term here, rather than the immediate situation of making sure the deliveries are safe or not, the point is that they're not safe, whether or not you extend the capacity of BLF by around 30m or 0m.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The bulk materials that are planning to be brought to the beach are all in the name of an environmentally detrimental endeavour.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

One major threat posed by this build is human demand on nature and environment, specifically loss and degradation of wildlife habitats for key species, eg marsh harriers and bitterns, through water abstraction and destruction of ancient water meadows at Sizewell Belts.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The natural habitats need not be replacement in the first place, as they are home to many creatures who have every right to remain there.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Of course you should move as much material by rail and sea as possible. It is crass stupidity to think that Suffolk roads are capable of taking that amount of extra traffic. You have not done any surveying in a normal year during the week or on a Saturday when the A12 is habitually clogged. Any incident brings the whole network AND the surrounding villages to a complete standstill.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

While I don't live very close to the railway line and would not be affected by noise, it makes sense to use the railway. Many people in London and other places live beside the line and become used to the rumbling at night time. Some improvements should be made to the line and the two tracks could be reinstated to make the traffic run as smoothly as possible. There is no mention of the "temporary" extension to the line to allow delivery to be made at the Sizewell end of the line. Why is this facility not being retained for future use when refuelling the power station? Will this be done by sea?

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The existing BLF is not very intrusive. I understand that the superstructure would be removed when the BLF is no longer needed. Marine life is quick to colonise submerged structures, so this would potentially add to the habitat

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The argument for this was rather inconclusive. Presumably loose materials will be unloaded via a pipe. Why can this not be installed adjacent to the existing BLF, using the same structure? There is no mention of the effect that any new BLF would have on the existing ground-nesting birds all along the top of the beach. They cannot tolerate further disturbance.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I do not have the technical knowledge to comment on these matters

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I do not have extensive knowledge of this area, but any mitigation of damage to the SSSI has to be of benefit

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

You would have to create the new habitat well in advance of any work involving the existing area. It would require an intensive period of management to remove all the fauna and endangered or necessary flora to the new site before any disruption of the existing site occurs. Any new habitat should be adjacent to the existing area, or it will be of no use whatsoever to the existing fauna being displaced.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I don't fully understand the question. Wetland is a very valuable habitat, whether it includes wooded area or not. The existing area should be retained; if more is created, then that is to be applauded.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

If this is a temporary measure, it is probably acceptable, but care must be taken that only very clean water is discharged directly into the sea. What is the likelihood of contamination occurring?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Are the trees of significant value? Are they/should they be protected? The marsh harrier habitat should not be reduced unless new habitat is created BEFORE work begins. Should the bridleway be enlarged so as to be suitable for local traffic?

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

As much use as possible should be made of existing brown field land within Sizewell A

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I cannot comment on a) or b), apart from the fact that any alteration must improve the safety at these junctions. You are being short-sighted in only building a two-village bypass. A four village bypass has been needed for the last 20 years, so your proposal will only increase areas of congestion on the A12 and may prove a hindrance when the proper bypass is eventually constructed. Increasing the landscaping at the Southern Park and Ride is an improvement and reinstating the existing footpath is only proper. There is still no mention of how construction workers coming from the West are going to approach this site. The B1078 is already very congested at times as it is used by local lorries and cars. Extra traffic will have a disastrous effect on Coddenham, Charfield and Wickham Market. There is no mention of improving the layout of the road junctions near this site. Minibuses returning from Sizewell have very poor visibility turning right off the slip road. Many people do not realise that the road from the roundabout to the A12 (northbound) is currently 2-way, so MUCH IMPROVED signage will be necessary to protect traffic exiting the Park and Ride site to return to the roundabout. The amenity building at the Park and Ride should contain a kiosk offering coffee and papers to prevent all this traffic detouring through Wickham Market. The management of this kiosk should be offered to local businesses.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous page 1 of 1 Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This will impact the beach for a long duration and restrict public access

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Will impact on the safety of the beach

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Higher percentage of non-road movements in latest proposals. Moves at night where possible.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

If timetables allow, the more off road movements, the better.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As above: maximise off road deliveries.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I don't know which would be most efficient or cost effective but all these would reduce road movements and be short term (relative to overall construction life).

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

An improvement on initial plans. I am very keen on local birds/wildlife but we can't be held to ransom by RSPB and others in the event that a few birds, newts, bats, etc have to move up the coast. They will return. I expect a severe winter storm could easily damage the habitat.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

As above Q6.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

There must be some disruption and changes in a national project of this scale. Mitigation measures look excellent and proportional. I can't believe you have had to go into minutiae such as counting trees.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Alterations are primarily within Sizewell estate with little effect elsewhere.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

See earlier comments.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

It is more sustainable to move freight by train, if well organised and it will keep HGV's off the roads

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Bringing in large components by sea will greatly reduce road disruption

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As Q4

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Makes sense to me!

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

As question 6

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Seems sensible, but outside my area of knowledge

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

As Q 8

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I know the A12 very well. The less it can be used, the better.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I do not agree with the project, so cannot answer the above questions.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This would be preferable to using road transport

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

If this WERE temporary, then it would preferable to road transport.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I can't answer these questions accurately as I have less knowledge of the quantities of materials to be delivered to Sizewell than EDF.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

This project will spoil the Suffolk countryside and hence, tourism, for decades to come

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

It's impossible to recreate an SSSI , just at the "drop of a hat". These sites take years to mature and attract rare wildlife.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The problem of flooding at Sizewell could be far, far worse than a water storage area you are suggesting.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Releasing excess water onto the beach after heavy rainfall would be totally unsuitable. What will be in the construction surface water. If there is anything chemical or unacceptable, then discharging it into the sea would be horrendous.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

My view is that this entire project is totally unsuitable for the Suffolk coast. We have already experienced the building of Sizewell B and the decommissioning of Sizewell A . In short, we have seen enough of nuclear facilities spoiling the unique Suffolk Coast.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

These plans will leave the area without its original charm and natural beauty.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I assume that the southern park and ride is the one near Hacheston. The building of a park and ride at this location would permanently ruin the rural nature of this area. It's highly unlikely that the land would return to its former state when the building is finished. It would become a brown-field site. Housing would more likely be built there. The Sizewell C project would be expensive, ruin the area, be a risk of flooding (remember the 1953 floods), also transform the rural Suffolk coast into a semi-suburb. Additionally, numbers of jobs at Sizewell C have been exaggerated: there may well be a need for construction workers, electricians, plumbers etc in the building stage, but once it is completed, the jobs will be few. One final point : I hear from a relative that the construction at Hinkley Point is a massive blot on the landscape. We don't want that in Suffolk, but , being cynical, I know that the population will not be listened to. Minds have already been made up in the offices of EDF.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

With a temporary dock/jetty most heavy plant could travel by sea. Less pollution in towns & villages.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

More material by rail as well as sea access would reduce pollution even further.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

More suitable access from the sea will give greater amounts of materials by sea.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Less aggregate, etc by road.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

270m BLF gives less impact than other options with good volume of capacity.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Anything to provide less impact on SSSI is appreciated.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Other locations additional to the above should be added, especially adjacent the coast.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I support a transition to wet woodland.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Great idea.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Tree retention. EDF should provide scheme in Sizewell and surrounding villages to plant quality trees free of charge.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1. I consider this option more environmentally friendly.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

A & C appropriate actions by EDF.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not support the disruption to the environment and RSPB site of important wildlife.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

RSPB site minsmere; disruption to birds and wildlife.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Disruption to wildlife

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Disruption to wildlife

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All highly disruption to wildlife.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

If not disruptive to actually birds and nesting sites.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Just no

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wetland retained for established wildlife and marsh harriers.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Inappropriate

Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate X

Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Inappropriate

Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know X

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am extremely concerned at the proposed volume of rail transport on the existing East Suffolk line during construction which will cause intolerable noise and sleep deprivation to those who live close to the line due to the number, weight, length and speed of the trains which will take a long time to pass on noisy rails which Network Rail are unable to upgrade in the timescale. I am particularly concerned as I live in an area where there is no screening between the railway line and my road - no houses or landscape features to act as a buffer to reduce the noise of these massive weighty clunky trains with at least three noisy crossings within earshot.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As explained above - the number of night time trains is unacceptable to me. What mitigation will you provide in terms of sound buffers, installing triple glazing or further noise insulation in houses affected? I imagine the number of houses directly affected is relatively small in your estimation but the noise will have an extremely detrimental effect on the quality of life of residents in these houses. I would prefer additional day time trains if necessary rather than so many night time movements.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

enhancing the capacity to deliver material by sea seems by far the best solution with far less impact on people so I support any efforts to make this possible to the highest degree

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I object to the development but if it goes ahead all construction material should be brought in by rail and by sea and NONE by HGVs. The neighbouring roads and villages cannot support/tolerate HGVs bringing in materials and returning.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As much material should be brought in by train and the remainder by sea.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

All temporary works are completely removed after construction, if it goes ahead, and the area fully restored.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As long as it is totally removed after construction, if it goes ahead, and the area is restored to what it was before.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 4 only appropriate if it results, in association with increased rail freight, in the total avoidance of any road freight, or the speed of construction is slowed to allow this to happen.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There should be no construction on the SSSI.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

If it is challenging to recreate fen habitat then it shouldn't be destroyed in the first place or at least construction work should not be started until the fen recreation has been successfully established.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wet woodland creation would be a useful addition as this habitat is uncommon.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

This seems like a very crude remedy; what effects on the beach, and any associated flora, would release of this water have?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

It would be good if some of Sizewell A land could actually be utilised. It would be even better to see Sizewell A demolished as it is an eyesore and given it is a redundant site.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know X

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The last thing the A12 needs is a roundabout. Never like the use of the word landscaping as it usually means grassing it over and planting a few trees (which die in a few years) or sowing ox-eye daisies.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Re c, please see my response to Question 2.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Whilst I have indicated that the options a, b and c are inappropriate, they are only inappropriate so far as they relate to regular night movements after 11pm and before 6am. I live approximately 3 miles from Saxmundham railway station and the line directly abuts the length of my garden ground and at the closest point is approximately 120 feet plus from my living room. Existing user at night has been only occasional and usually is a short train with two engines and a flask on a wheeled flatbed wagon. I understand that the anticipated night usage will involve very lengthy trains with many wagons weighing hundreds of tons. The recent testing has involved longer trains. These trains result in disturbed sleep. I believe that the rail line has been altered in recent years to continuous welded track but the track does not sufficiently reduce the noise or the vibration to permit undisturbed sleep. The vibration can be felt all over the house. The railway line is set in a cutting at this point to facilitate the road going over the A1094. Perhaps the vibration is exaggerated by the banking. My concern at this point has been the right to quiet and peaceful enjoyment of my property. In addition, I am concerned of the potential risk of damage to the property from the vibration which would arise from these proposals of additional and extensive use, not previously experienced on this line. I have lived in this property for almost 20 years and have had no reason to complain about the previous and current use by passenger trains and the occasional goods train, or indeed, existing Sizewell use. The anticipated night use is so substantial that it would be a factor that would have to be disclosed to a prospective purchaser as it may affect the normal right to enjoy the property ie, I believe that night use will potentially create a nuisance of noise and vibration. As a lay person, legal niceties can appear obtuse and complicated but although I moved adjacent to a railway line, this was not an anticipated use. If I move next to a cricket ground I would not expect it to operate at night with floodlights and an automatic ball server! If there is a statutory entitlement for the anticipated night user, I look to you as the schemes proposer to provide me with the details of the relevant authority. In any event, I would have no alternative but to hold you responsible and look to you for compensation and any necessary legal costs, and, to stop the nuisance if the vibrations cause any damage to my property or buildings there on what so ever. I hope that these recent proposals reflect an honest and open intention to explore all options for the movement of materials on both road and rail and that you are not using the recent objections to traffic movement as a justification for night rail traffic, pursuing an intention already held and expeditiously introduced at this time. Following the above observation, I have to trust that there has been full background disclosure and if this is Government guidance policy that the railway is to be used for night time deliveries, I am very concerned that my objections will be simply over ruled. Please let me have your assurance that there has been full and open disclosure in this respect.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality

and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

all should be moved by rail/sea to protect local communities and environment, wildlife. Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife habitat

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

nightly trains maybe too noisy for local residents. Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife habitat

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife habitat

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. Shouldn't be using any SSSI land. Might be planting trees, what about all those lost? bet more will be lost than planted. Who will look after new trees?

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. Shouldn't be using any SSSI land.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats

during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. 'Opportunities' and 'potential' gives a get out - nothing definite

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. Shouldn't be using any SSSI land. Should never cut mature trees unless diseased, might be creation of habitats, what about the losses?

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. Shouldn't be using any SSSI land.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C shouldn't be built due to damage to wildlife and habitat loss. Shouldn't be using any SSSI land.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

We are a freight and material handler which specialise in the movement of materials. Moving materials in bulk by Rail and Sea brings many environmental benefits and we would welcome the opportunity to work with you to build a robust logistics plan.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Rail supply significantly reduces the need for lorry movements which is positive for the environment, road congestion and public safety

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Taking these deliveries off the road is a benefit to the environment and the public

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

We have a specialist business that does this on a daily basis along the thames and are keen to be involved in Sizewell also

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

This will take significant movements off the local road network

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Suffolk Chamber is pleased to see that increased rail and sea movements could be used to transfer materials to the site, therefore reducing the number of HGV's in the local area. This is something we have been supportive of all along.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Running increased train movements is advisable and would reduce traffic on the main roads through HGVs. We are supportive of an additional fifth train and running trains potentially through the night but this needs to be mitigated for local residents.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Agree that this would be a good idea to enhance safety, and increase the number of deliveries, especially in the winter period.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Unsure due to the environmental impacts

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

In principal we are happy for additional materials to be moved by sea, but aware that a new temporary landing could have detrimental impacts on the environment. As a result we would support the small piers which could still receive deliveries but unsure of the larger ones, although we see the benefit with the tide. If a pier is to progress we would support option 2 or 3.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Additional flood relief, and less SSI land is welcome.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Appropriate - if supported by local residents in Pakenham

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

We are supportive of any changes which would create additional wetlands habitats and long term habitats after construction.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Happy with as long as it stays temporary

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Due to the loss of trees on site we would rather not see the loss of additional trees, we are supportive of the bridleway which could provide long-term benefits. We fully support the sea defence and have no view on boundary changes

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

We support option 1 due to reduce noise and environmental benefits but do not feel strongly about either option.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

During Sizewell B construction using the heavy material by sea where possible worked extremely well, using rail will also enhance heavy material movement such as construction loose materials. Also the strategy of dredging shingle for concrete production as in Sizewell B construction will massively reduce heavy lorry transport locally.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The use of the proposed train schedule will not make a great deal of difference to the general use and timetable of the East Coast line, the extra trains far out way the disadvantage of the temporary passing noise to the hauling of materials by road

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Worked wonderfully for Sizewell B construction.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Good proposal adding more flood relief

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

No brainer

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Good idea for the future wetland habitat

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Seems satisfactory proposals for the long term use of the area once the station becomes operational and having seen many operational nuclear stations around the world the surrounding areas always mainly turn back to nature and undisturbed by the station operations.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Good idea

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I do not think in the long term these proposals will affect the area once construction is finished and will be advantage for site workers during construction. One of the most important advantage of Sizewell C is long term employment of local people and the increase in the local support businesses.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The Parish Council has no objection to the increase in the number of trains, so long as these do not take place at night and there is mitigation against any increase in noise. As the consultation says 'trains would mostly run at night' this means the increase is inappropriate.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Increase in train movements: the line runs very close indeed to private houses in the village.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

This all pre supposes that I support the building of SizewellC which I do not. No Sizewell C means no need to move materials

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The biggest facility has to be the best to reduce impact on the environment

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The habitat, fauna and flora being destroyed is not in West Suffolk. This is a SSSI and should not be disturbed in anyway

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

wetland habitat maintained

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The A12 is no longer a continuous dual carriageway north of the Wickham Market/Campsea Ashe junction. It winds through villages, passing close to residential homes and already accommodates a large number of HGV's. Further south, there are already traffic queues at Copdock, Martlesham and Woodbridge. I welcome the two village bypass but believe that sending more freight by rail and sea will inevitably ease the traffic congestion not only on the A14 and A12, but on all the minor roads that feed into these highways.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This is a good idea as long as noise and disturbance is reduced to a minimum. Perhaps the single track length of line from Melton to Saxmunden could become a double line so that trains can move in both directions at the same time.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The more freight that can be transported by sea, the less there will be on our roads.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am keen to expand the capacity to receive deliveries by sea, but also aware of the visual impact on the environment, the noise and the underwater disturbance. Therefore, I've opted for number 3.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

We need to look after our SSSI's and the wildlife that inhabits them so I support the increase in replacement habitat.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I support a transition to permanent wet woodland in the future.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

As long as the wetlands are preserved this seems to be a good idea.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Tree retention. Generally, I am against losing any trees, particularly ancient native trees. I support the proposal to plant 2,500 trees, which fits in with EDF's desire to reduce carbon emissions.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The southern park and ride is [REDACTED] I support additional screening to lessen the visual and noise impact.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am opposed to the building of Sizewell C and cannot see any benefits from this project. Nuclear Waste!

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to building Sizewell C, and hope the construction will not be agreed by our Government.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to the building of Sizewell C in an AONB, close to Minsmere Reserve.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to the building of Sizewell C, the sea-life and beach will be devastated by the project.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I cannot provide comments on the above as do not agree with any 'potential design'. The government is unlikely to agree to this project.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

None of above. The project would take 15 year to build and the destruction along the way could not be justified.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This would not be adequate compensation.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

This construction will not go ahead, and comments like 'this offers opportunities to create' and 'the potential' are meaningless.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Huge concern over water/flooding.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I do not feel any of the above would compensate for building a nuclear power station on this precious part of Suffolk.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Totally opposed to the destruction of Coronation Wood, particularly prior to DCO process/

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The surrounding road networks are totally inadequate to deal with a huge increase in additional traffic

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

1. We welcome the re-consideration of the use of rail and sea transport. 2. We note the assertion that under the new proposals, the proportion of materials that will need to be transported by HGV is estimated as 40% – down from 60%. However, we note that this is qualified as “may be possible” and that it is also influenced by a re-evaluation of the total quantities of materials to be used or re-used. It is hoped further reductions can be made through effective use of alternative rail and sea transportation of materials. 3. We note and welcome the reduction in estimated HGV movements: Peak times Stage 3 1000 Current 700 Typical Day Stage 3 650 Current 500 4. We are disappointed that a similar re-consideration has not been made

of the need for the Facilities Management Facility at Levington, especially in the light of the reduction in estimated HGV movements. We would expect that the need for 150 parking places would be reduced proportionately to 115 with a similar reduction in land requirement. 5. We still maintain that in this modern digital world of mobile communications, the objectives of the FMF could be achieved by an electronic booking/management system, AS WAS PROPOSED BY EDF AT STAGE 2 [this has been included in the Parish Council submission to PINS "It is regrettable that SCDC did not support a web-based Delivery Management System [Volume 9 – 6.9 – Chapter 3 – 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 refers]". This should now be reviewed. 6. With a reduction in the number of HGV movements and the reduced need for HGV parking places [see 4 above], coupled with the use of modern freight management systems, this totally challenges the need for a separate Freight Management Facility. Sizewell C Project – Traffic Incident Management Plan [8.6] and Planning Statement Appendix 8.4c on the Southern Park and Ride Site clearly shows a Traffic Incident Management Area which sized to accommodate 90 HGVs. Although this is linked to either planned or unplanned incidents, it is a large available space which would be empty most of the time and greatly underutilised. By modern and efficient freight management coupled with reduced HGV movements [see above] would provide the Freight Management Facility. The use of just one site would be more environmentally friendly, avoid huge capital costs at the beginning and end of the project, and the revenue costs throughout the construction period.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

In respect of "Increase in the frequency of freight train movements to facilitate bulk material imports by rail" the response from RPC is:- "As most of these lorries will come via A 14/A12 and pass Martlesham Woodbridge (and impact traffic on A12 used by Rendlesham commuters/Schools etc and also the tourist traffic which already chokes at Martlesham and South of Woodbridge), RPC support the additional days rail use (proposed in para 3.2.6) and support the further development and investigation to continue the 'expansion of capacity' of this means of access to the development"

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

In respect of "Enhanced permanent beach landing facility RPC see no benefit to the enhancement of the permanent Beach landing facility as we cannot understand the additional AIL's identified now that were not previously identified in EdF Planning for then original DCO.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

In respect of options for "a new, temporary facility to import material by sea" RPC see the enhanced high capacity temporary Beach Landing facility as a significant positive development and a welcome revisit to strategy from EdF. The reduction of 1.4m Tonnes (or 75000 wagon loads) per year from roads such as A12 past Woodbridge affords a dramatic reduction in the consequences of SZC construction on our residents and we fully support the construction of such a temporary facility and the optimising of the sea as a delivery route to the development. RPC also note that we expressed our view that "Seaborne landing" was unacceptably rejected by EdF at previous stages in the Consultation process (see our comments on stage 4 consultation).

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The biggest concern for Rendlesham in respect of this consultation is the HGV traffic and how it impacts the lives of our residents (in the main indirectly at the A12 and the wider arterial roads used by our residents as part of their lives. RPC therefore see "more deliveries by sea as 'better' and logically "much more by sea is 'much better'". So whilst any increase in seaborne delivery us seen as positive we support the proposals in the priority of the amount actually delivered to the Construction site by sea

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

This proposed change has no impact on Rendlesham either directly or indirectly therefore RPC have "No Comment" in respect of this proposal.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

This proposed change has no impact on Rendlesham either directly or indirectly therefore RPC have "No Comment" in respect of this proposal.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

This proposed change has no impact on Rendlesham either directly or indirectly therefore RPC have "No Comment" in respect of this proposal.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

This proposed change has no impact on Rendlesham either directly or indirectly therefore RPC have "No Comment" in respect of this proposal.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

As with other site specific elements these proposals (the short term Construction details and the long term sea defence increases) have no direct effect on Rendlesham and therefore RPC note the proposal but have no specific comment or opinion. In respect of (b) Change to certain parameter heights and activities on the main development site to facilitate the construction process:- RPC note and accept these changes as a consequence of our strong support for the enhanced beach landing facility and increased delivery by sea noted above.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The principle of not using Pill Box field and reserving that for new trees to replace Coronation wood is environmentally sound & therefore the intent to seek land agreement with Sizewell A is overall environmentally positive. ... As the proposal has no direct or indirect effect on Rendlesham RPC have no specific comments to make but note that this is a wider "planning" aspect and includes interaction between East Suffolk (as the Local Planning Authority) the DCO process.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These Changes relate to minor "Changes to Order limits" etc which are proposed have no significance to Rendlesham and RPC therefore have no substantive comment to make on those matters

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Think it's better environmentally all around, as the land area is sensitive, near as it is to Suffolk Wildlife Trust managed areas and RSPB Minsmere, also to residents.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Again, more disruption to residents and maybe timetables is not acceptable.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Permanency in this area could be bad. More affects on marine life, birds and environmental potential deems it unsuitable.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

It can be removed and the area restored naturally after works completed.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

It's a question of "lesser of the 4 evils". The less per year deliveries prolongs the constructed site's life, hence prolonging environmental visual and practical damage.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I'm against ANY damage potential here, however you dress it up.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I'm against ANY damage potential here, however you dress it up.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Don't believe any positives come out of those proposals.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Sounds awful.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) The sea defence proposal doesn't make sense nor explains it's visual impact. c) Trees take many decades to establish, making promises to dig up mature trees and re plant new never comes to a good fruition. d) Boundary changes as mentioned, are rarely 'reduced' for the good. Using semantics such "improvement area" and "compensation sites" , is not reassuring.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sounds like you are just increasing your whole large footprint of 3 Sites -Sizewell A,B,C- into one large permanent blot on the landscape.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

b) Vague in respect to actual effects it will have beneficial or otherwise.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Whilst there are concerns relating to the impact on environment and sustainability moving forward with this proposed change to moving construction material for Sizewell C the impact on the overall health system will reduce and therefore the Health System is broadly supportive of the proposed change.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

In order to reduce construction traffic off the road, this proposal is supported in principle. The change in passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line cannot be commented on at this time without sufficient detail of the impact

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Whilst there are concerns relating to the impact on environment and sustainability moving forward with this proposed change to moving construction material for Sizewell C the impact on the overall health system will reduce and therefore the Health System is broadly supportive of the proposed change.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Whilst there are concerns relating to the impact on environment and sustainability moving forward with this proposed change to moving construction material for Sizewell C the impact on the overall health system will reduce and therefore the Health System is broadly supportive of the proposed change.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All options are broadly supported and welcomed. Further impact on environment and sustainability currently unknown

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Broadly supported

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Broadly supported

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Broadly supported

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Broadly supported

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All of the above elements of the proposal are broadly supported, whilst there are concerns relating to the impact on environment and sustainability moving forward with this proposed change to moving construction material for Sizewell C the impact on the overall health system will reduce and therefore the Health System is broadly supportive of the proposed change.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Broadly Support

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Broadly support

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

N/A

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Protecting the environment.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

a) and b) providing this will speed development. c) too disruptive for rail users.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

How would this affect marine life? Would it affect coastal erosion, and, if so, how?

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

How would this affect marine life? Would it affect coastal erosion, and, if so, how?

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

How would this affect marine life? Would it affect coastal erosion, and, if so, how?

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

It should be possible to take more and better steps to retain and protect more SSSI land.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

But, more of the existing fen meadow habitat should be retained.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

A decision on whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported should be made in consultation with experts in the field. EG RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

OK as long as it does not adversely affect wildlife.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

How would these affect marine life? Would it affect coastal erosion, and, if so, how? For c), the option that results in least trees removed should be used.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

[REDACTED] East Suffolk Rail Line and the proposed change to the DCO Application, increases the number of rail freight movements, particularly those occurring overnight. Whilst the DCO proposals do not involve trains travelling through Leiston at night, the Nuclear Development Director and her associates have deliberately increased movements by rail freight where the East Suffolk Rail Line [REDACTED] This will have a profound affect by way of an increase in overnight noise pollution from the proposed changes coupled with greater periods where vibration to the house and land (ground borne) will occur throughout the night caused by heavy load movements using the rail freight system of bulk weight materials with huge train/locomotives on route to the Sizewell C construction site.

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats

during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Increase in transportation of heavy bulk freight on the East Suffolk Rail Line.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

East Suffolk Rail Line and the proposed change to the DCO Application, increases the number of rail freight movements, particularly those occurring overnight. Whilst the DCO proposals do not involve trains travelling through Leiston at night, the Nuclear Development Director and her associates have deliberately increased movements by rail freight where the East Suffolk Rail Line This will have a profound affect by way of an increase in overnight noise pollution from the proposed changes coupled with greater periods where vibration to the house and land (ground borne) will occur throughout the night caused by heavy load movements using the rail freight system of bulk weight materials with huge train/locomotives on route to the Sizewell C construction site.

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats

during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C consultation – Pakenham Parish Council's comments in relation to the possible purchase of land re Fen Meadows within Pakenham. If EDF Power Station at Sizewell C does go ahead and the land at Pakenham is obtained the Parish Council would like these questions answered to inform the residents of Pakenham: I. What is the proposed timescale for this (start to finish)? II. Who will ultimately own the land and will this organisation be legally separate from EDF and a charity? III. Will a member of Pakenham Parish Council be invited to sit on the board of Charity as a representative of the village? IV. Will this land be open to access by the general public in perpetuity? V. Currently footpath no.3 runs through this area, will this footpath be retained and raised on duck boards. VI. Will there be further footpaths created across the new Fenland, if so, where would the access be and will these footpaths be raised on duckboards. VII. Will there be an opportunity for Pakenham Parish Council to agree the location of new footpaths? VIII. Does this Plan have the approval of Natural England who are Guardians of the existing SSSI meadow? IX. Will any changes to the Land Hydrology on the other side of the Mill Stream have any adverse effect on the existing SSSI meadow? X. It appears that the boundary of the new Fenland follows the route of Pakenham stream, how will this impact on the flow of the stream and in turn the listed Pakenham Water Mill. XI. How will the organisation managing the new Fenland maintain the stream? XII. Pakenham Parish Council are concerned about the about the affect on the stream, has this been modelled and studied in depth to avoid any problems in the future with the operation of the Water Mill. XIII. Will this

proposal have an impact beyond the immediate area and have an effect on the wider area including water levels. How will this be monitored and controlled, will there be any effect on homes and gardens. XIV. Pakenham Parish Council would like to be included as an interested party on future discussions for this site.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am unable to respond to this question until you provide full details as to the amount of material involved and how each alternative will be used (frequency and number of trips etc). None of the suggest freight management options appear, however, to over come the unacceptability of the proposed development or the disruption and damage it will cause.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am unable to respond to your questions until the full details of what is involved are available. For example what are the impacts on the passenger services, what mitigation's are you proposing to adjoining buildings etc.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Again it is impossible to answer your questions until full details of what you are proposing and their impact on the surrounding area (both the immediate coast and wider sea environment etc) are known.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above this question can not be answered until the impacts of the proposals are known and fully explained

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again until the full impact of each proposal is known it is not possible to answer this question.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Any barrier to the SSSI is in my view unacceptable. It will have severely adverse impacts on the control and balance of flood waters and migration of the rare species on the marshes. An alternative method must be found

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Creation of a new site does not fully mitigate the loss on an ancient one. Any areas lost can not be satisfactorily replaced. In addition creation of another site at a random location remote from the site doe not help maintain or enhance the current environment, fauna and flora.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I can not answer this question until the full impact of any changes are known and quantified.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Again this question can not be answered until the full impact of the changes have been identified.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

None of these alternatives can be considered until the full impact of the changes has been assessed and confirmed.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again you have provided insufficient information to enable any of the above alternatives to be considered.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Once again the lack of information and certainty as to the deliverability or outcome of any of your proposals makes it impossible to answer any of these questions.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The road network in Suffolk is still very rural compared to other regions in the UK. The A12 simply does not have the capacity to accommodate large numbers of HGVs both in size and without damage to the infrastructure. In addition the main roads pass through a number of villages which would be materially adversely affected by such traffic for a number of years.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Anything which reduces the volume of construction traffic by road has to be welcomed. Any disruption to the train timetable under option C should be made outside of the "commuter trains" though.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Large and oversized loads would cause mayhem on the roads especially through villages. Transport via sea would not inconvenience anyone and would be safer for residents and road users alike

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The road network is not constructed to handle high volume of heavy lorries. Movement by sea would be safer and more environmentally focused.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 3 appears to provide a high level of capacity. Option 4 does not increase the capacity to a huge extent for the additional length and complexity of the pier. Options 1&2 do not in my opinion provide enough capacity

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Flooding is a local issue and any measures which can be incorporated to reduce this risk and provide protection to the SSI is to be welcomed

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Fen Meadows are an important habitat and every effort should be made to protect them

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The area is important for migrating bird life as can be seen from Minsmere. The creation of further habitat for wildlife can only be seen as a positive development

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Excess water needs to be drained away, although unsightly if this is the only option, than yes.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

c) Tree retention - every effort should be made to retain all trees as removal will materially effect the landscape and take years to recover

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

If there is land available at the brownfield site of Sizewell A this should be utilised before any green field is considered

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

A) any reduction on the amount of land to be used is to be welcomed C) screening of works is also to be welcomed

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not think that the project should go ahead in any circumstances

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The rail network serving this area is barely adequate at the moment and cannot support more traffic.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Any changes to the seabed in this area needs extensive research as to the long term environmental impact in such a sensitive area. There is potential impact on adjacent foreshores and the changes further out which are dynamic and can affect the viability of Minsmere, a site of international significance.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

My views for this are the same as the previous answer: any changes to the coastline in this area are potentially disastrous.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

None of the proposals is appropriate since the project has not sufficiently researched the long term impact of this structure on the seabed and the surrounding coastline.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

A Site of Special Scientific Interest should not be interfered with in any way so crossing in any format is greatly to its detriment.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The existing fen meadow is unique and should not be sacrificed.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats

during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The area should be left as it is and not interfered with in any way.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

The area should be left as it is .

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I do not agree with any of these changes as I consider that the construction of a project on this scale is entirely inappropriate for the area and far cheaper alternatives for power are now available.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I consider the whole project inappropriate so these changes are irrelevant.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

None of these changes are of any significance compared with the impact a project of this scale will have on this area including an internationally important nature reserve and a nationally important Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I support both these options - seems you are going back to the original proposals.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Ease of road congestion

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Ease of road congestion

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Ease of road congestion

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 4 - makes the best of the available space

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Better for environment

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Better for environment and wildlife

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Environmentally friendly

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Mitigates flooding risk

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All these changes will support the ecological measures being taken

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Utilising existing facilities and improving landscape

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Better landscaping

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

Retired Resident of Orford

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

There is a need to reduce road traffic on both amenity and environmental grounds, ie inconvenience and pollution.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

The more on train the better. On c I would need to know the extent of the disruption

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This provides least disruption on land.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

This provides least disruption on land

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The more the deliveries by sea the better. However the 400m length would seem excessive depending on the disturbance to the seabed and the length of time in place.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I would prefer the woodland option. Apart from habitat considerations woodland will be a carbon sink.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Care must be taken that the discharge does not affect erosion.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I do not believe enough study of the effect on Coastal erosion and shoreline management has been carried out. My answers to the consultation depend on their being no change but this is far from certain, particularly in the long term. Thorpeness and Orford Ness, and its estuary are dynamic areas and shoreline loss is already being experienced, witness the loss of the Lighthouse. At Orford the changes could affect the whole estuary and in the longer term its economy. Therefore further study of the coast to the south of the site is essential.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

See comments on page 6

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The impact of the proposed changes on the beach and coastline are insufficiently defined. The impact of structures on erosion of the coastline south of Sizewell has not been considered, but is essential. There is insufficient detail for a decision to be recommended or made.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This will be a major intrusion on the coastal landscape of the Heritage Coast and is entirely inappropriate and unacceptable. The impact on erosion south of Sizewell has not been analysed but could have considerable relevance to Aldeburgh and the defences at the Martello Tower in Aldeburgh to prevent a breach between the River Alde and the North Sea.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

This will impact on the use of the beach and coast by the public and is unacceptable both from a utility and visual impact consideration.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Insufficient design detail is provided to be able to assess the impact on coastal erosion and movement through longshore drift.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Minimising damage to the SSSI.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This is remote to the area and does not replace the lost habitat. EDF should invest to ensure that the replacement fenland meadow locally is sufficiently well resourced, managed and maintained that it is recreated. Financial penalties should be imposed if EDF fail to do this.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats

during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Placement of this on the beach is not clear, nor is the impact on beach profile and sediment movement or on beach users. Once again proposals are vague, lack sufficient detail for robust consultation and appear to be designed to placate rather than allow rational and informed debate.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Increasing height of permanent defences will have a significant and detrimental visual impact. Design of the hard defences is unclear and their impact on coastal erosion to the south not mentioned. This makes the proposals either naive or disingenuous. A statutory guarantee by EDF to remediate the impact on coastal erosion to the south must be imposed, and a full evaluation carried out as part of the assessment.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

There is excessive development in the area. Workers should be bussed in and not housed in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is an utterly unacceptable part of the proposals.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The degree of development of the entire area is unacceptable. Public transport should be used and park and rides should not be built. They encourage private vehicle use and are completely inconsistent with the alleged carbon reduction motivation for building Sizewell C.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

I am responding as an individual. I am responding as I am concerned about the impact of the new Sizewell C development on the RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve and the surrounding area.

Job title

Retired. [REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 1: Freight management Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options. My Comments: Question 1: Freight Management: I would say the consultation period should have been longer; especially for those coming new to responding to this consultation. There is a great deal of

documentation to be read, not only that produced by EDF: [1] The Sizewell C Project Consultation Document Consultation on Proposed Changes: November - December 2020. [176 pages] and [2] The Sizewell C Project 6.10 Revision: 1.0 Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a) PINS Reference Number: EN010012 Volume 9 Rail Chapter 2 Description of Rail. But also reports produced by or for Suffolk County Council: 'Sizewell C DCO application, Rail Proposals Preliminary technical review Suffolk County Council V0-5 Final Project number: 60445024 17 September 2020 <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/major-infrastructure-projects/AECOM-Limited-Report-to-Sizewell-C-DCO-Rail-Response-v0-5-Final.pdf> also: <https://tasizewellc.org.uk/edf-test-train-noise-levels-between-saxmundham-leiston-watch-the-video-its-noisy-05-08-20/> Also: <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Sizewell/141211-Sizewell-Study-REVH-final.pdf> and several other documents. Even from EDF's information it is clear that the impact of 'new' and 'upgraded' road, rail and sea projects to enable the right amount of transport infrastructure is massive. You are obviously hoping that the new proposals will solve some of the problems but the amount of impact on the environment is [whatever you do] going to negatively impact on the existing wildlife and habitats quite extensively; and it is likely to disrupt the natural habitats that we need for carbon collection [hedgerows, grasslands, reed beds and the like] and for wildlife. The fact that the proposed site for Sizewell C is much nearer to and right on the borders of RSPB Minsmere it is likely [unless carefully planned] to disrupt the good work that the RSPB has done with reintroducing species. The new infrastructure will have to be costed in to the value of the project both in money and the impact on the environment. The process as laid out is far from straightforward. As it seems that before trains can run the service you propose new and updating of track will have to be put in place. a huge amount of new infrastructure would need to be put in place. It is good however that you are trying to look for better ways forward a) Support the DCO application approach. No My Response: I cannot support the DCO: Development Consent Order, I don't think the consultation period has been long enough, particularly bearing in mind Covid restrictions. The new proposals seem to produce as many questions as answer. I do feel you need to have greater dialogue with the local councils, Suffolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB Minsmere. And the local farmers. b) Support moving more material by rail. No My Response: Theoretically moving material by rail would be an improvement on moving material by road, but as new and 'upgrading of lines' would need to take place before work is undertaken and I think you need to liaise with the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the RSPB at Minsmere. I think you need to look further at the impact on the local environment of the infrastructure work proposed. As a point of information we have night trains that carry aggregate gravel, Eastleigh to Salisbury when they started the trains went much faster and were very noisy as sound carries further at night. Discussions resulted in the trains going slower which fixed the problem. You can still hear the trains but much less impact now. I draw your attention to the report for Suffolk County council as the views expressed and questions asked may help you to move forward. <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/major-infrastructure-projects/AECOM-Limited-Report-to-Sizewell-C-DCO-Rail-Response-v0-5-Final.pdf> c) Support moving more material by sea. No Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer My Response: Bringing in goods by sea would seem a better alternative. Less long term impact on the land. This would have to be sensitively handled though, as any major structural work may have detrimental impact on other parts of the coast. I would suggest discussions with RSPB Minsmere; The Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the Local Councils. I would have concerns about building a heavy duty structure. Maybe you could use an updated version of the Mulberry harbours used in the second world war: <https://theromneymarsh.net/mulberryharbour> I attach a link to show the changing landscape near Orfordness lighthouse: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-suffolk-53263525> My Note 1: Having read that in World Nuclear News: <https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR-Taking-the-plunge-with-Sizewell-A-pond-clearance-0202184.html> It seems that progress was made in 2015 to complete decommissioning of Sizewell A's two 210 MWe Magnox gas-cooled reactors operated from 1966 until 2006. Defuelling began in 2009, with fuel removed from the reactors placed in the site's used fuel storage ponds before being packaged in transport containers for shipment to the Sellafield complex for reprocessing. The final flask of fuel was shipped to Sellafield in August 2014. Sizewell A was declared completely fuel free in February 2015. The decommissioning milestone marked the removal of 99% of the radioactive hazard from the former Magnox nuclear power station. <https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR-Taking-the-plunge-with-Sizewell-A-pond-clearance-0202184.html> My Question 1 : if Sizewell A has been fully decommissioned would it not be better to use that site rather than a completely new site as proposed for Sizewell C. This would save a huge amount of structural work and therefore less material to be carried to and from the site. And maybe less need for so much infrastructure and damage to the surrounding area.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements: Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night. We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity: My Response: I have put 'Don't Know' as the answer to all three questions as I think this needs to be worked out locally in consultation with the Wildlife Trust, RSPB Minsmere, Local Councils and local residents. AND you will need to study the logistics. The least disruption you cause to the land, hedges and existing countryside structures and environments the better.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility: We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m. My Response: Creating a Temporary Platform for unloading onto on piles would seem to be a sensible strategy. But you really need to be consulting with RSPB Minsmere to see impact your proposals will have on Minsmere. There are all sorts of rare birds and reed beds at Minsmere and these need to be protected. See also my response to Question 1: c) Support moving more material by sea. Yes No Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer My Response: Bringing in goods by sea would seem a better alternative. Less long term impact on the land. This would have to be sensitively handled though, as any major structural work may have detrimental impact on other parts of the coast. I would suggest discussions with RSPB Minsmere; The Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the Local Councils. I would have concerns about building a heavy duty structure. Maybe you could use an updated version of the Mulberry harbours used in the second world war: <https://theromneymarsh.net/mulberryharbour> I attach a link to show the changing landscape near Orfordness lighthouse: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-suffolk-53263525> Also would you need to ask permission for such a development with Defra; the Planning Authority or the Ports and Harbours Board?

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility: We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this. Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is: Appropriate; Inappropriate, Don't know Please explain your views Quote from: The Sizewell C Project Consultation Document: Consultation on Proposed Changes: Page 9: 2.2.17. Enhancing the design of the permanent BLF would involve making the seabed in front of the permanent BLF better able to receive more regular deliveries by barge without requiring additional maintenance works. These changes substantially increase the ability of the permanent BLF to receive AILs; up to approximately 100 beach landings per year could be achieved in total. The Application assesses up to approximately 50 beach landings per year. Chapter Heading Page 39: 3.3. Enhancement of the permanent beach landing facility and options for a new temporary beach landing facility to facilitate material imports by sea and diagram Diagram: shown on page39: Figure 3.2 Typical visualisation of permanent BLF during the operational phase. My comment: The structure shown in Figure 3.2 suggests that this option is less likely to have a negative impact on the coastal environment than the further options suggested in question 5 I would also like to comment here on: Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 24 Marine Navigation 6.3 Revision: 1.0 Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a) PINS Reference Number: EN010012 Page 50: vi. Fishing gear snagging Page 50: 24.6.50 Fishing vessels carrying demersal gear that interacts with the seabed when deployed pose a snagging risk to subsea infrastructure such as the proposed cooling water intake/outfall heads. If a snagging incident occurs, damage may occur to the infrastructure and/or the gear. Should snagging occur, it is safest for the gear to be abandoned; however, some vessels have been known to attempt to free their gear. This can result in a loss of stability and potential risk to crew members. My Comment: I think you need to change the wording here to : 'Should snagging occur, it is safest for the gear to be abandoned' This should NOT be recommended. Any snagged fishing gear needs to be retrieved as marine creatures can get caught up in th nets and die a protracted death. You should change the wording to say: 'Should snagging occur contact Sizewell C immediately to ensure that the location of the net and the snagging is identified and the netting removed to a safe place on land so no marine creatures are endangered. Page 50: vi. Fishing gear snagging 24.6.51 The baseline fishing analysis identified at least two demersal trawlers operating within proximity to the proposed subsea infrastructure in the 2015/2016 data provided in Appendix 24A of this volume, however, it is again noted vessels under 15m in length are likely under-represented in the area.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF. Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer. I will have to answer Don't Know to all four of the Options given question 5 as I don't know which option would be least damaging to the environment. There is a fine balance here between the most effective structure for receiving deliveries and making best use of the tide and the option that would most impact on the coast either side and the wildlife and other sea users. I feel I must again urge you to work closely with RSPB Minsmere, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the local councils and the local Ports Authority. My main concern with all of the above options is the impact that the work would have on the adjoining coast, the sea creatures and the impact the work would have on RSPB Minsmere. RSPB have put a great deal of effort into developing Minsmere for wildlife and that must be respected. There will be inevitable impact on the local environment and protecting it must be one of your top priorities. While you are considering the logistics of the venture you need to consider the fragile wildlife next door at RSPB Minsmere. From Minsmere's Trail Leaflet: 1] To discover what makes Minsmere special, start exploring today. The trails take you through a variety of different habitats, bringing you closer to some of Minsmere's most interesting wildlife, from impressive red deer to tiny insects, familiar blue tits to elusive bitterns. Families will love the short loop through the woods to our Wild Zone, build a den area and Discovery Centre. Extend the walk further by strolling to the Wildlife Lookout to see what's about. Most of the paths are easy access, apart from the beach, Woodland trail and the section between Bittern and Island Mere hides. A mobility scooter is available to borrow from reception. 2] Coast trail A 2 mile (3.4 km) circular walk. This path takes you through the North Bushes, where tired migrant birds refuel, and along the North Wall, which affords great views over the reedbeds. There are five hides overlooking the lagoons – known as the Scrape – where gulls, terns and avocets nest, migrant wading birds feed and hundreds of ducks spend the winter. Head south from the sluice to scan the Minsmere Levels, then return through the reedbeds. The walk should take about two hours. 3] Island Mere trail A 1.5 mile (2.4 km) circular walk. A lovely walk through oak woodland to raised hides overlooking the reedbeds. Listen to the chorus of birdsong in spring or spot tit and finch flocks in winter. Look out for red deer too. Bittern hide offers superb views from five metres above the reeds, while Island Mere hide is spacious with great views of the mere. Return via Canopy hide, which is great for watching insects in summer, and relax in the sky watching seats on Whin Hill before returning to the visitor centre. Allow two hours to complete the walk. 4] Woodland trail A 1 mile (1.5 km) circular walk. This unsurfaced path takes you deep into Minsmere's woodlands. There you can search for bluebells in May and insects in summer, including beautiful white admiral and purple hairstreak butterflies, Norfolk and southern hawk dragonflies, and a variety of hoverflies. The path links up with the public bridleway from Eastbridge to Dunwich to allow further exploration. It should take you about one hour to complete the trail circuit. A further comment: The Reed beds and the scrapes may be adversely affected by dredging and digging and you will need to work out a Strategy with RSPB Minsmere to protect these fragile environments. Reed beds are now known as one of the many habitat that are carbon collectors A natural solution to the climate crisis <https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/wild-wetlands> Plant matter steadily decays and accumulates in the waterlogged conditions of wetlands, meaning they are hugely important for holding carbon. However, the ability of a freshwater wetland habitat to capture carbon varies according to the condition of the wetland. Good management is critical to ensuring that the habitat can store more carbon for years to come. It is also vital that

our remaining high-quality wetlands are protected, as it can take decades for restored wetlands to be able to draw down carbon at the same rate as natural wetlands

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 6: SSSI crossing: We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints. Do you think this potential change is: Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know Please explain your views
Quote from: The Sizewell C Project Consultation Document: Consultation on Proposed Changes: Page 82 Chapter: 4.5. Change to the SSSI crossing design to a single span bridge with embankments Option a) The proposed development in the Application [I presume this is the original suggestion which is being replaced by Option b.] 4.5.1. The main development site needs to be accessed from the north, from a new access road linking the site to the B1122. The Application includes a vehicular and pedestrian crossing over the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It is located at the narrowest practicable location of the SSSI corridor to minimise environmental impacts. Option b) Description of the proposed change Figure 4.10 Typical visualisation of SSSI Crossing during the operational phase, with proposed changes [I assume that Option b [shown in Figure 4.10 and described below is the new proposal] My comments are at the end of the quote from your document] 4.5.6. SZC Co. proposes to change the design to comprise separate embankments at either end of the SSSI crossing with a 30m long single-span bridge connecting them. As stated above, the current design is for a continuous pair of embankments with a 3.6m wide culvert over the Leiston Drain. 4.5.7. The bridge design would retain very significantly more space around the Leiston Drain and would reduce the amount of SSSI land take by approximately 450m². The bank and channel of Leiston Drain would remain intact. 4.5.8. A ledge would still be installed to enable passage by otters and artificial bat roosts would be included within or on the bridge abutments. 4.5.9. SZC Co. is also consulting on the potential to reduce the gradient of the slope on the eastern (seaward) side from a 1:2 gradient to approximately a 1:3 gradient. The landward slope, which is generally less visible in views, would become steeper meaning the overall width of the crossing would remain unchanged. 4.5.10. The access road to the power station on the SSSI Crossing has a fixed alignment and therefore the change in gradient of the embankments would result in the footprint My comment: although I don't really approve of encroaching on the SSSI I can see your problem. Option b, is a huge improvement over Option a. Option b] having a full span bridge, as you say allows wildlife to traverse the site and keep the SSSI as best as you can as one unit. I think it would be beneficial to consult with the Wildlife Trust; or the Woodland Trust to decide on the most appropriate trees to plant following the construction work. You say in: 4.5.14. [Page 84] The change in design from a culvert to a bridge would provide greater connectivity for species including water voles, otters and bats, thereby reducing the potential for fragmentation of populations. BUT you will need to ensure the safety of the wildlife on site when you carry out the work.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness. Do you think this potential change is: Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know Please explain your views
Quote from: The Sizewell C Project Consultation Document: Consultation on Proposed Changes: Page 17: g) Off-site developments i. Proposed development 2.3.35. To mitigate the effects of activity on the main development site, the following off-site developments are also proposed in the Application: • two areas of fen meadow mitigation land, one to the south of Benhall and one to the east of Halesworth, to create permanent fen meadow habitats to mitigate the loss of approximately 0.7 hectares of fen meadow habitat from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI My comment: Is there really no way of protecting the original 0.7 hectares of Fen Meadow in question. Surely there must be some way to retain this area as Fen Meadow. My main observation is that any loss of Fen Meadow is bad for the environment and bad for the wildlife. Any encroachment on this high value land for wildlife is a huge loss. But I can only suggest that you involve the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB Minsmere to ensure that you have come up with the best possible solution for the environment, habitats and for wildlife.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area: We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete. Do you think this potential change is: Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know Please explain your views Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported My Comment is that I think you need to work more closely with RSPB Minsmere as the part of the site shown on the plan looks to me to be very near to Minsmere. I believe that if EDF Sizewell could work more closely on the detail with the RSPB Minsmere it would be the best way forward. I notice on their RSPB Response to the Sizewell C Stage 4 Public Consultation There were two named people and contact numbers. They finished their response by saying: We trust that these comments are helpful, and look forward to further discussion of these issues Adam Rowlands Suffolk Area Manager Email: adam.rowlands@rspb.org.uk Tel: 01728 648085 Jacqui Miller Senior Conservation Officer Email: jacqui.miller@rspb.org.uk Tel: 07711 918603 So I am sure they would be pleased and reassured to work alongside you for the best outcomes for the RSPB Minsmere and the land adjoining at Sizewell C. This would ensure the best possible outcome for the wildlife at Minsmere and on the Sizewell site.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 9: Surface water: Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path. Do you think this potential change is: Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know Please explain your views My Comment: Your suggestion seems appropriate, but again I would recommend liaising with RSPB Minsmere Adam Rowlands Suffolk Area Manager Email: adam.rowlands@rspb.org.uk Tel: 01728 648085 Jacqui Miller Senior Conservation Officer Email: jacqui.miller@rspb.org.uk Tel: 07711 918603

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 10: Other main site changes: My Comment: Again I would suggest that you contact and work with the RSPB Minsmere: Contacts: Adam Rowlands Suffolk Area Manager Email: adam.rowlands@rspb.org.uk Tel: 01728 648085 Jacqui Miller Senior Conservation Officer Email: jacqui.miller@rspb.org.uk Tel: 07711 918603 They will have the long term knowledge of the site and the area and will know the impact of developments on the wider coast. They will also have the best interests of the wildlife and their habitats at heart.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities My Comment: Again I would suggest that you contact and work with the RSPB Minsmere: Contacts: Adam Rowlands Suffolk Area Manager Email: adam.rowlands@rspb.org.uk Tel: 01728 648085 Jacqui Miller Senior Conservation Officer Email: jacqui.miller@rspb.org.uk Tel: 07711 918603 They will have the long term knowledge of the site and the area and will know the impact of developments on the wider coast. They will also have the best interests of the wildlife and their habitats at heart.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes My Comment: Again I would suggest that you contact and work with the RSPB Minsmere: Contacts: Adam Rowlands Suffolk Area Manager Email: adam.rowlands@rspb.org.uk Tel: 01728 648085 Jacqui Miller Senior Conservation Officer Email: jacqui.miller@rspb.org.uk Tel: 07711 918603 They will have the long term knowledge of the site and the area and will know the impact of developments on the wider coast. They will also have the best interests of the wildlife and their habitats at heart.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous page 1 of 1 Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Wickham Market and surrounding areas cannot EVER cope with amount of HGV vehicles required for this project a the proposed car park in Lower Hatcheston will be a total nightmare for the whole area. The proposed moving of material by sea will further affect the land corrosion on the Suffolk coast.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

These proposals will totally affect the housing all along the line - particularly at night.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This will ruin the biodiversity of the surrounding areas and the coastal and marine life. It will also be another blot on the surrounding area.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

This will ruin the biodiversity of the surrounding areas and the coastal and marine life. It will also be another blot on the surrounding area.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Any additional BLF will totally disrupt and ruin the wildlife and tourist industry (therefore the livelihoods of local business).

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

This will create a dreadful blot on the landscape.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

It is unforgivable to lose existing habitat.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Would your proposal include sewerage - if so, I am completely against your proposal.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Your proposals are completely self centred aimed at big business at the cost of the health, welfare and social standing of local human life and marine/habitat life.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

This proposed change is assuming the project would go ahead and it should not have this impact on an area of outstanding beauty, let alone the CO2 emissions of the haulage and site.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

If you were building wind/wave/solar/other green, clean, safe renewable energy installations and construction materials would be delivered from some distance, clearly moving them via rail and sea would be preferable. I've indicated 'No' on all as I am totally against Sizewell C or any other new generation nuclear reactors being constructed in the UK at all. The Government's commitment to zero or carbon neutral targets cannot be met by Hinckley Point C or any other nuclear power plant by 2030 as it will take the whole decade to construct, and the obscene amount of financial costs to consumers cannot be justified, considering we are then left with keeping the toxic, radioactive waste on-sites, above ground (as I understand from pro-nuclear people, is the current situation). The cost of installing solar panels on people's roofs, solar farms and further wind turbine

on and off-shore as well as maybe hydrogen and wave power must be yours and all other energy power plant constructions' focus from now on. Nuclear has had its day and should remain 20th Century technology that is not good for the environment. You are not able to use your Sizewell A or B plants for anything else now. I do not want to see our unique and beautiful coastal or inland areas devastated for new nuclear reactors that take at least a decade to build and probably another decade before they are fully and safely operational (if they can ever be described as 'safe' given the fatalities that have arisen from the unforeseen and horrific accidents of the past.) The devastation to the area during construction will put off tourists and visitors, and impact terribly on the long term hospitality, travel and tourism industries and employment in the area.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

a), b), c) Rail and sea use for moving materials and employees for clean, safe, green and renewable energy technology installations would be acceptable but need to be moderated to ensure least adverse impact on all the local communities that would be affected. Once again, all 'Inappropriate' boxes are ticked as solar/wind/wave/hydrogen?/other safe technologies are far less costly to construct if £20bn were invested in these installations instead. Then, local populations would not have the background worry of health issues, etc arising from any leaks of radiation, should the unforeseen incidences occur, or rise in sea levels making Sizewell C unoperable and unsustainable to operate anyway.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Any structure that allows the construction of Sizewell C will be something that allows the destruction of our unique Heritage Coastline in Suffolk for ever. It's bad enough that the two existing power stations cannot be reused for anything else ever? If you were constructing wind/wave/solar installations I would be all for it. The impact of construction of Sizewell C to the local area will be absolutely awful for the whole decade and more ahead. I understand these two reactors will then only supply a paltry 7% of our energy needs. If one such plant, provided all our energy needs, I might, at a real push, decide it could be worth it. Our coastlines would have to be 'littered' with these ugly power plants with their toxic waste having to be sited with them. No thank you.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The increased volume of traffic, disruption for this facility is unacceptable not only to many local people, but to the rest of us in East Anglia. Please withdraw your applications and turn your expertise to clean, green renewable energy technologies that will be so much cheaper and definitely safer than nuclear.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

If these were for wind/solar, maybe low capacity option, but as it is for an unwanted nuclear power plant, none of the options are appropriate. I do not want to see a new generation of nuclear power plants anywhere in the UK. I understand only one of these reactors is in operation - in China! Sorry if this doesn't fill me with confidence over how safe it is. We know China's record on human rights and health and safety for its citizens. I do not know of any other of these types of reactors being the saviour of their nations' energy supply needs anywhere in the world. All that I have read about are almost a decade behind in being operational with safety concerns still ongoing and all way over their original budgets. We cannot afford this catastrophic mistake here.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The unspoiled and unique natural environments in the vicinity should definitely be left alone. Please feel free to plant more substantial trees to enhance East Suffolk, though. I'd be happy for you to do that. Just don't build the nuclear power reactors you are planning to. Please invest in and construct other forms of green, renewable energy installations that don't require radiation and produce all the toxic waste that must then be safely stored. The cost of constructing and providing wind/solar installations are plummeting greatly and are much faster to install than a nuclear power plant ever could be.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This country cannot afford to lose any more of its SSSIs, ancient or any other woodland areas to Boris Johnson's vanity projects. The Government is wrong to use our money to help your company or any other to provide more unwanted new generation nuclear power reactors. Please provide an additional fen meadow at Pakenham if you wish, but leave all existing SSSI and existing meadow habitats alone. This again shows Boris' words are meaningless when he wishes to protect the environment.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Of course wetland habits should be retained and if a wet woodland already exists, then enhance that too. Please do not destroy any of the natural areas that already exist.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Sea defences will need to be reviewed and enhanced as our sea levels rise in our climate change crisis we are facing. If it weren't for the fact you are only doing this to construct a nuclear power plant, any work to improve sea defences on the Suffolk coast would be welcome, but never for the reason to construct and then maintain a nuclear power plant. Sea level rises could one day make this area an island and very vulnerable to sea defences planned being breached.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) Sea defences will need to be strengthened - but not for the retention of any nuclear power plant in the area. Any wind/solar power plant I would agree would need enhance sea defences, as would the local population since sea levels may keep rising at an unprecedented level. b) Increased transport by sea may be less disruptive to travellers by road and rail but is inappropriate for enabling the construction of any nuclear power plant. Please turn your attention to constructing wind/solar powered installations instead. c) Tree retention shouldn't even be raised. All existing trees should be retained regardless of what is being constructed energy plant-wise as much as possible. No tree should be lost for more nuclear power plants. d) There should be no adverse impact on the marsh harrier habitat area. If you are considering improving it, please do so but not for the construction of an unwanted nuclear power plant. If you want to create further fen meadows at Benhall and Halesworth and Pakenham, please feel free, as long as it is for wind/solar power plants, NOT nuclear. e) A new bridleway link will be good if it does improve recreational connectivity for people to access recreational routes within the Suffolk Coastal Heaths and AONBs. Just don't do this if it's just for a decade-long construction of a nuclear power plant. This technology is no longer appropriate anywhere in the 21st Century. Please build many more wind/solar power installations instead that will be quicker, easier, cheaper and a much safer, greener, cleaner and sustainable form of energy for us all.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land If Sizewell A land can be used for non-nuclear power purposes, all well and good. Please plant additional trees anywhere appropriate on any of the above sites but not for the construction of a third and most unwanted Sizewell C nuclear power plant. Please provide any enhancement to the natural landscape. Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land As Sizewell A and B sites will always blight the landscape, why would any of us want you to litter remaining areas with even more: C, D, E and F? We don't want any of these to be constructed as they will then have to remain for good, take for ever to safely decommission when they come to the end of their so called useful lives. If the construction takes a decade and then another decade to ensure they operate safely at eye watering levels of public and other finance only to produce 7% of our energy needs per plant, this technology sounds truly awful and inefficient to me.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

In summary for this consultation: a) Reduction in land required: The required level of infrastructure just so you can create a village for the construction staff is not acceptable. the local population must dread what this means to their everyday travel and the fear visitors will be put off coming to this area at all. It will definitely put me off. I have grave concerns over the huge disruption for locals and visitors for their travel routes, day in and day out for more than a decade. Having lived with all the inconvenience of the upgrade of the A14 for the past four years, the thought of being inconvenienced for more than twice as long fills me with complete horror. The cost and disruption for a new village just to house all the construction staff and associated employees is immense and again means putting them in close proximity to the unique AONB and SSSI sites on this beautiful and relatively unspoiled Suffolk Heritage Coast. b) Boundary changes: Again, this means the local population will have more disruption for link roads, roundabouts and, unless the bypasses are wanted by local residents then none of this should take place for the construction of an abominable nuclear power plant. No more nuclear wanted or needed. Please construction wind/solar installations instead. c) Southern park and ride: If this was for enhanced public transportation, then landscaping and screening for views would be welcome. However, all the above is inappropriate if only needed for the construction of another new nuclear power plant. The Government will make the public pay for this latest vanity project when they should put every penny into wind/solar/other completely safe, green, renewable and sustainable forms of energy supplies. Nuclear is not the answer any more, if it ever was. Climate change and sea level rises are at a crisis point so the most inappropriate project at this point is a new nuclear power station on any of our coastal areas. Fukushima's sea defences were breached and the Japanese are known for their high standards of construction and engineering detail. They too were found wanting where nuclear power plants were concerned. I have no confidence in your plans to deliver this project without unforeseen major problems occurring. I object to this project in the strongest terms and demand you rethink your plans completely and turn your expertise towards providing green, clean and most of all completely safe forms of renewable and sustainable energy supplies. Nuclear is done and past. The cost and improvements in wind/solar/wave technology is improving all the time. Your company could be

part of that in a far greater way by ditching these terrible nuclear reactors you are planning to force upon the UK population. Enough already. No more nuclear power plants ever, thank you.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Consultation on proposed changes

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I support moving more freight by rail and sea but do not support the idea of overnight train movements through Melton and Woodbridge. These extra trains should run in daytime. I do not support the DCO transport strategy because it does not offer sufficient mitigation for the huge impact of SZC-related traffic on the local road network. (See next section for more explanations).

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I agree in principle with EDF's strategy to transport more heavy construction material by sea and rail and less by road. While the overall strategy is sound, the rail plan is flawed. What I don't agree is EDF's proposal to run its trains overnight through Melton and Woodbridge for 11 years from 2023 to 2034, possibly 6 days per week. In the peak years, 2024 to 2028, EDF would run between 7 and 9 overnight train movements. This would be completely unacceptable to residents. This plan ought to be code-named *Nessun Dorma* (none shall sleep). Even at the proposed speed limit of 10mph through Melton and Woodbridge, the train noise and ground vibration would be very disruptive to residents within sensory distance of the railway, as would the rolling fanfare of barrier alarms as the trains pass the many level crossings across the two joined-up towns. Our community deserves some consistency of policy from EDF. It has already acknowledged that overnight train movements would cause disruption to Leiston's residents and given them a guarantee of no train operations between 11pm and 7am. Indeed, EDF is to invest in a temporary "green route" rail line to take trains directly from Saxmundham to the Sizewell C site, bypassing Leiston. Why on earth should Melton and Woodbridge (with a combined population much larger than Leiston) not receive the same consideration for its residents? In short, there must be absolutely no EDF trains running through Melton and Woodbridge between 11pm and 7am, please! Local councils have asked repeatedly for EDF to increase the capacity of the East Suffolk line to increase the amount of heavy construction material that can be shifted by rail; to run the extra trains in daytime; and to increase the line's resilience. It is about time that the huge impact of SZC on our meagre local rail infrastructure was acknowledged by EDF and it accepts that the responsible thing to do would be to dual-track the line between Melton and Saxmundham. Turning to road transport, I was disappointed that EDF did not take the opportunity presented by this late consultation exercise to address some of the missing mitigations in its road strategy. Even if less heavy construction material is moved by road, there would still be a huge increase in HGV movements to exacerbate the already unacceptable traffic congestion in and around Melton and Woodbridge, on the A12 and A1152. SZC must not be allowed to make a bad situation worse. The A12's capacity, locally, is deficient in several places and its resilience (in the event of a major incident) is poor. There is an urgent need for the A12 to be dualled all the way from Woodbridge (Seckford Hotel junction) to Friday Street (junction with the A1094). There is also an urgent need for mitigation measures to the A1152 in Melton that would improve road safety and reduce pollution: including straightening out the right-angled bend over the level-crossing; reducing the number of vehicles that pass through the middle of Melton; and actions that would prevent the A1152 and other local roads in Melton and Woodbridge being used as a rat-run to SZC.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

No comment

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at

Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

No comment

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

No comment

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

No comment

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes
 No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes
 No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I would favour rail over road but, the proposed route would run along the NW edge of Kenton Hills, a communising route for rare bats. The extra trains will cause disturbance to Leiston residents, listed properties and the Pro Corda music school (and Leiston Abbey site generally).

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I understand all these proposals would involve night time trains. Surely this would be disturbing for people living near the train line. I understand local people had to fight hard to get an hourly rail service and this proposal seems like it may get in the way of that hard fought timetable.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Why would anybody want to disturb the sea bed and the marine ecology on the Suffolk Coast? A marine ecology that at the very least feeds birds. Why would anybody want to disturb the offshore banks which provide protection to the power station from storms? I object to the proposal of the construction of a new road from the BLF to the station platform the proposal of which is to run it adjacent to Minsmere-Walberswick Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Many people walk on the beach at Sizewell (last weekend the car park was packed); there are rare plants and invertebrates that live on the beach. This is a County Wildlife Site and should remain that way. Translocating reptiles runs the risk of overloading other habitats leaving insufficient food to go round.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All of these options would cause significant damage. I understand the idea originally proposed for a jetty was abandoned due to the environmental problems it would cause. The Southern North Sea is a protected area - twice over (Outer Thames Special Protection Area for birds and Special Area of Conservation for harbour porpoise). There is surely no way EDFs proposals will not harm these marine habitats and species.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The structure of a bridge is a slight improvement on the original causeway idea. But, the space under the bridge would need to be large/high enough for animals to pass safely through this wildlife corridor. No harm should ever come to any wildlife due to the construction of such a bridge. There would still be a large culvert through which water from the marshes would have to drain which would be very damaging. It would act as a barrier to fish and aquatic invertebrates that will not go through it.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Newly created habitats have a very low success rate even if well planned and managed. Fen meadow in particular is extremely difficult to recreate, if not impossible. It is an ancient habitat that has taken many many years to evolve. None of the proposed sites is near Sizewell Marshes and any alteration to the water level would damage the existing fen meadow. This is a rare habitat and no building should be considered on this site. This site is too small for such a large construction - it is inappropriate.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I am not sure the marsh harriers will particularly like the noise, lighting and disturbance at this new site which would take many years to establish itself. This mitigation project should have been started years ago in anticipation of the construction works (see Natural England guidelines).

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I understand the pipe for excess water run off will not be available for two years. Silt due to construction will collect and disturb the delicate ecological balance of Sizewell Marshes SSSI and clog up ditches. Marshes, where it is crucial to keep the correct balance of water may become depleted.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Hard sea defences cause flanking erosion at either end. With climate change this problem will increase with rising sea levels and more frequent storms. This means erosion may speed up threatening Minsmere and Thorpeness. The taller the cranes and stockpiles, the worse the impact on an AONB. Many hectares of woodland will be felled and go under concrete (e.g. Coronation Wood). This is a loss of woodland. Boundary changes would lead to the felling of yet more woodland (Nuttery Belt). I understand this proposal is to ensure that lorries can travel at 60mph. This is too fast and risks wildlife and birds. Aldhurst Farm is a wildlife reserve. How would users of the bridleway not damage the site and cause disturbance?

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am opposed to putting the training centre and visitor centre at Sizewell which will take up more land. These should be in Leiston where there is a large redundant school building with extensive grounds. This would free up land and Coronation Wood could be saved. There should be no car park on Pillbox Field nor more land being taken from the SSSI for a footpath. I oppose the planting of trees on Pillbox Field which is rough acid grassland, a habitat which is missing from Suffolk. This land provides important shelter for insects that feed birds and bats. Small mammals thrive which are food for owls. Any mitigation planting should be elsewhere, perhaps on low-grade agricultural land but not Pillbox Field.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Any reduction in land take is supported. However, changing boundaries at this late stage is causing considerable extra stress to local people involved. There has not been enough information provided as regards public rights of way around Walk Barn for an opinion to be formed. Most people in Wickham Market I believe do not want a P&R so close to the town. The main street is narrow (single lane in part) with parking problems. There is also a fear that this will be used as a 'rat run' by Sizewell workers. None of the traffic solutions provided is acceptable. Indeed, the A12 bypass round Wickham Market was constructed in order to leave the town free of traffic!

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Increasing sea transport good. However design of foundations need to consider reduction in noise impact (driven piles) and ease of removal at decommissioning to return sea shore to original condition (drive piles need to be cut below seabed).

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Increasing sea transport good to reduce load on roads/ rail. Design of facility should be such to minimise environmental impact during construction and decommissioning.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Can't comment on proposed design as insufficient details on designs. Comments above on environmental aspects of design and decommissioning on surface would suggest self elevating platforms being a good solution.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Where unavoidable negative environmental impacts have to occur equal positive actions need to be taken.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

cant comment as out of my area of expertise

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Would appear to be ok but the effect of dirty run off water on environment requires to be assessed in an EIA.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The statements provided in Section 6.5.24 regarding the AFD are based on 4 year old data from Hinkley C. The quoted time of 12 to 18 months for replacement needs to be revised to reflect the design improvements. These are outlined on the FGS website <https://www.fgs.world/hinkley-fish-deterrent/latest-developments/>. The old replacement time figure was largely driven by the old pressure compensation system. This has been redesigned so it is reasonable to assume that the quoted replacement time quoted has increased. It is also to be noted that the pressure fluctuations at Sizewell are at least a quarter of those at Hinkley where the tidal range is the 2nd highest in the world (14m). From the tidal tables for Sizewell the maximum tidal range in December 2020 was 2.3 m. This fact combined with the proposed shorter head at Sizewell will greatly reduce the number of units required. (Deeper water dissipates the sound intensity field more so at Hinkley where high tide 14m greater than low tide will need a greater number of speakers. As the tidal range is massively lower at Sizewell than Hinkley (subsea currents lower), the risk to divers at Sizewell will be much lower. Details of the currents and turbidity are not available to quantify. Additionally, the use of divers may not be required by using Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROVs) which are routinely used for similar tasks in other industries. Finally the statement that the speakers will interrupt the flow to water into the heads is also not necessarily true. The Hinkley system was shown not to do this using computational fluid dynamics. Again, as there are likely to be less speakers required at Sizewell, and they can be incorporated into the design of the head at an early stage (Hinkley design was incorporated after the head inlet design was finalised) this statement in the EDF document is almost certainly false. It is recommended that a site specific independent study is done (not commissioned by EDF) to assess the technical feasibility of incorporating AFDs at Sizewell. Given the required design information (head drawings, environmental & metocean data, site plan) this could easily be carried out in 2 to 3 months at minimal cost.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

See comments to question 10 relating to section 6.5.24 of EDF Doc 6.3 Revision: 1.0 Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a) PINS Reference Number: EN010012 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Disruption on major infrastructure projects is I'm afraid unavoidable & the road transport links into the site aren't well suited to cope with that disruption. There are obvious synergies with port to dock delivery avoiding the transfer of material at a remote location onto road transport, moved around the U.K. to site and then unloaded again.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Moving freight by rail will reduce HGV movements with the obvious benefits that will bring.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

After some years involved in construction the option to create a local site marine facility has always been the preferred option, especially for large / abnormal loads.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Economies of scale & the ability to massively reduce road freight movement.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

After the initial expense of marine construction has been taken into consideration then size is just incremental cost. The capacity has to be maximised, not only for the routine but also for contingency. The objectives of routine maintenance and major outages should also be taken into account in that design.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Would appear to be a sensible compromise.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The post construction habitation environment must as a minimum support the pre construction ecology.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wetland environments be it flatlands or wooded support diverse ecosystems each one as important as the other. Increasing the area for that ecology to prosper should be supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Would appear to be a sensible mitigation provided that acceptable water quality is monitored and maintained.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Reasons as previously stated.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 2 would appear to be sub optimal.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Don't know

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

None of the above appear overly excessive and offer a pragmatic approach to the changes required to support construction.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Trains should be run during the day. Noise disturbance at night will be unbearable

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Concerned about the ecological impact

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Concerned about ecological impact

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

But really there should be no loss of fen meadow habitat

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

retired [REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am seriously concerned about the size and impact of the Darsham station site (so-called Northern Park and Ride), the size and impact of the Yoxford roundabout, and the inevitability of northern traffic travelling south on the A12 and cutting through Dunwich Road (despite your assurances about the latter). The impact on the single-lane A12 will be considerable. A huge parking lot for Darsham will mean well over a thousand people travelling from there daily. The Yoxford roundabout is unnecessary, except to facilitate the thousand-plus commuters. It is beyond belief.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As much as possible must be taken by rail or sea. I do not live near a railway line but would think that 5 trains a day would be inconvenient to those who do and to rail passengers. The inconvenience anyway to rail passengers is beyond ridicule.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Only appropriate if it would mean considerable reduction of road/rail traffic. Otherwise inappropriate.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Because temporary.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The one which would mean the least road/rail traffic and the most efficient completion of this horrendous scheme is the most appropriate, given that they are all temporary.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Less SSSI land must be good, although the whole scheme is of course disastrous to the SSSI.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

It sounds appropriate, but of course is hard to answer given that you do not say what 'small' means in terms of loss fenland.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Retain wetland habitats.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Appropriate if genuinely temporary.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

So little information is given above that it's hard to answer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am not local enough to be able to answer. Option 1 sounds best but what is the additional Sizewell A land?

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Any additions can only be bad. Any reductions must be good.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes
 No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

We are trackside residents and ANY use of the railway will impact our quality of life. The ever-increasing number of trains suggested - currently every hour every night for 10 years minimum is unacceptable,

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Try living alongside the line with trains every hour every night....

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Clearly the Develop Consent Order (DCO) that I responded to was badly planned by EDF. Even if I agreed moving more material by sea or rail, i am not convinced that this is what would actually happen. Percentage of different movements of materials, equipment and people to and from the site, would 'blur' if Sizewell C were to get the go ahead. The prospect of building a landing facility on the beach at Sizewell which has to be long because of shallow waters and a loose material sea bed will i believe change the movement of traffic by road by at best only a very small amount. The deposition of sea materials along this stretch of stretch of coast forms shingle banks protecting the mainland from the sea . Beach formations

particularly but not exclusively will change if a beach landing facility acts as a diversion to tidal flows, so there may well be erosion and deposition of beach material elsewhere causing destruction of cliffs, sand banks and change depths of sea along the coast very close to shore. This in turn will lead to more wave damage to shoreline. This will be accentuated by the growing frequency of high winds in our changing climate linked also to accentuation by Spring tides. There is also the prospect of damage to marine life if there is a beach landing facility. Rail movement is unlikely to be a big game changer in terms of moving people or freight. The reason is firstly, fact that there are few daily timetable 'slots' for additional trains on the Ipswich Lowestoft line. The reason for this that there are one hourly timetabled passenger trains between Ipswich and Lowestoft and this is complicated by parts of the Ipswich Lowestoft line being only single track. An additional daily train to Leiston/Sizewell is therefore unlikely. planning issues linked with the Rail Authorities are at a very late stage. Too late i think to initiate real change in the time frame needed. There are so many issues to deal including track replacement and maintenance as well as structural issues with bridges, road crossings on track much of which is single causing major problems for increased frequency of trains needing to go and return on the route between Saxmundham and Leiston/Sizewell . There will be even major disturbance caused by more track going actually nearer to the development area via Kenton Hills running 24 hours a day and disturbing wildlife en route to parts that are designated as AONB which should not be happening. I If you wish to move not just passengers but additional freight by rail, this is an even more complicated issue because there is a need for additional areas of land for sidings and organisation for the variety of materials to be put together, coupled to a train and then at the receiving end, there needs to be a another very large area of land; a facility in which individual carriages can be decoupled and unloaded and for the train itself to be returned. All this requires additional space and management . Not feasible i think. It must also be mentioned that these proposed trains will possibly be running night and day. Some of the new track to Sizewell making more heavy demands on land space and causing disturbance for those who live or work nearby.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

The Ipswich to Lowestoft train line is hard pressed to run an hourly service during day time, mainly because there are large parts of the route that are single track. I think the East Suffolk train Line would be hard pressed to run additional passenger trains on the existing network safely and the prospect of freight requires additional siding facilities as mentioned above. See previous comments on question 2

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As i understand it, enhancing the BLF will require it to be 30m longer. Whatever the proposed design of the BLF, will the channel need to be dredged as well? I ask this question because at low tide , this water shallow and not deep at high water either. Delivery 'logistics' will depend on sea state and depth on a BLF that is limited by how much traffic it can contain at any one time. Marine ecology may be significantly disturbed and the erosion /deposition characteristics of the shore line may be significantly changed . This coastline is a delicate area as the complete erosion of the historic town of Dunwich signifies . Similarly at Aldeburgh, just down the coast , half of the town of Aldeburgh has been eroded by the sea. The Moot hall

was once the middle of the town. This erosion along this part of the Suffolk coast continues. As i understand it , the coast has soft sand and shingle and a more protective crag strata which form the Sizewell-Dunwich protective banks which acts as a barrier to erosion . Destruction of these protective banks by piling dredging etc, will make the coast more vulnerable to erosion. Not a good idea. Roads are not often disrupted by high winds and can more easily deliver freight 24 hrs a day without the great number of marine logistical problems. A longer BLF may make a very small not significant difference . As i understood it there were plans to land nuclear core pressure vessels by sea but everyday materials for construction, i think unlikely! This area is a beautiful stretch of coast used by local tourists and walkers . A permanent landing site from the sea would be yet even more intrusion . There is also the destruction of marine wild life to consider!

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I have already talked about disturbances. There are many rare plants and animals on this stretch of beach, This is a Country Wildlife Site. I have particularly enjoyed the sea pea and wild poppies and there are many other creatures as well as birds. No disturbance wanted. Similarly, inland , Sizewell C plans to permanently disturb SSSI sites in its bid to build inappropriate structures. Totally inappropriate.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I do not want to see any Beach Landing Facilities as i have already discussed and reasoned in previous questions.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments –

one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There has never been a choice of accessing the proposed Sizewell C site during the early planning stages. Any road structure over this site is a serious and wrong intrusion of an SSSI. Damaging a Site of Special Scientific Interest, flora and fauna and special drainage/hydrology should never have been considered. A bridge is slightly better than previous plans but there is still great concern about damage to wildlife in situ and movement of wildlife to and from this area to so called 'new habitats, elsewhere. This is not acceptable . The SSSI sites needs to be left alone and managed carefully where as it is in its complete state .

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The success rate of transplanting flora and fauna to new sites is very low. I am told only 29% to 45% successful. Rare species need a better success rate than this. It is therefore inappropriate that flora and fauna should not be moved or have any interference from developers including EDF. Such sites should be left alone.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

What is it for? if the Sizewell C site is developed . There will be a great deal of light sound and movement disturbance on a vast construction site and harriers are not going to thrive in these foraging areas. I think not. They will just go elsewhere or die.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I am given to understand that this temporary outfall pipe will not be in use for two years . in the meantime , vast quantities of silt and other site residue will run off on to Sizewell Marshes and SSSI land causing possibly irreparable damage. This is saying to me that there should be no more building with massive concrete structures covering a land surface that will so severely affect such sensitive special areas nearby.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

So many areas to cover:- Sea defences. Climate change is bringing rising sea level and more large storms and even hurricanes. It is well known that a hard coastal defence will cause flanking erosion at either side of the hard structure. This being the case wave energy will be accentuated on each side of the hard defences leading to possibly more erosion at Minsmere and Thorpness. What is a 'temporary sea defence'? In this situation it is so that you can build a tunnel for the cooling of the reactor . An essential need and 'not to simplify the structure'. C Tree retention; Coronation Wood has gone, many trees in Kenton hills have gone, Goose hill trees will be removed and many many others . Loss of mixed woodland is a great concern for the plant and animal of the ecology in this are and i think this wil also badly affect Minsmere too. D Boundary changes. Work seems to have already started on new constructions before the Planning consent for Sizewell C has not been given.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I have already sent objections about these matters:- Using Sizewell A land will no be for several years and only if permission is give. Pillbox is sandling and should be left alone as part of AONB . No car parking , no use by Sizewell B or C, even at Outage times. Sizewell visitor centre has no need to be on a nuclear site . That can be located in nearby Leiston . Plenty of available space there for this resource. A safer distance away during possible development too. Relocation of B facilities , is about making space for Sizewell C . I think the proposed C site is too small to accommodate what is planned and i do not want to see additional land taken to try and resolve this.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Boundaryction changes and reduction of land required: At a very late stage in proceedings. Stressful for local residents. Never something for nothing where development is concerned . Too little too late is old saying but appropriate. Wickham Market do not want park and ride so close to their town . The town was bypassed to cut down congestion.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I and many many others live near the railway line. I was shocked to hear the proposal of night transport on the line. How are we supposed to sleep? What happens in summer when windows need to be open. It will be a nightmare literally for many communities near the railway.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

These are night trains which are inappropriate and few living near are aware of the impact this will have on their lives

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This development is catastrophic to wildlife with the environment top of the governments agenda how can this loss be accepted.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not believe that Sizewell C would be a suitable base load station - should such be needed - in order to replace aging capacity in the National Grid. As all viable alternatives have not been thoroughly explored by EDF, being intrinsically wedded to an evolution of the nuclear option, the question of how to best supply materials to 'C' becomes a mitigation issue and misses completely the core issue of what is the best way to generate electricity in the UK. Until an open and informed discussion is held on sustainable electricity futures, which would be impossible given the current biased propaganda from EDF, I am opposed to a new large scale power station at Sizewell with all its attendant damage on the East coast

environment. So, no movement by road - old or new - train or sea, until an energy review by HM Gov., preferably by a non-political Royal Commission, properly funded and with all potential means of safe and non-polluting generation considered.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to a new large scale power station at Sizewell with all its attendant damage on the East coast environment. So, no movement by train, until an energy review by HM Gov., preferably by a non-political Royal Commission, properly funded and with all potential means of safe and non-polluting generation considered.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to a new large scale power station at Sizewell with all its attendant damage on the East coast environment. So, no movement by permanent beach landing facility, until an energy review by HM Gov., preferably by a non-political Royal Commission, properly funded and with all potential means of safe and non-polluting generation considered.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I am opposed to a new power station at Sizewell, with all its attendant damage on the East coast environment. So, no temporary beach landing facility, until an energy review by HM Gov., preferably by a non-political Royal Commission, properly funded and with all potential means of safe and non-polluting generation considered.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

This really is 'Fiddling whilst Rome (the world) burns' and re-arranging the deckchairs' whilst the Titanic (EDF) sinks. Moving building materials by alternative routes and claiming that it is less damaging to someone somewhere else ignores that fact that huge resources will be used for delayed benefit which might be better used differently and elsewhere ... or just not used at all. A pier or new road may initially placate the NIMBYS of Middleton and Therberton but who will actually notice the lessening of lorry movements given the scale of this construction? What about those living along the B1120 and other local roads?

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Don't alter, damage or take any SSSI land and don't pretend that this new crossing would somehow solve other existing problems. A classic example of EDF 'Smoke and Mirrors' in order to justify the unjustifiable.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also

proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

You just can't move nature around at a time when the Earths environments, Flora and Fauna are under unprecedented threat. Pakenham is not a coastal environment and it is simply not possible to determine whether this will provide an adequate future alternative, despite all the money and consultants that EDF throw at it.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I think that the term 'Wetland' says it all really. Why try to build a mega power station on and around a wetland bog? This isn't a local Coop stores, it's going to be one of the largest construction sites in the UK and Europe! No large industrial development should be made in this location whatever the 'National Need' when better sites, smaller de-centralised generation and other - more appropriate options - are available.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

The diversion of storm water because it's inconvenient again highlights the inappropriate nature of the Sizewell site for any large scale development. In all these questions EDF are trying to tweak nature and overcome the problems that such a difficult building site presents. Hinkley C should be an abject UK lesson in excessive unforeseen and additional costs, despite EDFs 10 year tenure prior to commencing works. The old adage 'What can go wrong, will go wrong' is no solace to using common sense when choosing an appropriate site on which to build; flooding, subsidence, erosion and ground heave being just some of the obvious problems in store.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Well thank goodness that trees, Marsh Harriers and recreational activity' are being considered. Maybe EDF will upgrade the provision of doggy bins and approve a petting area for displaced wildlife? Hardly likely given the ongoing destruction of Coronation Wood in advance of any financial deal with 'Butcher Boris' and without a bat license in place. Wildlife measures are only trotted out as 'greenwash' to swaddle the huge monstrosity hidden within. We are not fooled.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The whole of the Sizewell A site could be used if it wasn't a repository for the nuclear detritus that helped produce Plutonium for Britain's nuclear arsenal from the 50s onwards. This is primarily why nuclear power started with Magnox and later AGR station's development and other associated costs provided by HMG. Not much has changed - we still have the same Queen - and EDF will have to secure both government, public and private sector funding in order to progress.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

As the 'C' station development consists of unproven EDF EPRs , may not come on stream until 2035 (Flamanville), produces highly toxic waste and lacks long term storage for 1,000,000 plus years, we are again back to looking at relatively minor short term considerations here set against the long term damage done. THIS IS NOT A SOLUTION TO RUNAWAY GLOBAL WARMING THAT IS WITH US NOW! EDF simply won't be producing the electricity from 'C' for the electric vehicles that we are all meant to be driving in just 10 year's time. With Hydrino technology now a viable commercial option, nuclear has yet another nail among many in it's dirty rotting coffin.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

SIZEWELL C PUBLIC CONSULTATION I am writing on behalf of the British Horse Society (BHS) a membership charity with over 115,000 members representing the UK's 3 million regular riders and carriage drivers, in response to the current consultation on Sizewell C. The BHS is the largest and most influential equestrian charity in the country, working to improve the lives of horses and their owners through its four core foundations of education, welfare, safety and access. 1. BACKGROUND TO OUR COMMENTS I am responding to this consultation on behalf of The British Horse Society, an

equestrian Charity which represents the 3 million horse riders in the UK. Nationally equestrians have just 22% of the rights of way network. In Suffolk, they have just 18% of the rights of way network, increasingly disjointed by roads which were once quiet and are now heavily used by traffic resulting from development within the County. It is therefore important that these public rights are protected. Increasing pressure for development of houses and industry is making even fewer of those bridleways and byways available. Ancient 'green lane' bridleways, byways and unsurfaced roads are being tarmacked as access roads or cycle tracks and engulfed by new development spreading into the countryside. Traffic increases with new development or change of use so roads become even less safe for riders and carriage-drivers (equestrians) to use to access any traffic-free routes there may be. Riders are also increasingly excluded from verges by creation of foot-cycleways – segregated provision for other vulnerable non-motorised users but equestrians are excluded and forced into the carriageway. Historically verges have provided a refuge and could, if mown, provide a segregated route. Road Safety is a particular concern to equestrians, who are among the most vulnerable road users. Between November 2010 and March 2019, the BHS received reports of 3,737 road incidents, in which 315 horses and 43 people were killed. Research indicates however that only 1 in 10 incidents are being reported to the BHS; in 2016-17 alone, 3,863 horse riders and carriage drivers in England and Wales were admitted to hospital after being injured in transport accidents. (NHS Hospital Episodes Statistics). The BHS actively campaigns to improve road safety by making motorists aware of what to do when they encounter horses on the road (see <https://www.bhs.org.uk/our-work/safety/dead-slow> – we recommend taking a few minutes to watch the 'Dead Slow' virtual reality film for an impression of how vulnerable equestrians are in proximity to cars and lorries). Because of the difficulties that equestrians encounter on roads, they avoid using them wherever possible. Road use is often unavoidable, however it is simply because people have nowhere else to exercise their horses. The main off-road access available to them is the network of Rights of Way (RoW). England and Wales have over 140,000 miles of RoW, but only 22% of this network is available for horse riders (who may only use routes designated as Bridleways and Byways) and a mere 5% to carriage drivers (who only have access to Byways). An additional factor is that the network is fragmented, and roads are often the only available links between one RoW and the next.

2. REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT SIZEWELL C PUBLIC CONSULTATION – QUESTION 10 E BRI-DLEWAY

a. Amenity value The amenity value of the routes in and around the Sizewell C site must be preserved along with the physical resource of the routes. With only 18% of the Rights of Way in Suffolk available to equestrians these limited routes should keep their natural rural characteristics.

b. Surfacing On paths where horses are legally included and may be a common user—bridleways and restricted byways—a surface more appropriate to their use than to motor traffic should be provided. The BHS has found resin or polymer bound rubber crumb-grit compounds to be the most successful in providing resilient, free draining, smooth sur-faces which accommodate all users well. Bound rubber crumb has been used very suc-cessfully to provide a hard surface that can look like tarmac, is easily used by cycles and wheelchairs but is also excellent under foot for pedestrians and horses as it has some 'give'. This is a surface that the BHS recommends for multi-use paths where a bound sur-face is necessary. As this material becomes more used, its price is reducing and in 2018, it was found cheaper than tarmac at one site. Its lifetime and guarantee are generally greater than tarmac. The ideal path surface preferred by horses and their riders or drivers is:

- Non slip
- Resilient, with some give (10 to 30mm at point load)
- Well drained
- Adequate bearing capacity to avoid erosion or poaching
- Free from stones, especially if angular or sharp edged

Types of path surface, in descending order of preference, are:

- Short, firm, well-drained turf, which is ideal for horses and pedestrians, and usually firm enough for cycles and horse-drawn vehicles.
- Vegetated paths on a firm base such as grassed over forest roads or disused railway tracks stripped of ballast to expose consolidated ash solum, which are ideal for support-ing year-round multi-use, provided they are well drained.
- Paths where the natural vegetation is protected or reinforced by some type of partial surfacing, such as embedded stone.
- Formally constructed paths with firm, non-slip surface. Sealed surfaces may be necessary to facilitate cycle or wheelchair access, but care should be taken to ensure that the finished surface is not hazardous to horses. The proposals for the new off-road route of new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills the granite fines surface must be suitable for equestrians. Quarried ag-gregate without a consolidated dust wearing course is completely inappropriate for multi-use paths because angular stones will damage horses' feet and may result in seri-ous lameness. Where it is used as a substrate or structural layer, the surface must be fin-ished with 75-100mm depth compacted MOT type 1 (40mm-dust) dressed with dust to fill the spaces between the stones and consolidated to withstand rainfall. Aggregate surfaces may occur naturally or where erosion has removed an upper surface layer. Such a surface is 'out of repair' as it limits use by natural and legitimate users (horse rid-ers) and should be topped off with a consolidated dust layer. A specification for an ag-gregate surface should always include clauses for topping-off as required to a uniform consolidated dust finish and checking after so many months with subsequent top-off as appropriate. This is because aggregate quality is variable; it may settle in transit to give inconsistent levels of fines throughout the laid length of track or may wash through if there is heavy rain before consolidation. Any new construction or path restoration project should always provide a finished surface to this standard. It is not acceptable to leave an unconsolidated surface of stones following work. Any stony tracks may need improvement by topping-off with consolidated dust to avoid injury to horses. Rubble or similar recycled material may be used as a substrate but must be fin-ished with a wearing surface as for aggregate. It is very important that it is 'clean', i.e. not contaminated by material such as wire, glass or nails that could work to the surface and cause puncture wounds or trip hazards. Specifications should state non-recycled MOT type 1 or clean rubble as a requirement.

c. Road crossings The British Horse Society should be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that all road crossings as part of the Sizewell C proposals are suitable for equestrian users and meet The British Horse Society's specifications and standards. Please find attached guidance leaflets for more information.

d. Vegetation planting A route should be at least four metres wide to ensure that users can pass each other with ease without brushing against adjacent fences, walls or hedges. Vegetation should be cut so that the full width can be used if necessary. Hazards overhead such as branch-es, cables or derricks should provide at least 3.4m clearance, preferably 3.7m in case a horse takes fright and jumps or rears.

3. SIZEWELL C PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Within Suffolk, there is a both a demonstrable demand for safe access for equestrians and a documented lack of provision. The issues identified in the Suffolk Green Access Strategy with 2.3.2 Create a more connected network – Obtain significant public rights of way improvements and legacies on nationally important development projects, such as Sizewell C'. We hope that EDF will take this opportunity to address the disjointed nature of Suffolk's Right of Way network in these new opportunities and ask that routes affected by the Sizewell C plans should include:

a. Recognition of equestrians as vulnerable road users Historically, pedestrians and cyclists have been considered as the main vulnerable road users. Equestrians are however increasingly recognised as being part of this group: during the Parliamentary Debate on Road Safety in November 2018 Jesse Norman, Under Secretary of State for Transport, stated that "We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders." We therefore ask that EDF include Suffolk's equestrians as vulnerable road users, to ensure that their needs are considered equally alongside those of pedestrians and cyclists.

b. Inclusion of equestrians in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan The term 'Active Travel' applies to journeys undertaken for a range of purposes, wheth-er to reach a place of work or local amenities, or for recreation. It is also the case that many of the routes that are used to walk or cycle to work or school are the same routes which at other times provide for recreational use. It is now acknowledged that horse-riding is as much an 'active travel' mode as recrea-tional walking or cycling. At the recent Parliamentary Debate on Active Travel in West-minster Hall, Robert Courts MP proposed that "horse riders...ought to be thought about in the context of active travel as well." This was endorsed by Michael Ellis, Minister of State for Transport, who confirmed that "Active travel includes horse riders and bridle paths – this debate includes them." Cambridgeshire is demonstrating good practice, James Palmer, Cambridgeshire and Pe-terborough Mayor has stated in a current transport consultation: 'Active Travel – cy-cling, Walking and Horse Riding Promoting active and sustainable transport like walking, cycling and horse riding are key objectives at a national, regional and local level.' He has also stated that Greenways are an '... off road route for walking, cycling and horse rid-ing.' The recently adopted Joint Cambridgeshire and

Peterborough Local Transport Plan defines Active Travel as: 'Active Travel: Physically active modes such as walking, cycling or horse riding.' We would ask that all Active Travel provision must therefore be embedded in new transport projects in the same way for all modes. We therefore suggest that horse-riding should be included within the Sizewell C and would welcome the opportunity to contribute the development of this document. The Suffolk Local Transport Plan includes: 'Safe, healthy and inclusive communities - Maintaining assets that encourage active travel choices: pavements, cycling routes, the Rights of Way network.' It also recognises the need for safe off road routes: 'This network provides off-road access to services, links between settlements, and access into the countryside. The importance of rights of way, quality greenspaces, greenways and corridors, for an effective non-motorised urban transport network threading through urban areas and linking to more rural areas is recognised.' We would suggest this is included in the plans for the Sizewell C site could show a trail blazing attitude to access throughout Suffolk. c. Equestrians to be included in any shared-use routes, wherever possible. In order to maximise opportunities within Suffolk to help provide more off-road links for equestrians they should support the automatic inclusion of horse riders on shared off-road routes, unless there are specific reasons why this is not possible. Conflict with cyclists is sometimes given as a reason for excluding horses from shared routes, but this rarely has anything to do with either the horse or the bicycle, simply the inconsiderate person who happens to be riding one or the other. Horse riders and cyclists as two vulnerable road user groups have more in common with each other than differences. This is illustrated by the work that the BHS are doing in partnership with Cycling UK in the current 'Be Nice, Say Hi!' campaign and with Sustrans in their 'Paths for Everyone' initiative. The key to a successful shared route is the design: for example, rather than positioning a cycle path down the centre of a route with verges either side, the cycle path should be positioned to one side and the two verges combined to provide a soft surface for walkers, runners and horses on the other. (This also addresses the issue of horse droppings which, as research has confirmed, represent no danger to health and disperse quickly, particularly on unsurfaced paths.) d. Reference to Highway Advice for Developers 'Equestrians in Hampshire – a reference guide for Transport, Planners, Developers and other decision makers' is a document written by members of HCAF with support from Hampshire Countryside Service and the BHS, this document has been widely circulated within and beyond Hampshire, sparking interest from other authorities outside the county. We would like to work with EDF to create a similar document specifically for Suffolk to so that the proposed new bridleways, when implemented, will restore connectivity within the wider RoW network in a way that will benefit all users, including equestrians. We would urge EDF to incorporate the principles set out in this guidance into their plans: most particularly, that there is an opportunity to include equestrian use to provide safe off-road access where appropriate. 4. CONCLUSION Horse riding is a year-round activity which (along with associated activities such as mucking out and pasture maintenance) expends sufficient energy to be classed as moderate intensity exercise. The majority of those who ride regularly are women, and a significant proportion of riders are over 45. For some older or disabled people, being on horseback or in a horse-drawn carriage gives them access to the countryside and a freedom of movement that they would not otherwise be able to achieve. Most riders and carriage-drivers wish to take their horses out on bridleways and byways, away from motor traffic, for the physical and mental health benefits to animal and human, in exactly the same way as most walkers (with and without dogs) and cyclists. Many are unable to do so because the traffic on tarmac roads is too dangerous for such vulnerable road users, and there are generally so few traffic-free routes available to equestrians. There are also considerable psychological and social benefits from equestrian activities, as the BHS is demonstrating through the Changing Lives through Horses initiative. Equestrianism is a popular activity in this part of Suffolk, and one which contributes significantly to the local economy. The equestrian community in Suffolk currently has many difficulties in finding safe access within the area, as identified in Suffolk's policies. Many of these issues could be addressed and resolved through good planning of future routes. We hope therefore that EDF will support this and local equestrians affected by Sizewell C. If you have any questions, or would like to discuss any aspect of this response further, please do not hesitate to contact me. Yours faithfully Charlotte Ditchburn Access Field Officer – East Region charlotte.ditchburn@bhs.org.uk (email sent on 15/12/2020 to info@sizewellc.co.uk/dpo@edfenergy.com with BHS guidance leaflets attached)

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes
 No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

We acknowledge that EDF have full control over the branch line during the construction phase but not over the Ipswich to Lowestoft line. This line is not currently used for freight at all and would need upgrading if EDF's plans to adjust the percentages sea/rail/road. My impression is that this would not fit in with the current timetable or infrastructure.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

There is already a gap in the afternoon timetable to accommodate Nuclear Flask trains. As someone who does not believe that Nuclear is a feasible way forward on this particular site for dozens of reasons, I do not accept that altering the timetable is acceptable.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Having seen a presentation detailing all the proposed Beach Landing scenarios, I am none the wiser. They consisted of computer generated graphics and Powerpoint scripts. They did not touch on the pressing wildlife mitigation issues. Some practical demonstrations of existing technology would help us understand the possibilities for this delicate beach habitat.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

I think you will find that when the people of Suffolk finally wake up to the reality of a third, much larger Nuclear Power Station shoehorned between an Area of Outstanding Beauty and a Site of Special Scientific Interest they will oppose any and all tweakings of the percentages.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I do not have the expertise to comment in detail on these proposals, suffice it to say that all of them will disrupt a rare and beautiful coastline which is eroding fast, involve dredging, always a bad practice and a damaging one I believe. The sea bottom is fragile enough.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

You should not even consider impinging on a SSSI.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

None of these rather ill thought schemes has the support of English Nature, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the RSPB or indeed any conservation organisations. This should be sign that they are all non starters.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I do not believe that the pollution generated by the building works will be mitigated by this proposal. Water is too precious a habitat for this kind of 'adjustment.'

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I simply do not believe that this is anything other an attempt to patch over an incurable possibility.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Appropriate provided you never, ever consider building Sizewell C, let alone D.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I have no idea whether any of this makes any sense although 'moving the deckchairs around on the Titanic' comes to mind.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These are all 'window dressing' as far as I can see.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not agree the proposal for multiple overnight freight train movements through Melton. EDF has guaranteed no freight trains through Leiston between 23:00 and 07:00 and should do the same for Melton and Woodbridge.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I totally oppose the extra movements of 300m long heavily laden trains at night. You need to invest in upgrading the capacity and resilience of the East Suffolk railway line so you can run extra trains in the daytime if you must. It seems that double tracking between Melton and Wickham Market would be a cost effective option, which would also help to level up the local infrastructure, which might attract Government support. You could also hold trains at Ipswich instead of Leiston to allow daytime working on the East Suffolk line. You could consider reducing the frequency of passenger trains slightly.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I think its entirely appropriate to bring heavy materials in by sea, and I find it astonishing that you need to bring so much by land.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I think its entirely appropriate to bring heavy materials in by sea, and I find it astonishing that you need to bring so much by land.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

If this reduces rail and road transport then I'm all for it.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Great Glemham Parish Council

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Great Glemham Parish Council would like to register their support for the proposed landscaping bund at the Hacheston Park & Ride site. However we do remain disappointed that there has been no engagement regarding the traffic management protocols that will need to form an integral part of any development consent order to prevent rat-running to the two park & ride sites (which will not be subject to monitoring by EDF) and regarding convoy times, particular from Hacheston to Sizewell.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Freight by road (A12) I believe that the public has been consistently misled about the proposed number of HGV movements along the A12. At the start of this project in 2012 EDF stated that there would be a peak of 300 (600 2-way) HGV movements using the A12 between the Sizewell C site and the Seven Hills interchange (A12/14). This figure was already intolerable to the existing populations abutting the A12 due to increased traffic congestion, light, air and noise pollution as a result of these movements. Since 2012 East Suffolk Council (LPA) has given planning permission for many residential developments bordering this A12 route including a large 2000 home development at Brightwell Lakes in Martlesham and consequently future residents will have to suffer the effects of these HGV movements. Furthermore, these new residents, with their vehicles, will contribute to the already heavily congested A12 at Martlesham making HGV journey times even greater and slower. This latest proposal now suggests that the peak

will be 350 (700 2-way) HGV movements WHICH IS AN INCREASE IN HGV MOVEMENTS NOT A DECREASE. If 60% of freight transport by road equated to a peak of 300 HGV movements then 40% SHOULD EQUATE TO 200 HGV MOVEMENTS. Freight by rail The East Coast rail route is not suitable for a large number of heavy freight movements as it has always been mainly used to connect Lowestoft with Ipswich for inter-village communication, tourism, commuter services and negligible freight from Sizewell B. The route passes through many small villages and has numerous level crossings. It is absurd to suggest and impose on residents abutting the route to tolerate the noise pollution and vibration resulting from any large movement of freight for Sizewell C (and B) over the next 10-12 years. Consequently I am opposed to the existing proposal for rail usage let alone an increase. In conclusion, EDF must realise that the Suffolk site is totally different to the Hinkley Point site, being that the Sizewell site is not only in an environmentally sensitive area but has numerous pockets of population whose existence and livelihoods deserve to be respected. Hinkley Point has not been a good example of development and has been more expensive than originally conceived and the protections quite rightly demanded by the existing population and councils of Suffolk will require even more funding especially as even the A12 is not up to standard for such a major development that Sizewell C demands. I therefore object to any increase in Sizewell C freight movements by road or rail. In fact I wish to see a major reduction in usage of road and rail for Sizewell C freight with the vast majority of the freight being delivered by sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The East Coast rail route is not suitable for a large number of heavy freight movements as it has always been mainly used to connect Lowestoft with Ipswich for inter-village communication, tourism, commuter services and negligible freight from Sizewell B. The route passes through many small villages and has numerous level crossings. It is absurd to suggest and impose on residents abutting the route to tolerate the noise pollution and vibration resulting from any large movement of freight for Sizewell C (and B) over the next 10-12 years. Consequently I am opposed to the existing proposal for rail usage let alone an increase.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Not technically competent to express a view.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Not technically competent to express a view.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Not technically competent to express a view.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There should be NO SSSI CROSSING

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The existing fen meadow habitat on the SSSI should be left intact.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Mollett's Partnership

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

As consistently stated in our responses to earlier consultations, we fully support measures to use sea and rail to reduce the volume of materials being transported by road.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Whilst we supportive of the general approach to increase the use of rail, we are disappointed that more effort has not gone into increasing overall rail capacity through the timely construction of passing loops.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As consistently stated in our responses to earlier consultations, we fully support measures to use sea and rail to reduce the volume of materials being transported by road.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As consistently stated in our responses to earlier consultations, we fully support measures to use sea and rail to reduce the volume of materials being transported by road.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

As consistently stated in our responses to earlier consultations, we fully support measures to use sea and rail to reduce the volume of materials being transported by road.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Anything that minimises the heinous effects of this project on supposedly protected areas and RSPB Minsmere in particular are welcomed.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Whilst we find the destruction of any natural habitat inappropriate - particularly in areas that are supposed to have statutory legal protection - we are supportive of habitat creation elsewhere. Whether this can ever be considered as adequate replacement for the lost habitat is debatable.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The decision for the long-term use of this area should be guided by conservation bodies.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The minimum amount of greenfield land should be used for this development and the use of existing brownfield land is welcome.

Question 12: Associated development changes**a) Reduction in land required**

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Yet again – an opportunity lost! EDF Energy have once again missed an opportunity to demonstrate that they are acting on or even listening to the views of those affected by their Two Village Bypass proposals. As members of FERN we fully endorse their submission (under separate cover), but also feel the need to submit separately due to additional factors concerning ourselves and our business.

a. Lack of Detail – There is still a fundamental lack of detail, which has compromised our ability to make a reasonable assessment of your proposals and to judge if they are suitable or not. Proceeding to a formal DCO application prior to providing such detail and allowing those affected to respond has seriously undermined the credibility of your consultation process. It has also blighted our business and prevented us from moving forward, given the uncertainty of the situation you have put us in.

b. Proximity – A new single-carriageway road running along the indicated alignment will bring the edge of the A12 to within 150m of our farmhouse and private gardens, and 50m of our paddocks. This is unacceptably close and will have a significantly negative impact on our family, guests, business, land-use and property value. Despite consistent representations from our two parish councils, County Councillor, neighbouring properties and neighbouring businesses, no re-assessment of EDF's poor choice of Two Village Bypass route has been offered; despite the many and clear advantages of an alternative to the east of Foxburrow Wood being highlighted. We therefore continue to fully support the proposal to re-route the Two Village Bypass through the gap between Foxburrow Wood and Palant's Grove, based on the greater good it will serve. The shallower ground levels would also allow road construction with smaller gradients, thereby keeping vehicle-derived noise and air pollution down.

c. Speed Limit – We are wholly opposed to a 60 mph speed limit being introduced on the new bypass. The change from 50 mph to 60 mph will mean noise levels experienced here will greatly increase, especially taking into the direction of the prevailing wind. Vehicles accelerating and going through the gears to and away from the roundabouts on the A12 (especially heavy lorries) will add significantly to noise and pollution. We have not had a satisfactory explanation about the noise and pollution impact on our particular property nor, therefore, adequate information about potential mitigation.

d. Noise and Vibration – Modelling in earlier bypass reports assessed that several properties along the proposed alignment – including our own – will experience noise levels in the "red" zone, which is detrimental to an extent that is considered hazardous to health and well-being. Again there has been no response to our concerns on these issues. Indeed we have been designated as "not significantly impacted" without any survey or documentation to support this complete U-turn from previously assessed information. We have asked again and again for noise reduction measures such as low noise road surfacing and noise attenuation fencing / bunding, especially as the proposed bunding is so low as it comes past us, as to be completely ineffectual. Again, this has fallen on deaf ears.

e. Air Quality – The consultation process has acknowledged that such a bypass would increase levels of NOx (oxides of nitrogen) and carbon emissions, which will adversely affect properties along the proposed alignment. What measures will be taken to eliminate or mitigate these effects or compensate for them? Again, we would suggest that the easterly route alignment would be much more appropriate. And again we would ask for proper documentation, surveys, etc.

f. Light Pollution – We are concerned that 24x7 lighting of the proposed roundabout at Friday Street will lead to light pollution and cause a loss of the dark sky views that can currently be obtained here. Such things enrich our lives and bring pleasure to those visiting (often from more built up areas) and would be shame to destroy. Lighting design should be used to minimise the effects of any mandatory lighting beyond the roundabout surface itself. Again, there has been no response to our concerns.

g. Wildlife – By creating a new physical barrier, the proposed route will sever and disrupt established wildlife corridors connecting multiple habitats. These routes are known (and documented) to be extensively used by Muntjac, Red Deer, Roe Deer, Fallow Deer, Red Fox, Brown Hare, Badger and Hedgehogs. Construction will also destroy land, hedgerows and mature trees actively supporting Harvest Mouse, Wood Mouse, Field Vole, Common Shrew, Grey Squirrel, Weasel, Stoat, Skylark, Meadow Pipit, Barn Owl, Tawny Owl, Little Owl, Shelduck, Kestrel and Common Buzzard. Many of the above listed species are recognised as being in national decline, with ever-decreasing habitat.

h. Agriculture – As well as the loss of productive farmland due to the new road's footprint (and associated works), the proposed route will also subdivide existing parcels with the effect that they will become either physically inaccessible or uneconomic to farm. Future access would also require rights of way which do not currently exist; the destruction of hedges; and/or the bridging of water courses. If this project nonetheless proceeds, we would like to see annexed land parcels used constructively and sensitively to create both visual-impact and noise-abating buffers between the new road and affected households and businesses. As yet we have still had no response to our concerns nor can we see any details addressing them in the DCO submission or this consultation.

i. Environment – The proposed route (and associated works) will be within close proximity of several ponds (and therefore neighbouring countryside) known to support Newts, Frogs, Toads, Rudd, Mallard, Moorhen, Dragonflies, Darters, Grass Snakes and Bats. As well as ground water contamination, we are also concerned about disturbance of ground water levels – which our ponds follow and are therefore dependent upon. Again no details have been provided, nor surveys carried out to assess the impact on us.

j. Drainage – The proposed route crosses a drainage ditch carrying surface water from much of Mollett's Farm (and other arable land to the east) towards Friday Street. Parts of the proposed route and adjacent land are already subject to flooding and run-off during severe weather events. But yet again, there are no details or responses to our many concerns as to how this will affect us.

k. Irrigation – Water that is essential for the irrigation of certain crops at Mollett's Farm is pumped overland from stored and bore-hole derived sources at Friday Street. The crops that require this water perform an important role in both the health of the arable land (being a break crop in the farming rotation) and in the income derived from it. Severing this facility would cause financial hardship - requiring mitigation. But no one will respond to our concerns nor is there anything in the DCO application or this consultation.

l. Access – Land at Mollett's Farm benefits from an historic right of way to Friday Street, which the proposed route will sever. This and other permissions (including a Public Right of Way) allow ourselves, our guests and walkers from the direction of Farnham to access the Friday Street farm shop, butchers, fishmonger, antiques centre, café restaurant and car-boot sale. Aside from any legal issues, the loss of this route would have a material effect on the attractiveness of our tourism business, as it connects our self-catering and caravan site visitors with local shops and services. This route is also used by agricultural vehicles moving between land parcels. Suggesting that the route will still exist across the new road is ludicrous at best, as pedestrians and high-speed vehicles do not mix well. Given the proposed traffic flows and speeds it would be highly dangerous to cross the bypass, if indeed possible at all.

m. Rights of Way – The proposed route severs two other well-used footpaths between Farnham village and the ancient woodland at Foxburrow Wood (known locally as the "bluebell wood", on account of its prolific display each spring). As well as being Public Rights of Way, they also connect walkers to the Greenwood burial ground, Snape and unspoilt countryside beyond. The one passing between Farnham Hall and Farnham Hall Farmhouse also carries both private and agricultural traffic. The mitigation proposed is woefully inadequate. On the specific question of re-routing the PRoW footpaths near Walk Barn Farm, the SCC-proposed Option 1 makes sense – particularly given the historically poor directional signage in this area. Should a wider consensus be reached that a larger deviation from the current PRoW route is acceptable, then Option 2a would be preferable. In either case, we would urge the County Council and landowner to improve the PRoW signage in this area. Despite being horse owners ourselves, we cannot support the proposed footpath-to-bridleway upgrade as it stands. The current proposals are dangerous and inadequate.

n. Tourism – Tourism in Suffolk is worth an estimated £1.85bn per annum and is said to account for 13% of all employment. East Suffolk Council estimated 2019 tourism spend as £211.70 per person and we currently bring 1,000 guests a year to the area. Their tourism business plan for 2017-22 found visitors were attracted by the character, culture, festivals, music, art, food, drink, clean beaches and spectacular coastline. We are concerned about the inevitable disruption our tourism business will suffer during bypass and Sizewell C construction, as well as the impact of

other traffic increases encouraged by an upgraded road infrastructure. It is widely acknowledged that the quiet, rural nature of Suffolk is intrinsic to its tourism industry, which is significant in value. These characteristics and the unspoilt landscape immediately around us are fundamental to our business and would be seriously affected by the additional traffic Sizewell C would create and, specifically, by this bypass. Even if we had the opportunity to accept workers to take up accommodation, it is at significantly lower rates and with higher wear and tear – this would make our business unviable as the levels offered are not even enough to cover our costs. There is no doubt that tourists would not come and even if they did the detrimental effects of poor reviews (based on noise and disturbance) would decimate our business and the reputation we currently enjoy. o. Construction – Inadequate information has been provided about the adverse effect of this road's construction – such as noise, vibration, dust, light pollution, contamination, traffic disruption, temporary loss of access – or on its mitigation. EDF's proposed construction compound at Friday Street also appears unacceptably close to the two Stockhouse Cottages, The Old Police House and ourselves. These factors cannot be ignored, should be minimised and must also receive careful consideration before accepting such a scheme. Building this bypass as well as the power station itself is likely to make our business totally unviable. The inevitable noise and disruption is set to completely devastate our livelihood, yet in your proposals you fail to address any of our concerns or even respond to our issues. p. Compensation – What measures will you put in place to provide legal support and/or compensation for those homes, businesses and land owners disadvantaged by your proposals and activities? Currently your plans show none, as we are not within your red line development boundary. q. Failure to Acknowledge our very Existence – We are constantly overlooked on your plans. Not even being designated as an inhabited property, let alone a business. r. Failure to Consult – We are already blighted by your plans which are putting us in limbo until a decision is made as, obviously, we cannot continue to proceed with our own business plan and further invest in our business as your proposals might make it totally redundant. Despite numerous attempts to engage with EDF, there has been little to no communication or acknowledgement that we even exist. We have in effect the "Sword of Damocles" hanging over our business. We have been unable to progress our business as we would have wished because of the uncertainty. We have planning permissions to add further accommodation and to develop our barn complex, but have been unable to act on these because of the uncertainty, which could make such an investment potentially ruinous should the bypass go ahead. So, yet again we do our part and respond to you in the ever-increasing knowledge that a response or even acknowledgement is far from certain. The triumph of hope over experience, if you like. We even find ourselves wondering if anyone even reads these or if it is just another tick-box exercise for you.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

 Yes No

If so, which?

Ipswich Borough Council

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

If Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

IBC consider that any increase in freight movements above those proposed within the DCO need to be balanced with ensuring no adverse harm on the amenities of those existing and future residents (from new developments). Any increase in freight movements which have the potential reduce passenger trains along the East Suffolk Line is a concern as this could be to the detriment of sustainability with the reduction to a sustainable mode of transport being available to residents of Ipswich and in particular the impact upon the Ipswich Garden Suburb Local Plan allocation. This would need to be considered and assessed as part of any amendments to the DCO.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Any amendments to the DCO application that increase the number of freight movements to those already within the submission must have proper regards to the impact upon those existing occupants along the East Suffolk Line and to the potential impact upon the Ipswich Local Plan allocation for the Ipswich Garden Suburb (3,500 dwellings) with particular reference being made to potential added noise and disturbance and air quality. Further Environmental Work should form part of any amendments to the DCO. IBC wish to highlight that a passing loop between Woodbridge and Samundham would increase flexibility to run additional freight movements. IBC are concerned over the potential reduction in any passenger trains along the East Suffolk Line which could be to the detriment of sustainability with the reduction to a sustainable mode of transport being available to residents of Ipswich and in particular the impact upon the Ipswich Garden Suburb allocation.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I support the proposal to decrease the transport of material from road to rail and sea especially in the early years of the project. Until the site access road I complete, all traffic movements will have to use Sizewell Gap Road (SGR). SGR is the only access road for both Sizewell A and B facilities, and to Sizewell village, Beach View Holiday Park, Sizewell Hall Conference Centre and the Wardens Trust as well as many residential properties. This road is extremely busy at the beginning and end of each working day and has significant leisure traffic especially in summer. There will also be a cumulative impact with ScottishPower Renewables program of works along SGR, which SPR have designated their primary access route for HGV traffic for either an initial 4 year period if both projects run concurrently, or a further 4 year period is carried out sequentially with an undetermined

delay between to 2 phases of work. There are also refuelling outages at B site to consider. Dependent upon when construction of Sizewell C begins, there will be at least 2 outages, or up to 3 before the access road is available. Traffic levels are disruptive now during outage periods with up to 1500 – 2000 additional vehicle movements a day. Attempts at access / egress from Halfway Cottages on SGR become very difficult and at times extremely dangerous, especially during outages, as many drivers do not keep to speed limits or consider the danger of vehicles turning into or out of properties, on a blind bend, and they are travelling at excessive speeds. Residents have many times be subjected to visual abuse, gesticulation and tailgating by some who are in such a hurry going to or leaving work. During outage periods, residents at Halfway Cottages need to time their journeys to start or finish before or after the beginning or end of the working day, 06.00 – 08.30 and 16.00 – 18.30. Adding additional traffic on SGR prior to the new access road completion, added to by SPR traffic, default A & B traffic, plus outages presents a horrifying prospect to all local residents who have no other option to use this road daily.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Whilst I am in favour of more rail freight movements, I am not in a position to comment on any increased nuisance additional trains will cause to residents along the Sizewell Branch line. I also cannot comment on any changes to BR Timetabling as I am not a regular train user as so not directly affected. If more freight can be transferred from road other means, reducing HGV movements on the B1122, this is a positive move.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

In the original DCO it was stated that an increase in a sea-led delivery strategy would lead to increased damage to the beach. If this new strategy is a result of further studies and advanced design from the previous offering, have these studies been ratified by an independent suitable qualified person, i.e. the MMO? I am in favour in the context of removing road delivered freight but have reservations about the BLF extensions leading to increased beach erosion or changes to the seascape. How will introducing additional piles in to the seabed affect natural coastal sedimentary flow? How will these proposals affect fish stocks and marine life?

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Please see answer to question 3

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again, am in favour in the context of decreasing road freight but with reservation on the coastal effects resulting from these proposals as I am not suitable qualified to comment. Placing the options in preferential order: 4, 3, 2, 1.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I share the concerns of RSPB and SWT over restriction / alteration to water levels in the SSSI and surrounding areas. The overriding feature that makes the whole area so special is the absence of roads and tracks making human impact scarce or non-existent. The Suffolk Coast and Heaths and Sandlings are a continuous strip of coastal land allowing the free passage of birds and animals to live, breed and transit through in safety, with many diverse species of plants and animals, including invertebrates, providing food and shelter. I share the concerns of many that disturbing the peace

and tranquillity of this area that is so special will have a direct negative impact on species population during the course of the project. Nature will adapt as it always does but this takes time and may take generations to recover. With regard to water levels, any change to mean levels at Minsmere reserve will be devastating and there is a direct risk of water levels falling if natural water courses become altered through this proposal.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Whilst any habitat creation is welcome and has a positive benefit replacing one area of land with multiple smaller habitats will not address the habitat loss of Sizewell marshes. Many species will be displaced and may not survive or translocate to new areas, especially as they are not contiguous to Sizewell marshes. Whilst the habitat creation at Aldehurst Farm has attracted some species, others have to negotiate the busy Lovers Lane to gain access from Sizewell Marshes and Fen Meadow.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I answer don't know as I am not suitably qualified to make a proper judgement. I can only provide my thoughts and reaction to this proposal. There is mention of this part of the site being a 'foraging habitat for marsh harriers during construction'. This is hardly likely. With a road across the marshes, heavy traffic and trains going in and out of the site, and resultant noise and light pollution 24/7 from construction and contractor lay down activities, the opportunities for any raptor activity is limited as prey will be scarce to non-existent, especially when you look at all the trees and hedges being removed. The water storage being used as mitigation to control water level, though fluvial activity reads a flood control. Surely the opposite is true as digging borrow pits will have the effect of lowering water levels across the area, affecting wetland areas at Minsmere. If the plan is to top up water levels from this development, where will the water come from to fill the storage area. Sufficient detail has not been supplied.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

I have answered don't know as I am not qualified to make a proper judgement. The proposal to remove excess surface water from site. Considered in conjunction with the previous question 8, is the water storage area the primary means of site surface water collection with excess water released via the temporary drainage pipe. In principle this appears a sensible idea though what surveys have been carried out to determine the effects of a discharge rate of 200 litres per second on the marine environment through reducing salinity in the immediate area and resultant erosion of the seabed during discharge. A 1 in 30 year storm event is quoted which may prove correct though weather abnormal patterns are becoming the norm and this frequency rate may be optimistic.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) Any change in sea defence height will increase the visibility of the site in the local area and should be avoided. b) It appears this change is required to stockpile the additional materials delivered to site by sea / rail. Deliveries should be timed to co-ordinate with use. Height increase should be restricted to not alter the already significant visual impact of the construction site activities. c) Further removal of trees is unacceptable d) Boundary changes however minor are not acceptable e) The bridleway crosses Lovers Lane at a point where oncoming traffic does not have a clear view of horse and rider for several hundred metres. There is a national speed limit along Lovers Lane though many users frequently exceed this. A temporary 30 mph speed restriction is currently in place for the public waste disposal site, again the limit is not enforced and generally ignored. Should this proposal proceed a proper Pegasus rider-operated crossing with a significant corral or refuge area for horse, rider and road user safety. Ideally an underpass or overpass provides the safest solution but this entails the loss of yet more land and an unsightly visual intrusion.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1 The use of Sizewell A land should be developed to the max with sympathetic tree planting in Pillbox field and retention of Rosary Cottage garage. Option 2 Any further development of pillbox field is to be avoided at all costs. We do not agree to the loss of Coronation Wood and believe this is a disgraceful act of wanton vandalism especially as this feature has been used as mitigation by both A and B sites as a visual and noise barrier for both sites. To declare the wood unsound and in a dangerous condition is testimony to the inadequate custodianship this wood has endured whilst the responsibility of EdF. Buildings such as the control simulator and visitor centre do not have to be located on or adjacent to the site, this is purely for the convenience of site staff and does not affect the availability or function of these if located remotely at other sites in Leiston. There is land at both Eastlands and Masterlord estates that can be developed for these purposes. The developments as proposed in the local planning application, why were the proposals for Coronation Wood part of the DCO as this is an enabling project?) as totally unacceptable, especially with regard to pillbox field development and the accompanying road junction developments of Sandy Lane.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Happy to support night trains - provided there is sensible consideration for local people to sleep. As it is night time can ALL audible warnings be omitted ie no train hootings and the auto crossings operate on visual warnings only.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Why should other areas benefit whilst Sizewell is abused

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The more that can be moved by rail and sea the better to relieve the pressure on the inadequate roads leading to Sizewell

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I urge as much use as possible of rail for the movement of materials. I do not know what changes to the current passenger timetable are envisaged in question 2c so I cannot comment

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Bringing in materials, especially large or abnormal loads, by sea should be maximised to the greatest extent possible.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above. All possible means should be used to bring as much as possible by sea.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I support any additional beach landing capacity but especially Option 4 on the basis that the greatest possible capacity should be used.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not support Sizewell C due to the huge negative impact on the environment. If Sizewell C was to go ahead, then I would prefer more movement by rail and sea, because I think that they will have less impact on many areas of Suffolk, which is a very fragile and largely unspoilt rural county.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

see answer to Q 1

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I am not sure which has least impact on the environment

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

see answer to Q 3

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

see answer to Q 2

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The whole Sizewell C project will destroy current habitat permanently across large areas of Suffolk. Any proposal creating particular habitat would be some compensation. I think ALL new roads and sites should be scrutinised to reduce their impact and to increase the screening and sound deadening, etc, to reduce the visual and sound impact. Footpaths and their landscaping should also be scrutinised.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

see answer to Q 6

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

see answer to Q 6

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not support the changes for the following reasons: Although rail is slightly preferable to road, the necessary rail route on the NW edge of Kenton Hills, would need to be constructed to take the amount of traffic. This route at present, is a commuting route for many rare bats, including the Barbastelle and therefore the proposed rail route is entirely unsuitable. The extra trains will cause noise and disturbance to residents all along the line for many years. Lorry numbers will not be reduced during the early years of construction. Moving material by sea will severely damage the marine environment and so not to be supported.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I do not support the following options. Night time trains would cause noise disturbance to residents along the east Coast line and the Saxmundham branch line. Extra day time trains will disrupt the hard fought gains local residents have made to get an hourly service on the East Coast line. You have not explained how you intend to work with Network Rail in order to make the fabric of the rail line safe and serviceable. You have not explained about footpaths diversions, level crossings etc. It needs to be clear how this is to be done.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Longshore drift - Building out into the sea to this extent will change the make up of the sand banks. Such an extension will cause coastal erosion further down the coast putting land south of the project in peril. Such a big permanent structure will damage forever the marine ecology for the area. The Sizewell/Dunwich offshore banks protect the stations you have already. Surely you are putting your own stations so far at risk, by putting in the beach landing facility (BLF). The road to the BLF runs adjacent to Minsmere/Walberswick Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar. As well as light and noise pollution, there will be road run off and habitat fragmentation, which will affect internationally protected sites. This disturbance cannot be tolerated next to such a protected area.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

It is uncertain as to how long 'temporary' means. So much work on the beach will only ruin what is a delicately balanced habitat for rare plants and invertebrates. It is a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and as such should be protected from development of any kind. The plants on this land help to keep the structure of the habitat. Even if you keep the substrate for replanting, I am not sure that the seeds will stay alive for long enough waiting for a

replant. There is no accurate or certain information provided on how you plan to restore the habitat. As for the many reptiles, translocation is rarely successful. A completely new area would need to be found. It is important not to add animals to a existing habitat, as you will be in danger of overloading the new area. All that and there are also humans who regularly walk this area. How will you provide for people who find that they can no longer use this space?

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Piers need piles. So whatever pier you choose will cause damage as piles cause long term scouring at the base. There will be an ongoing need to dredge the area. So in an area of the Southern North Sea which has two levels of protection, Outer Thames Special Protection Area (for Red throated Diver) and Special Area of Conservation(for Harbour Porpoise), you are proposing to damage the area. The longer the projection, the worse the damage to the sea habitat will be.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There should not be a road over an SSSI. You have not given any thought to how you could avoid crossing this area. The culvert is too long and dark. Animals will not use it. You have only thought about otters crossing. There is a great range of creatures living now on this SSSI who will not be able to cross the area. Habitat fragmentation. The trees you plant will not adequately restore the habitat that has been around for so long.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

You admit that creating new habitat is challenging to achieve. There is a very low, long term success rate for establishing fen meadow. It is a habitat that has developed over many many years. Also your proposed site is miles and miles away from the SSSI you intend to destroy. Altering the water levels on the existing site will put in jeopardy the remaining part of the SSSI.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Natural England tells me that wet woodland takes 30 years to establish. If you are removing wet woodland you should have begun you replacement wet woodland at the earliest opportunity. Marsh harriers will not use marshes which are polluted by noise, light and human disturbance. I can't believe that you are asking whether I would like a wetland marsh or a wet woodland. I would like all of the amazing, protected, habitats of this unique area, to be cherished for years to come.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

The hard surfaces of the site will increase run off. The proposed pipe will take two years to come into use. In that time the delicate balance of the water levels on the marshes could be compromised. It is likely that there will be silt build up and blocked ditches. A delicate balance.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

10a - A hard sea defence will speed up erosion on the coast in surrounding locations such as Thorpness and Minsmere. More frequent storm events are likely to make matters worse. The 'temporary sea defence' to which you refer is to provide a clear space behind so that tunnelling works for a cooling structure can be put in place. It is not to 'simplify the structure'. 10b - Taller cranes and stockpiles will have a greater impact on the ANOB. 10c - Trees are being removed already before Natural England have given licence, for example in Coronation Wood where roosting bats have had their surrounding trees removed. Veteran trees must not be removed. Changes to tree retention means 'we are going to concrete over more than we planned in the first place'. 10d - The Marsh Harrier compensation site will be too noisy and disturbed, the habitat creation sites are unlikely to succeed. 10e - Aldhurst Farm. If it is a wildlife reserve it will not succeed with disturbance from people eg. horse riders, dogwalkers, cyclists etc . If it is a country park there will not be the biodiversity gains needed to replace what has been lost. You must be clear as to what this area is really meant to be for, not just green wash.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The Training centre should be in Leiston where people live. Pillbox Field should remain as acid grassland, another rare habitat in this area. It provides insects and small mammals as a valuable food source for owls and bats. I fail to see how the cutting down of Coronation Wood is lawful. I can only hope that you restore the area and make good this travesty.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

12a - Finally something we can agree to. 12b - So many boundary changes are very stressful for local people. You need to be clear and open about all changes however minor. What is the proposed change to public right of way? I need to know before being able to comment. 12c - The Park and ride is too close to the town and residents are concerned that there will be a rat run through the narrow main streets. Although landscaping is a slight improvement it does not take away the fact that the Park and Ride is not wanted.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I believe that you should keep as much traffic off the roads and lanes as possible.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As much as possible should be moved by rail

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

What can't be moved by rail should go by sea.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

If this increases the amount that can be taken of the road then it should be done

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Any improvement is welcome. Option 4 provides the greatest capacity.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

If you have to encroach on the SSSI then minimising the intrusion is to welcomed

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I do not know enough about Pakenham to know if this is appropriate or worthwhile.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

This is a question which should be answered by people more knowledgeable. Please take advice from the independent environmental experts.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Your mention of Coronation wood prompts me to say how appalled I am that you are already felling the wood before any consent has been granted.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Any reduction in land use, however small, is good. 12 a

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Living near to the railway line I am concerned about the disruption to sleep as we hear when trains pass the level crossings.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As above if these trains are to run overnight

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This is likely to be very damaging to the nature reserve at a time when we know that the birds and other wildlife in this area are declining nationally.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

I would be concerned at the splitting and potential isolation of habitats

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Sea transport has the least impact on the county. Road would increase pollution and CO2 emissions and would destroy wildlife and tourism in the area. Rail would cause issues with residents close to railway lines where they would suffer the impact of vibration and noise especially at night.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Daytime movements are to be encouraged. Night time movements will result in sleep deprivation for the residents nearby who suffer the noise and vibration from the trains and level crossing barrier systems

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Temporary features best so they can be removed at the end. Not sure how coastal erosion works here.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Find another way of doing this so it doesn't interfere with the SSSI or RSPC Minsmere or Eastbridge

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

You can never replace lost habitat

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Keep wetland habitats. Just don't build Sizewell C as you will be destroying a beautiful area of natural land for wildlife

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Against the whole development. It's too much for even the modified infrastructure

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The new railway will be damaging to the ecology of East Suffolk.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The ecology of the beach and sea bed will be destroyed by these developments. The beach should not be used in this way

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The coast is an ecological heaven and should not be used for industrial purposes

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The whole development is inappropriate

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

These sites are far away. The exististing ones must be retained

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

See above

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Enough trees have been destroyed already with the telling of Coronation Wood. The whole development is inappropriate for east Suffolk and will destroy the area.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I believe more freight can be moved quietly and efficiently by sea thus not having an impact on residents living close to the rail lines.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The disruption to local residents is too impactful and sea transportation is a better option.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I agree that this is the best solution

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Agreed that this is the right solution

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am in favour of sea delivery of as much freight as suitable and realistic to ensure residents have limited traffic movements and pollution levels are kept to a minimum

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I am not sure about the environmental impacts of this

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name
[REDACTED]

Email
[REDACTED]

Address
[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
Yes No X

If so, which?
[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:
S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Set backs in construction will lengthen the short period and impact passengers using the rail line

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Whenever man tinkers with one part of the Suffolk coast there are always repercussions elsewhere on the coast, usually in the form of erosion

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Keep as much as possible off the roads

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Possible repercussions on Minsmere

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Doubt whether the developers will be motivated to see through

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

It would be unsightly in a formerly beautiful area

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This added rail movement will disturbed some [REDACTED] but the increase in train movements will cause far less disturbance to the most,. More businesses would be impacted and costs to local people and businesses would be increased by road movements, congestion and it will reduce accidents on the roads.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This sea movement will cause far less disturbance to the most. This method shall reduce congestion, keep those happier who live close to the rail lines, and it will reduce accidents on the roads. The rail infrastructure shall receive less ware and tear utilising the sea method. More businesses would be impacted and costs to local people and businesses would be increased by road movements.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above, either or both increase is better for all concerned

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

happy either way and suggest this is worked up with the local specialist

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I think this is acceptable and preserve the country side.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Again this should be worked with local specialist for the best long term enjoyment of the public.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Anything to enhance the bridleway shall be beneficial.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Go by local opinion for the best option

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

It's obvious that the major infrastructure changes to our roads would irreversibly damage our sensitive environment and the ongoing environmental effect of the increased traffic would be highly detrimental to health and well-being of our natural capital and local populations

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

If this project goes ahead then rail seems to be the least worse option

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I'm not sure what effect this will have on things like erosion and disruption of tidal movements, so I can't say

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I'd need to see a very detailed review of potential environmental effects of these proposals before I can comment

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

This is the problem. I don't think anything that is going to cause untold damage to the SSSI can be appropriate

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This is absolute rubbish. No loss of habitat in the SSSI is acceptable to me. Talking about 'replacement habitats is so disingenuous. You can't replace what is going to be lost.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wetland habitats are precious and should be retained

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

You've already buggered up the footpath with flooding so people can't get access to the beach from Sizewell Belts. How can we trust that you know what you are doing with regard to appropriate discharge of rainfall?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1 seems to be the least damaging

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The proposal to run up to 9 trains backwards and forwards at night through populated areas is unacceptable. The noise and vibration of the freight trains carries long distances and will disturb many residents sleep patterns for years. As currently indicated, the minimum number of years will be 11, but in reality, this is likely to be much longer to allow time in the immediate future to improve the line and to allow for the inevitable project slippage

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

You have phrased these questions badly in that the proposal does NOT suggest running these trains each day but each night. I have explained my concerns re the ongoing disturbance of residents sleep particularly in Melton and Woodbridge where the train line runs through and very close too highly populated areas. If Lewiston can have an 11pm to 7 am curfew on trains running through the town, so should Melton and Woodbridge. There is no difference. The disruption will be the same and noise and vibration carries far and wide.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

[REDACTED]

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.



Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This would change the landscape, effect the marine-life and ruin the beach

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above plus it won't be temporary, the build will take at least 10 years

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I can't support any of these options for the reasons given above

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

It's still impacting the SSSI

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Losing the original habitat is unacceptable and no further man made constructed habitats will compensate

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

It's not temporary, it will be there for ten years or more and will ruin the beach environment

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All of these have a detrimental effect on the area. Where it's proposed to create sea defences and bridleways, I can't say if the benefits outweigh the risks

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I can't say if the benefits outweigh the risks

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know X

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I can't say if the benefits outweigh the risks

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Moving materials by rail and sea will minimise local disruption and damage to the local infrastructure.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This seems like a measured plan and enables bringing in more material by train.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I don't like the permanent nature of this structure on the coastline.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

A temporary facility would enable sea transport of materials, which will lessen local disruption and stress and damage to local infrastructure.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am taken aback at the scale of what is proposed.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Please take measures that do as much as possible to protect a site of Special Scientific Interest.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I understand this to mean three sites of fen meadow habitat - in which case I support it.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

All that can be done in the circumstances.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

For ecological and public health reasons, using roads and trucks would be disastrous. Presumably the sea would be far better than rail.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

My support is conditional on not running trains after midnight and before 6:00 am.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Sea transport is by far preferable to train and road.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Obvious

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The more by sea, the better!

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The timing/lateness of the changes are highly suspicious and came too soon after many people had taken time and trouble to respond previously.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The disruption the building of Sizewell C would cause is completely/totally unacceptable. Noise and pollution to those along the railway line would blight their lives for the est 10 years involved.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The effect on the seashore and surrounds over the proposed construction period are totally unacceptable. No amount of high cost "extras" would make this site suitable for a new nuclear plant. There is no mention of long-shore drift - manmade attempts to challenge the strength of the sea are continually broken down and putting objects in the way causes even more damage and change along the coastline.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See previous

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

see previous

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Unfortunately, building over, beside, along SSSI's cannot undo the decimation this construction would cause. This is man against nature. It would be impossible to "hide" a new power station and EDF levelling Coronation Wood, which did provide some visual protection for Sizewell B, shows that there is no real commitment to attempts at lasting screening.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

"We can create replacement habitat". Time is not on our/your side.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

"Opportunities" "potential". No real plans and again - time is not on our/your side. No mention of how you will deal with water polluted during construction.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Diversion of the coast path would already have caused disruption. "Temporary" means how long? No mention of testing the water (see previous) | repeat time is not on our/your side.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Pouring more concrete into this site adds to the already huge carbon footprint of the build, completely overshadowing the claim that it is low-carbon. The site is unsuitable on an already tilting, eroding coastline and in light of climate change effects and targets. Wild creatures would be deterred due to construction noise and light. Recreational connectivity would be marred by the visual impact of this proposal. "Three or four trees" removal... how many have you removed already eg Coronation Wood.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All options. I am against the building of Sizewell C completely and am very concerned at ESC allowing destruction of Coronation Wood before EDF had permission to build. Storage of radioactive cells... where do you mention this at all? What part of the existing site do you propose to use, for how long and at what cost to future generations.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All proposals. None will reduce the impact on local communities. Traffic, light, dust pollution. If workers are to be local why is there a need to build accomodation blocks? I do not want this power station built.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

My concerns centre on the proposal to run many trains through populated areas of Woodbridge and Melton at night. These will cause a great deal of disturbance. This is the reason that you are not running trains through Leiston at night. Yet you are prepared to do this to people in Melton and Woodbridge {more populous areas}. What you need to do is spend money on improving the capacity of the rail line so that these trains can be run in the day time. Furthermore without the improvements to the line the infrastructure will be too unreliable to be able to run these trains for 11 years, even at night. The end result would then be that the traffic would be pushed back on the roads. EDF has misunderstood or misrepresented the disturbance effects of night time trains through our village and has given inadequate time for the residents to understand and respond.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I would like to see the maximum amount moved by sea so long as this does not harm the environment.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

I still have concerns about where EDF is going to get the millions of gallons of fresh water needed to run the turbines. the Consultation does not address this.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I am deeply concerned about the proposed erection of Pylons at the site. These were not needed in the 1980s, why with modern technology can this not be avoided now. It sounds like a cost cutting measure to me.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

My concern is the proposal to run many night time trains through densely populated areas of Woodbridge and Melton over an 11 year period. You make a virtue to the residents of Leiston that you will not run trains at night there but then propose to do it in Melton and Woodbridge where more people live and where the level crossings generate more noise. What you should be doing is investing in improving the rail infrastructure so that these trains can be run during the day. Furthermore investment is needed to make that infrastructure robust or else, by default more will end up back on the roads. The noise over an 11 year period will be far worse in Melton and Woodbridge than EDF assume and there compensation measures will be inadequate .

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Where is the millions of gallons of fresh water the reactor needs coming from given that Suffolk is the driest county in the UK. Edf have failed to address this issue despite it being raised by many people and local bodies.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know

Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

, but without a serious upgrade of the A12 and building a link road, the road system in the area is not suitable. Use the railway as you can get more to site with less inconvenience to the 'niby's'

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Far better way of getting bulk materials to site

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Any of the temporary solutions would be suitable as once finished structures will be removed, so won't stay to upset the anti's

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Good idea

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The increase in night trains through Melton is totally inappropriate. It will be highly disruptive to residents.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

It is not clear whether '4 trains per day' is during the day or night or both - assuming during the night as above, the increase is unacceptable.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Freight trains frequently breakdown on East Anglia routes resulting in delays and cancellations to passenger trains. Furthermore, the line from Woodbridge to Saxmundham is single track and this causes delayed trains to wait at either station for a train to pass

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Pls see my reply to Q1

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

A beter alternative to increased rail movements

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Pls see reply to Q3

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 4 would hopefully result in a considerable reduction in rail transport

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Inappropriate for an SSSI

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Inappropriate as stated 'Fen habitats' Also may take several years to create

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Construction water may have high levels of sediment which would disturb and delay establishment of wetland habitats

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Contaminants as well as sediment in surface water may be discharged to the beach during and after heavy rainfall events.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Bridleway will be used by off road cyclists. Loss of trees ('changes to tree retention' PR speak !) is inappropriate

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Staff should be bussed to site from Ipswich, Saxmundham etc. thus reducing size of car parks.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Surely moving material by sea would be less noisy? It's bad enough with the constant bellowing of the fog horn from the trains twice an hour!

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As of my previous comments!

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Using the sea route would be much quieter for local residents who have more than enough every day traffic to poke up with!

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

One BLF should surely suffice?

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Refer to my previous comment please.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Makes sense to protect local wildlife.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Please refer to my previous comment.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Anything to protect natural habit in all areas of use is highly important. Such a small island as the UK, with so many millions of people, way too much green land has been used up for buildings of all sorts. Nature and Greenland is vitally important to humans for mental well being.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Could you not bury the pipe to disperse the water into the sea?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

To be thoughtful to local residents and the natural surroundings habitat is vitally important, and I must admit that I'm not in the least bit happy about any form of nuclear power, I believe in the natural ways of all things is our way forward to nurture our poor raped planet.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I think I have more than made my point as to how I feel overall, in previous comments!

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

We are very concerned about the plan to increase the supply of construction materials by train. There is already an issue with train noise during the day. This is the noise of the bogies on which the carriages rest as they pass on the rails. In addition the new trains have a klaxon instead of a whistle and both the volume and length of use of the klaxon can be heard throughout Woodbridge. We have written to the train operating company on this issue but nothing has been done to mitigate these very intrusive sounds. [REDACTED]

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This is a designated area, AONB which if Sizewell goes ahead will be desecrated to achieve large profits for French & Chinese companies and which, apparently, the British tax payer will end up paying for!

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

It is well documented that the Suffolk coastline is eroding due to climate change. It would seem totally inappropriate to undertake work which would aggravate an already very vulnerable area of the coast.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

See comments above.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

No SSSI land should not be used and RSPB Minsmere should be protected at all costs.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The existing location should not be altered

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C is a very costly and unnecessary white elephant! The money should be spent on renewable energy projects.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

A12 already overburdened. With rail less co2/to be freight. No need to evict people from their homes and land for more roads

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

With only one train per hour on the rest suffolk line there is plenty if capacity, if a rail switch is built trains can pass

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Less impact, could provide a good legacy facility for commercial fishing.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Sea moves preferred

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I am nit sure on which, but build the biggest one needed to take freight off roads

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Better than not doing it, but why is the existing aporiachbroad unsuitable with enhanced sea moves?

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

You can't just slice up the reserve and relocate it. Make better use of land at SZA, e.g. for workshops, offices, support and activities nit directly related to operating SZC

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Sounds ok, but I am but a wetland expert

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Fresh water run off ok

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Bridleway should be footpath only, so vehicles are not able to use it. No habitat boundaries should be changed. All felled trees replaced at ratio 10:1. Ant increases in construction height need to have reduced night lighting.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Make max possible use of SZA land

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

With increases use iyf sea and rail no land outside of the SZC construction boundary should be used

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

More materials need to be moved away from the road network as these are already full to capacity, however I do not agree with trains being used at night time through Melton & Woodbridge. [REDACTED]

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The transport via rail needs to not alter the passenger transport as the rural villages rely on this for commuting and visitors. A second line needs to be installed for use by EDF for day time ONLY transport

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

It should be temporary

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

This can be returned to previously following completion if the community want this

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Sounds good but I worry about effects on habitation and wildlife

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Sounds ok but not sure how it will affect the natural processes

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Will this not contaminate the sea water

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No

If so, which?

Sizewell Residents Association

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

We always understood that as much as possible would be brought in by rail and by sea as many of our roads are country roads and we like them as such, and while there will still be massive road intrusion the proposals will ease some of the strain on villages around...unfortunately not Sizewell itself and residents remain hugely concerned about the use of 'Gap' Road as the one and only access point for ALL construction/personnel traffic during the first phase of construction - this reckoned to be 18 months plus. We have stressed many times how we feel we should not be expected to bear this, and still feel that health and safety/ emergency procedures requirements should forbid this, given existing essential use of this road for all

residents and visitors, as well as A and B stations, outages, Galloper/Gabbard etc. , and the prospect of SPR traffic etc..Having now received your latest figures on expected movements for this part of the road we are even more upset with this aspect of your plans.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Though we would wish construction to be completed in the shortest time possible it is a balancing act between hurry v. excessive impingement on quality of life, and c) is an unnecessary step too far. Living so close to the construction area will be a trial for all of us, so the limits of working hours/days are very important. There should be no carte-blanche situation re extra trains, extra hours, extra night work, extra disruption.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The existing plans involve huge intrusion to the beach area anyway, and to the marine environment/ seabed/ fishing space so it seems sensible to maximise the use of the facility, providing always that good arrangements have already been put in place for communication/ consultation/ consideration of local residents/ fishermen etc.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above, the intrusion to the beach area and marine area are planned to happen, so again maximum use of the intrusion makes sense providing always again that the balancing act between haste of construction versus quality of life for residents/ users has been well considered to agreement.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Options 1 and 2 seem like half a help for construction purposes and seem to involve regular dredging operations, which would likely upset a larger area of fishing/potting space with sediment disturbance etc. On balance options 3 or 4 seem preferable, but of course with good local agreement in place for hours /days of working to limit noise, light, vibration intrusion. When B station was being built for example limits were set on hours for pile-driving and this was extremely helpful. We understand that the aspects of loss of /disturbance to fishing grounds will be discussed to agreement prior to any work commencing. We are aware too that you will address any adverse effects on the coastline/erosion/flooding aspects etc. We have previously raised aspects of concern regarding beach access, maintaining footpaths etc and are reassured that you are aware of these concerns.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

This seems to offer better screening and improved water management.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

It seems that much replacement area has already been provided, and in places more relevant to the intrusion area.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

As long as this does not disrupt walkers, and eases footpath flooding locally.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Concern has been expressed regarding the bridle way crossing the road and it may be that some traffic control measures such as traffic lights would help to reduce danger.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Use of Sizewell A land is entirely appropriate and much more desirable than use of pillbox field, and we would very much welcome this as Pillbox field is important to local people and we would not wish to see cars parked on it, nor using Sandy Lane. It is a buffer between leisure and industry and we would very much hope that this can continue to be the case. The additional screening would help this too.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes
 No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes
 No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

 Inappropriate X

 Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

 Appropriate

 Inappropriate X

 Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

 Appropriate

 Inappropriate X

 Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C should not be built.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

 Appropriate

 Inappropriate X

 Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

 Appropriate

 Inappropriate X

 Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

 Appropriate

 Don't know

 Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C should not be built.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Rolling trains through Melton and Woodbridge at night will damage property prices, reduce sleep, increase noise pollution and disturb wildlife. Is it not possible to upgrade the rail infrastructure to increase daytime rail? This is an incredibly unfair thing to put on people - and for years?!

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Running these trains at night at all is unacceptable -- for so many years! -- and one of the options is SIX times a night?! I understand you're not running trains through Leiston - why, then, Woodbridge and Melton? And another effect is to mess with our timetables? Run the trains during the day if you have to!

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name
[REDACTED]

Email
[REDACTED]

Address
[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
Yes No X

If so, which?
[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:
S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

slow and steady would be better as too much delivery at once could go wrong

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Is it appropriate the consideration that the view would be better from the sea. there will be another power plant built ! I think advice should be gained as to what would be best for the environment not what looks good.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The fen meadow should be as near the lost sight as possible.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

If any wetlands are developed it would have to definitely still be there after construction is completed

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Could the pipe be longer and go straight into the sea to stop erosion of the beach from inland.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Increased rail use on such a small rural line will damage the local environment in numerous ways. This is essentially a computer line from the Heritage Coast to Ipswich and beyond to London. It currently offers an excellent community facility. Running overnight freight trains on such a consistent basis as proposed will obviously disturb the local environment and especially for those who live within earshot of the track itself - that is most of Woodbridge and Melton. [REDACTED]

There will also be a very clear risk of disruption to the commuter services as much of the East Suffolk line is single track and it is clearly foreseeable that on occasions the freight trains will break down or be delayed or experience track issues which will mean that they in turn obstruct and disrupt the commuter services.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The line simply won't be able to cope with any additional freight traffic let alone the heavy freight envisaged.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

This would reduce the direct impact upon the local population but Sizewell beach and the surrounding area is one of stunning natural beauty and any additional sea transport will inevitable damage it.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

See above.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I have absolutely no confidence in the ability of EDF to put such proposals into effect and achieve the aims referred to.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

The environment is not a commodity that can be bartered by offering potential improvements in one location to offset damage in another.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

My view is that these areas should remain untouched.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes**a) Reduction in land required**

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Don't know

Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Requires less ruination of the area and by sea would cause minimum disruption

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This area is not a building site where every single aspect of every public facility has to revolve around SZC

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Stops more road alterations, lorries, lorry parking and disruption. Sea transport has to be an obvious option

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above - all by sea makes obvious sense

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again more by sea and less by road

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This is nonsense. You've ruined Coronation Wood already. If you do these meadows you should make them big and spend money on them

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

As much existing habitat must be kept

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The existing road network between Sizewell and the A12 Orwell Bridge is already at capacity for extended periods. The A1152 through Snape and Melton is extremely congested and passes through the Melton crossroads traffic lights which already back up to the level crossing in peak periods or following a train closing the level crossing gates. The existing railway should be re-dualled from Saxmundham to Woodbridge to allow more frequent material movements by rail without resorting to increased activity at night. It should be noted that EDF's pre-Hinckley PWR at Flamanville in Normandy is currently a decade behind programme and £8.2billion over budget. Hinckley is equally behind programme and falling further behind

as time passes. Any decision regarding the infrastructure facilitating the construction process should therefore factor in the inability of EDF to deliver projects on time and the consequential disruption to the surrounding areas over an extended period.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The East Suffolk line was built to mainline standard with two tracks. If EDF wish to increase rail volumes then the track should be returned to a dual track format between Saxmundham and Woodbridge which would obviate the need to disrupt passenger timetables and allow more running during daylight hours. given the constraints on the network at Ipswich and further afield, Trains could be held at the underused sidings adjacent to Ranelagh Road to the north of Ipswich station.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The more material transported by sea the less the impact on the surrounding area, it is thus to be welcomed. Equally, Lowestoft docks should be utilised which would bring employment back to this deprived area.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The more material transported by sea, the less the impact on the surrounding area, it is thus to be welcomed. The area to the south of Sizewell is not scientifically important and any works should ensure that the cliffs at Thorpeness are protected.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The largest possible pier should be used, they are all eyesores but at least the largest option at 590 deliveries per year (~3 x Option 1) would speed the process and reduce the number of rail/road movements accordingly.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Its a sticking plaster to salve the politicians conscience when they shaft the RSPB.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Its a sticking plaster to salve the politicians conscience when they shaft the RSPB. It is the least you can do.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I would support the RSPB view in this area.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Any surface water outfall should utilise an Oil interceptor or suitable filtering to prevent pollutants entering the sea. During construction projects, inevitably things get spilt. At 0.5m, its only a small pipe after all.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The use of existing brownfield land within Sizewell A is to be welcomed. It is not unreasonable to expect the NDA to facilitate the use of Sizewell A and minimise the need for further encroachment on the surrounding area.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The Southern P&R should be totally screened from the B1116 and A12.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Further heavy vehicle traffic will increase air pollution and make the area less attractive for tourism.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Impact on tourism and species habitat. Your proposals are opposed by the RSPB

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See above. The project to build is uneconomic now and will become less so over the course of any proposed construction period.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

This type of traffic in an area valued by residents and visitors is not appropriate in any dimension

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I do not support disturbance of sites of special scientific interest, whether accompanied by cosmetic screening or not.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

As stated you cannot easily create habitat, though destroying it is easy.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Please consult RSPB on this who can advise.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

This area of coast is subject to constant, and often unpredictable change: raising one area changes sea flow and can impact somewhere else. Coastal site is not safe for nuclear, as catastrophe in Japan illustrated 10 years ago.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I do not know these specific sites

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Screening is not the point. This project is inappropriate and unnecessary. Would you kindly provide a fully worked and costed projection for the disposal of nuclear waste from the site for say the next 50 years. The public could then take an informed view of value for money of the entire

scheme.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Try not to alienate the general public further

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

████████████████████ and these are the most effective delivery methods

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Less road movement

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 3 allows greater versatility

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Better for the environment

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

where on onshore additional habitats was created with excellent effect.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Appropriate as additional habitat will be provided

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Minimal disturbance to all, and excess water on construction site areas is a nightmare

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Good mitigation on all aspects

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Railfuture Ltd

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

a) The application approach places too greater reliance on HGV movements by road b) This would reduce reliance upon road movements to service the site and if accompanied by additional investment to increase the capability/capacity of the East Suffolk Line would leave a lasting 'legacy benefit' to develop the line for enhanced passenger services c) While supporting the case for greater use of rail we would support greater transportation of material by sea in addition to making better use of rail as taken in combination, they would minimise reliance on road transport

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Our response is without prejudice to our submission to the Planning Inspectorate. From the limited choice presented by this style of consultation we are generally in favour of all options which avoid the use of HGVs where possible and maximise the use of alternatives, particularly rail. We are disappointed to note that there is no firm commitment on the part of EDF to increase the use of rail, only a statement of 'desire' so to do. We are not yet convinced that the option of creating even greater capacity for rail has been fully explored. The provision of a passing loop between Woodbridge and Saxmundam, as an absolute minimum, would permit more trains to serve the construction site without the restrictions imposed by the present infrastructure. We regret that EDF have not provided any indication as to the costs of the Enhanced Permanent Beach Landing Facility (BLF) nor of the temporary additional BLF, giving us no opportunity to comment upon the relative benefit/cost ratio of these amended proposals. We are therefore unable to evaluate the relative merits of the 'More materials by Sea' option against the costs of providing increased capacity on the East Suffolk 'main line'. If EDF have a genuine interest in leaving a legacy benefit to the local community, we would much prefer there to be investment in additional capacity on the local rail network rather than on a marine landing facility which is of use only to EDF and for a limited period.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

All rail movements should be during day.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

More trains should be accompanied by dueling the line so passenger services are not interrupted

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As much as possible should arrive by sea

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

To allow more to come by sea

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Shouldn't build at all in the Desi but if this totally inappropriate project goes ahead damage to the SSSI should be limited

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am not in favour of building Sizewell C

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I am very much not in favour of Sizewell C

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Bigger environmental impact using rail

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Increased noise pollution affecting wildlife and causing sleep deprivation for people living near the railway line. [REDACTED]

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am really pleased that you feel that you will be able to reduce the number of HGV movements by moving more construction material by rail and sea, provided that this will not have an increased adverse effect on the environment.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

██████████ by any train movements and so I support any proposals which will allow freight to reach the site more efficiently and not have to be transported by road.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I support this option as it will enable deliveries to be made safer.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I think this is appropriate as it will reduce the number of HGV movements.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I think that Option 4 is the best option as it has the highest capacity and so it will greatly reduce the use of HGV's to transport material.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I am really pleased to see these new proposals as I was very concerned that the previous proposal did not allow for the free movement of the wildlife in that area. I am also in favour of these proposals as less SSSI land will be used and it will provide additional flood relief.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

I am in favour of new fen meadow sites being created but am baffled as to how the three proposed sites can be directly linked to be compensation for the loss of fen meadow at Sizewell.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I am in favour of a transition to wet woodland if the experts in that field consider there is a need for it.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I support this proposal as excess water will need to be discharged from the site.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I do not support Option 2 as I consider it imperative that Sizewell A land is used.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

 S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

, how can we be expected to sleep and carry on functioning 9-5 working lives, with no sleep or children be fit enough to study at college and uni. Plus what damage overtime will be done to foundations of houses.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

It's not needed you are pushing things through without enough consultation in a sneaky way. This will be detrimental to our physical and mental health, before even considering the fact you will have devalued our property value, for a lot of us part of our pension.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Not needed people do not want it

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I believe that this major energy infrastructure project should contribute to the Government's environmental aims of reducing harmful emissions from transport. Enhancing and leaving a viable rail at Leiston would benefit local population, business, tourism and reduce road pressure on Aldeburgh and surrounding coastal areas.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I think that any improvement to public transport options is worthwhile and this particular project would be a great way for the nuclear industry to give something back. Possibly work with local Longshop Museum and other local interests to encourage the private running of the line from Saxmundham to Leiston post construction. I would happily live near a railway line.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Potential damage to coastal currents, wildlife and general character of this area of coast.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I fear that any temporary installation would set a precedent and allow for other development. May also harm the natural environment.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

For reasons mentioned above, harm to marine and coastal environment, also more use should be made of the existing rail potential.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Perhaps better than original culvert, but still likely to have a significant impact on increasingly rare plants and animals from light, noise vehicle pollution, restriction of green corridors etc. Please make more use of rail.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Every effort should be made to replace like habitat with like. It should be more joined up.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I don't understand enough about the damage that run off can cause to nearby wildlife habitat. Please try to retain wetland .

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I don't know enough about the proposals and must say that I have answered by gut instinct.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I agree that there is a need to spread the impact of trying to transport goods to site by using as many different means as possible. However I am concerned about the effects on the environment and tourism.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am concerned about the noise of several trains throughout the night and early hours of the morning for such a long period of time.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This is a deliberately pointed question; it is angled at the people who do not understand the question that is being asked. It needs to be written differently.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This whole project is inappropriate; what we need is renewable energy. The proposal is obsolete.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

It is not necessary - we the people of Suffolk do not need a nuclear power station.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Trees planted in accordance to biodiversity rules are never watered, are never mature; this is a get out clause; the trees often die. Minsmere nature reserve is well loved and would be devastated by this proposal.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

A "small amount" is not appropriate in the current climate emergency. No habitat should be lost going forward.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.
EDF and the government have not taken the climate change emergency which is going to see land erosion into consideration.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All trees, natural habitat and Coronation Wood especially should not be touched.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

None of these are necessary. We do not want our coastlines devastated. We are in support of green, clean renewable energy. Nuclear energy is something of the past. Your questions are also deliberately misleading. The final question here requires careful reading; it is only appropriate "if" one accepts that the proposal is given the green light. There are a number of reasons for this opposition, of which, I am sure you, will be well aware.

Nevertheless, it seems germane to list just some of these once again. • China's involvement is quite clearly now hugely controversial. • We are living through a now recognised climate crisis. The proposed plans for Sizewell C should as such strike us all as wholly misguided. The traffic congestion and pollution would be greatly increased and the devastation to the local environment catastrophic. It is well worthwhile you listening carefully to the views of those of the Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership and the RSPB for evidence of this imminent disaster. • The cost to the economy. £20 billion is now the estimated cost. I cannot believe that this money could not be spend more creatively for the greener and more economically viable good. This is the time to find a greener alternative. • 6,000 workers will be brought in rather than be given to those who now find themselves without income in the local area. • Radioactive waste will erode the coastline.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

To double the capacity of the BLF, as now proposed, would involve adding a further 30m to its length. I understand that any projection into the sea disturbs the coastal processes that are based on longshore drift. As the sand and shingle is trapped by the structure, increased erosion is caused further down the coast. The longer this is, the worse the effects. Creating a landing platform on the sea bed would upset the marine ecology and could threaten the stability of the Sizewell-Dunwich offshore banks. These banks are considered to provide protection to the power stations from storms. A road would lead from the BLF to the station platform. This would be directly adjacent to the Minsmere-Walberswick Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar. Deliveries could cause great disturbance to rare birds.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I am very concerned about so much work on the beach. Not only is this greatly valued by walkers along the Coast Path, but there are many rare plants and invertebrates here. This is a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and should be protected. Vegetated shingle supports such rarities as Sea Pea and Yellow Horned Poppy. EDF says they will keep substrate and use it for replanting - but when? This could be a decade later. How long would the seeds last? Under what conditions would they be stored? Butterflies such as the Grayling use this habitat for breeding and basking (thermo-regulating) - as do protected adders and other reptiles. There are plans to translocate reptiles, but that is likely to overload the other habitats, leaving insufficient food to go round.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Any of these four options would cause significant damage. The jetty, originally proposed in the early consultations, had to be abandoned because of the environmental problems it would cause. Piles into the sea bed cause long-term scouring at the base, so that ongoing dredging would be necessary. The Southern North Sea is a protected area twice over: it is part of the Outer Thames Special Protection Area (SPA) for birds, especially the red-throated diver, and it is also a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) mainly for harbour porpoise. EDF have not convinced us that no harm would be caused to these species.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I firmly believe that there should be no road at all over the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – a precious habitat supporting a great many rare and uncommon species. EDF should have followed the Mitigation Hierarchy. The first stage of this is Avoidance. They have done nothing to avoid this crossing. We have never been presented with other less-damaging routes for the access road. The bridge structure is a marginal improvement on the causeway with culvert and is more likely to alleviate problems caused by flooding. The space under the bridge offers the potential for a safe animal crossing – but only if proper fencing is installed to funnel the animals through so that they won't be in danger on the road. EDF are only planning fencing for otters, not for any of the other animals that would be at great risk on the road, e.g. reptiles, deer, that need special fencing. There would still be a long, dark culvert-like structure, through which all the water from the marshes would have to drain – very ecologically damaging. This is smaller than the DCO one (3.6m as compared with 5m). It would, in effect, act as a barrier to fish and aquatic invertebrates that won't go through it, as they use polarization of light for guidance

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at

Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Newly created habitats have a very low success rate. Even if they are well planned and managed by conservationists, only 26%-45% are successful. Those that are developer-led, as here, do even worse, due to lack of monitoring and poor management. Fen meadow is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to recreate, as it is an ancient habitat that has taken a great many years to evolve. We know of none that has been successful in the long term. None of the proposed sites is really close to Sizewell Marshes – and Pakenham is in West Suffolk! Altering the water levels here, as proposed, could damage the existing fen meadow. EDF should not be building into fen meadow at all. This is a very rare and precious habitat. In England, most have been lost to drainage for agriculture.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wet woodland is an uncommon Biodiversity Action Plan habitat that, due to the SZC proposals, would go under concrete. EDF is saying there is 'potential' for wet woodland in the water resource area but such a habitat takes up to 30 years to establish – so why didn't they plant it at the beginning of the consultations, so that we could see if it might be successful? Mitigation guidelines from Natural England emphasise that any compensation habitats must be started well in advance of any construction works.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

c) A great many hectares of woodland would go under concrete, including nearly all of Goose Hill and Coronation Wood. Trees have also been cut down in Kenton Hills woodland and at St James' Covert and elsewhere. I am opposed to loss of woodland especially at this time when we need to increase tree cover - loss of veteran trees could significantly affect the ecology of the area.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

It is my opinion that the substantial volume of traffic using both road and rail will disrupt the lives of the people who live in the area, for some considerable length of time and I consider it unacceptable.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The impact on the environment would be too great. I do not see how trains can run at night without causing disturbance and I do not agree that a new power station should be constructed on this site considering that it is within an AONB.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

With sea levels rising I consider any beach landing facility a waste of time

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I don't want to see a new power station at Sizewell, so I consider all the options a waste of time and resources

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Maintaining an existing habitat is much more viable than creating a new one

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

It is becoming clear the building of large scale nuclear power stations no longer meet the energy requirements of the country. An alternative approach would require no material to be moved at the site.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Habitat disturbance is a major threat to flora and fauna. The larger to project the more intense the disturbance. Smaller regional projects would cause less intense disturbance.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Replacement habitats are a very poor alternative to habitat destruction.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

A more up to date energy policy would make this project redundant and all the changes redundant.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(d) - PIL

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The roads in the local area are small roads and could not cope with heavy traffic, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The track is not in use very often so it has effected many people in a negative way but if it was in constant use it would disturb a lot of local people as the track is very close to a lot of domestic houses!

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

SizewellC is located right by the coast and it would disrupt less people and there lives if this was used to assist with bringing materials in.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The more material that can be brought in by sea would be better.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The more SizewellC can do to help the environment that they are using and replace what they destroy the better it will be for everyone concerned.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

If you are taking parts of nature away you must do what you can to replace it and put back into the environment.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

As long as it does not effect the landscape of Sizewell the water must be put somewhere, I have noticed in recent months that the drainage in the local area is very poor and the roads flood every time.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Very concerned about increased night rail use

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Object to road congestion, pollution, and traffic noise. Object to increased railway noise through Melton, particularly at night, and increased obstruction at level crossings. Support servicing the project by sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Any increase in trains will cause noise and disturbance, a particular concern at night. The passenger timetable is already unreliable, and congestion from construction trains would make this worse.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This is the obvious solution to service the site and minimising the adverse impact on residents throughout the construction period.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Maximise the capacity for deliveries by sea.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

We are concerned about the immediate vicinity and greater Suffolk Coastal area, not WEST Suffolk.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The volume of movement of materials over land on this part of the Suffolk coast will have a serious impact on the environment and on the quality of life of residents. The majority of materials should be transported by sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The running of this volume of trains will be noisy and disruptive of existing train schedules.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The least bad option

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Again, if this takes transport away from land based routes it is the least bad option.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Again, as a way of taking transport from land base routes this would be the least bad option.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Any encroachment on the SSSI is inappropriate

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Any encroachments on or changes to the SSSI are inappropriate

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These changes interfere with the existing habitat and are unwelcome

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not support the building of sizewell C at all. I find that all options will have a negative environmental impact.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This will have a detrimental impact on residents, increased environmental damage and potential inconvenience to vital travel connections.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

You cannot plan to make deliveries safer with something as unpredictable as the sea.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

This would have unnecessary impact on the existing shoreline.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All options would impede on the existing shoreline.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There would still be too much land taken and destroyed.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Again, too much land would be lost and there would be too much of a negative environmental impact.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

This would cause unknown damage to existing areas of habitat.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

There is no guarantee this would be sufficient, and with the increased destruction of habitats and natural sources for water to collect in, there is likely there would be increased surface water than anticipated.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

It is unacceptable and inappropriate to remove additional, or any trees, the existing connections at Kenton Hills is sufficient and is well loved by locals and visitors alike, and the boundary changes still result in massive loss of wildlife habitat and our historic landscapes.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

No land should be touched at Coronation Wood, it is 100yrs+ Old and a valuable habitat.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

There is too much work required and it will change the layout of Suffolk and it's idyllic settings irrevocably. Tourists will not wish to visit. Residents will not want to stay. Wildlife and habitats will be ruined and lost forever. This is not a green, environmental option, and should be stopped. A nuclear power station on an eroding coastline, which has already had cliff falls and continues to be subject to uncertain weather, is an unnecessary risk in this age of renewable, safer energy.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Sea first, rail second, road last. Least disruption by sea, etc. [REDACTED] is already SATURATED with traffic up onto the A12. I fear that this road, with ANY increase in traffic - and there will inevitably be an increase in freight vehicles - will become permanently gridlocked! There is a terrible bend in the road at the railway line, near Melton Station where HGV's coming from Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham have to take up both sides of the road to take the bend - traffic already builds up. It all leads to pollution and is a nightmare. SizewellC Road freight will add to it, unless someone can find the money to straighten that impossible bend in the road at the railway line! Moving on to the Railway. [REDACTED]

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I don't mind how many trains run per day. However many are feasible - I would like to keep the freight off the roads as far as possible. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Leiston have been exempt and Woodbridge and Melton should be given the same status. [REDACTED]

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This is my preferred option.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

option 3 is the middle choice in that it would cause ? intermediate damage to the coastline, marine life and flora, but give high capacity delivery at the same time. Nature has a great way of self recovery but I do hope EDF will pledge to restore the coast line if this is the route they take.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Really good design

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Sounds a reasonable replacement

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Seems like a good idea. I would certainly support wet woodland

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I am not a user of the coast path or its diversion, nor am I familiar with the beach, but it does not seem unreasonable.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) and b) sound like essential safety stuff to me - so yes. Important. c) Trees - not sure where they are and I never like to see a tree go.....

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sorry - unfamiliar with the plans of Sizewell A/B so don't want to comment.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

All appear appropriate

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

To walk in an area of outstanding natural beauty does not and should not mean walking by main roads with heavy traffic.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C is an irrelevant, expensive white elephant which will do nothing to combat climate change. It is purely a money spinner for EDF energy and the French government who are desperate to maintain their nuclear credentials. It is also a dangerous irrelevance since no-one has any idea of the amount of disruption that climate change will cause over the next hundreds of years. On an eroding and increasingly stormy coast, enormous amounts of money will be needed to protect this part of the coast. The impact of that protection on coastal habitats is unknown but is likely to be severe.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

EDF and the UK government are attempting to get this development through on the cheap. The only satisfactory way to move large amounts of goods by rail is during the day on a track that has been fully dualled to allow free running of the trains. The people of East Suffolk and Saxmundham in particular do not want trains rumbling past them during the night for the next ten to twelve years.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Any changes to the coastline must only be done after exhaustive studies of the impacts on the neighbouring areas and the impacts on marine wildlife. A development that is supposed to be fighting climate change (and by implication environmental damage) cannot destroy marine habitats in the process.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above. And I reiterate that Sizewell C is a white elephant. Does the UK government need nuclear engineers to be trained up for the Trident replacement? If so then why does it not come clean about this rather than using the energy sector to train them up at the public's expense.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

As above

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Although an improvement on the previous proposal, it goes nowhere near satisfying the concerns of the local and national environmental organisations. This is a special area, not only for the UK but globally and MUST be protected.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

This in no way compensates for the loss of this habitat in East Suffolk. To make an analogy, it is similar to concreting over the whole of Minsmere and Dunwich Heath and creating a "similar" habitat in Leicestershire. Natural habitats can't just be created, they evolve over hundreds of years. The HS2 construction team have already accepted this fact as they go about destroying ancient woodlands in the course of their work.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

"Potential" is not good enough. I would wish to see certainty and you cannot provide that. Given your track record on honesty (recent fine by the energy regulator), you are not a trustworthy company.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I would wish to see far more information on the content of that surface water. Are you proposing to discharge polluted water into the sea??

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These seemingly minor changes could well mask a multitude of sins. Given that you have already started illegally felling Coronation Wood, how can we trust you on any of this?

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The least damaging option is clearly the best but, given the scale of the damage you will cause through construction, these are minor amendments.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These huge developments will be an eyesore for years to come. Please give up on your plans and stop trying to milk the UK energy consumer. You are not wanted or needed here. If nuclear energy is needed, which is debatable, it is not in the form of these huge plants but in smaller packaged installations that can be sited closer to where they are needed. Suffolk doesn't need your energy - you are supplying London with their power. So, site your power station close to London and minimise the energy losses in transporting it to the capital.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The road network in this area is inadequate for the existing levels of traffic. Without significant improvement, the existing rail network is inadequate.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The road network is inadequate for the amount of traffic in this area. Trains are an important alternative means of transport but this means that the passenger timetable must meet, in the first instance, the needs of passengers. Running trains at through the night is entirely unfair to the many people who live close to the railway line in this area.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This is a rural area, known for its natural beauty. The road and rail systems are already under intense pressure.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I would prefer to reduce HGV use for environmental and regional advantages. However, I would be cautio

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Trains would be desirable over HGVs but not at cost of more cars on the road

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There should be no SSSI impact

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Ecologically nonsensical - you can't just create a mature ecosystem somewhere else.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

These habitats will take time to establish (even if they do become potentially habitable) they cannot compensate for loss of an existing SSSI

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Possible disruption/harm to beach.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 1 seems preferable in terms of impact.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

THE HGV proposals are still massively excessive for the road infrastructure. Your plans will involve huge damage to the environment. Given that there is going to be damage somewhere, the marine environment is less important than the land environment where people live and visit. You should massively increase the movements by sea.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

We are going to suffer enough damage without you changing our passenger schedule - which is already disrupted twice a day by the existing nuclear slots which make a mockery of the "Hourly Service".

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

You must maximise the marine movements.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option 4 is much the least worse.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The two villages bypass is insufficient and it should be a four villages bypass. The Southern Park and Ride facility is in an wholly inappropriate place stretching onto very visible high ground.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

welcomes the changes proposed to the original application and the associated further period of Public Consultation. We particularly welcome the proposed changes to the traffic plan which will see an increased amount of material being moved by sea and rail and a reduction in HGV movements. However, we do not feel that these have gone far enough. An average of 500 two-way movements and up to 700 two-way movements is too many for the existing road network and is very environmentally damaging. Therefore, we would like you to continue and intensify your talks with Network Rail to increase the number of rail movements including running trains six days a week (as happens on the Felixstowe Branch). We are aware of the noise concerns and overnight deliveries should not be excessive, but rail is much more environmentally friendly than

road transport. We also welcome your efforts in extending the use of sea transport to deliver an increased amount of heavy material to the beach. [REDACTED] is yet to be persuaded of the economic benefit of Sizewell C against the environmental damage it's construction will cause. Therefore, we await the outcome of your talks with the Government about how the project is to be funded in the future.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

However, we do not feel that these have gone far enough. An average of 500 two-way movements and up to 700 two-way movements is too many for the existing road network and is very environmentally damaging. Therefore, we would like you to continue and intensify your talks with Network Rail to increase the number of rail movements including running trains six days a week (as happens on the Felixstowe Branch). We are aware of the noise concerns and overnight deliveries should not be excessive, but rail is much more environmentally friendly than road transport.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

We also welcome your efforts in extending the use of sea transport to deliver an increased amount of heavy material to the beach.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

██████████ is yet to be persuaded of the economic benefit of Sizewell C against the environmental damage it's construction will cause. Therefore, we await the outcome of your talks with the Government about how the project is to be funded in the future.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes X No

If so, which?

Peasenhall Parish Council

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name
[REDACTED]

Email
[REDACTED]

Address
[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?
Robert Wynn & Sons Ltd

Job title
[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:
S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Making use of Rail and Sea for the movement of freight should be applauded. The maximising the use of sustainable transport modes for major infrastructure projects such as this should be a prerequisite to permission being granted.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The movement of the largest and heaviest abnormal loads by road can create major challenges and significant disruption to local communities. We would like to support the thinking behind the creation of the BLF and hope that the use of the facility will be maximised through the whole life cycle of Sizewell C. We would ask if there are plans to make it available to Sizewell B and also if consideration is being given to 3rd party use. With the development of marine and wind power in the north sea there may well be opportunities that require shore based infrastructure, such as large substations) that could be served via the BLF. We would ask for early engagement with both Highways England (who administer the governments abnormal load policy and permit system) and those within industries such as power generation and specialist shipping (such as ourselves) to ensure that the BLF is developed mindful of a wide range of future use. Having a strategic site at Sizewell can only be a good thing for UK PLC.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Delivering bulk materials via marine infrastructure such as the proposed temporary beach landing facility should be supported. The opportunity for direct delivery to site via water based transport should be maximised.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

 S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I do not support the additional night trains for Sizewell C.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As indicated earlier, I do not support the additional night trains for Sizewell C. [REDACTED]

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Seems a reasonable balance

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Option3 appears to be a reasonable compromise with medium visual impact, but maybe it would be better to have the biggest one if it would mean less road transportation.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Better visual mitigation. Management of water levels in SSSI and surrounding sensitive areas is very important.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Additional habitat is to be welcomed.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I would support whichever is thought to be most appropriate by RSPB and Wildlife Trust.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

I can't see a problem with this so long as the water is not contaminated.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Whatever would reduce impact.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Suffolk Otter Group

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The scale of this building project will inevitably cause massive environmental damage, much of which can never be reversed or adequately mitigated. EDF's proposals involve the partial destruction of and massive disruption to Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The loss of wetland habitat is deplorable. We live in the 2020s - not the 1970s. We now know about the scale and impact of habitat loss and the impracticability and failure of most habitat replacement schemes. There should be no road at all over this wetland – a precious habitat supporting a great many rare and uncommon species. We believe EDF should have followed the Mitigation Hierarchy, whose first stage is avoidance. As far as we can see EDF have done nothing to avoid this crossing. Have EDF ever put forward suggestions for a less-damaging route for the access road? The causeway with culvert idea was appalling, and it is good to see it has gone from EDF's new proposals. The bridge structure is a marginal improvement and may succeed in alleviating flooding problems. The space under the bridge will offer the potential for a safe animal crossing – but only if proper fencing is installed to funnel the animals through so that they won't cross the road. We are glad that EDF is planning fencing for otters, but this will not be sufficient to protect other vulnerable species, e.g. deer and reptiles that need special fencing. The plan still puts forward a long, dark culvert-like structure, smaller than the DCO one (3.6m as compared with 5m). All the water from the marshes would have to drain through this, and its construction would create an effective barrier to fish and invertebrates, all of whom are vital prey for the otter population. It would thus impoverish the waterway, destroy the integrity of the site and significantly disrupt the marshes' ecological processes.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Altering the water levels here, as proposed, risks damage to the existing fen meadow. EDF should not be considering development on fen meadow. This is a very rare and precious habitat in the UK Most have already been drained to oblivion to make way for farming. [REDACTED]

Halesworth Millennium Green marshes and meadows, adjacent to the proposed fen meadow compensation area in Halesworth. It's a lovely area of wet fen meadow (already rich in wildlife) but sites there and in Benhall and Pakenham can hardly be said to compensate the plants and animals – or indeed very importantly the people – of the Sizewell/Leiston area for the loss and reduction in value of their SSSI.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I understand that the proposed 'wetlands during construction', is mainly to provide more marsh harrier foraging area, to help to replace that lost at Sizewell. It might be argued that it would also help otters, but we can't really see how this would be effective or usable since there will be constant noise, lighting and disturbance. In any case, it would take years to establish.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

We are not convinced by the proposals for dealing with the increased surface water run-off caused by hard surfaces replacing marshes, grassland and woodland. The proposed temporary outfall pipe from the construction site to the sea, to take the extra water during storms, will not be available for two years. During any downpour (and we experience these more frequently now than we used to) the earth works to create the construction area, roads etc would cause huge amounts of silt runoff. This could clog up the ditches and wreck the delicate ecological balance of Sizewell Marshes SSSI, despite what EDF says about best practice and SuDs drainage systems. Much of this work would take place before any outfall pipe is in place. The balance of water is crucial to sustain the protected habitats, removing surface water in this way could end up seriously depleting the marshes.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am concerned about the effects of the proposed large number of lorries, both in terms of carbon footprint, pollution from fumes & noise, and the devastating effect of so much road transport on our quiet beautiful countryside

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Anything to reduce road haulage (see above)

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

I would like to hear the views of environmentalists/conservationists. What is the opinion of Friends of the Earth for example? The whole development will be catastrophic to wildlife, will they use a bridge under a noisy road??

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

I don't believe this would truly replace what will be lost

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I believe c) is misleading as you are destroying Coronation wood I have not seen the route of the new bridleway. How will it cross the busy road?

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Better to use brownfield site as carpark. You will be destroying so much already, in fact our whole way of life here.....

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Absolutely NO to moving more by rail!

 You want this

nuclear project? Take it all by sea. Don't block our roads and [REDACTED] for a decade. If you do this, I hope you're looking forward to the class action suit we will file against you.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

All inappropriate. Take it all by sea if you want it made. This would be a clear breach of our human rights and we will not stand for it. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] ? People will have undeniable mental health challenges as a result of disturbed sleep and anxiety caused by this. So I guess you need to work out if you want all the resulting lawsuits?

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

whatever it takes to not use the Suffolk Rail Line or block our roads and pollute our beautiful Suffolk.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Any transport of material around this area of international importance is totally unsuitable and unacceptable.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

You would have to build some kind of platform and rail link. Totally unacceptable

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The beach is unstable and subject to erosion whatever you might attempt to do to strengthen it. It is a beach, used by the public for recreation, open to all and should be left as it is.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Again NO

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Nothing is appropriate of this kind in an area of tourism and protected wildlife. Massive disruption and air and noise pollution is not acceptable on our coast.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Leave it as it is.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

All this is to give the impression that wrecking this area will be compensated for in some way. You can tell that I am outraged.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Irrelevant if the objectors are listened to

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Would the pipe be free of radioactivity?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I know that efforts have been made to protect our environment but I cannot choose between any of the above.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Coronation Wood which is the habitat of protected species is or has been felled by the council. An outrage because permission has not been granted.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Road building is unacceptable. More destruction.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

Retired

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Concerned about more effects on an unstable shoreline and effects on biodiversity on the sea bed and surroundings

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The least impact on the environment the better

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The SSSI is there for a reason any development around this area should not be permissible.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

These habitats take evolutionary time to create! you cannot create SSSI out of thin air thats why they need to be protected.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

If it mitigates flooding then this is the best of a bad job.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

You destroyed Coronation Wood without the appropriate bat licenses been obtained. Wilful destruction doesn't seem to be a consideration at all in this development.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(d) - PIL

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Less traffic and pollution on roads.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

n/a

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

This late-in-the-day consultation shows that your original plans were not sufficiently well thought through; your proposed changes still do not reassure me that the level of disruption to the environment, the diverse species it supports and the people who live nearby have been understood at all. None of the proposals would reduce the number of lorries in the years before the other infrastructure was in place! The extra trains proposed will hugely impact the environment with the extra noise and the light at night, they will likewise affect the local residents. The marine environment will be seriously affected and damaged by c)

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Having heard previously that EDFs negotiations with Network Rail were problematic it seems odd that you are making proposals to increase the number of trains without knowing if this will be possible??? I object very strongly to losing any passenger trains on our line, we are badly enough served as it is and cannot think why/how EDF have even considered this as an option. Running night time trains is a source of noise and light pollution - both unacceptable for people and wildlife.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

I have personally witnessed regular changes along our coastline, shingle spits there one day, gone the next. Erosion and deposition occur as a natural part of coastal processes - both are super evident along this coast line and a plan to add 30m to the length of the beach landing facility would undoubtedly affect the longshore drift. A platform created on the sea bed would have a damaging and disruptive effect on marine life. The road serving the landing platform would inevitably be adjacent to the SPA, SAC, Ramsar 'protected area' of Minsmere/Walberswick - all the rare wildlife especially birds would be affected where they should, as their current designation states, be protected!

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Our poor beach! We humans will suffer as we will not be permitted to walk along our coastal path and all the rare plant, vertebrate and invertebrate species on our special environment of vegetated shingle will be threatened - they need appropriate habitat and feeding areas to survive. You seem to think they can just be 'lifted off' and put elsewhere or put back at a later date; no, they'll die!

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Bearing in mind the environmental problems EDF identified when you first proposed a jetty it seems obvious to me that all the above would put piles into the sea, the longer the pier is, the worse the impact on coastal processes so none of the above should be permitted in our SPA, SAC designated area. Piles into the sea bed cause long-term scouring which in turn will require ongoing dredging, terrible for our marine environment...

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

I strongly believe there should be NO ROAD AT ALL over the Sizewell Marshes. As an SSSI - a designation given to habitats supporting rare and uncommon species - EDF will be responsible for hugely damaging the environment. The loss of this beautiful area to walk in which supports so many species from the large deer and otter to the minibeasts is appalling. The tree loss, the disturbed water levels, the lack of understanding of animal behaviour shown by EDF really demonstrates a huge lack of knowledge of the need to protect our environment at all costs not spend unquantified sums of destroying it!

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at

Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

EDF, hang your heads in shame - it is not possible to create fen meadow as it is an ANCIENT, rare and precious habitat ie it has taken hundreds of years to evolve. Your proposals will very likely destroy all the fen meadow at Sizewell because of the altered water levels so your words about mitigation for the parts you will destroy ring hollow, your actions could destroy it all...

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Given that you have cut down Coronation Wood in advance of receiving planning consent for Sizewell C, it does seem to be an enormous omission on the part of EDF not to have planned for wet woodland creation in advance and are only consulting on this now? Why destroy wet woodland by putting it under concrete and then propose creating more wet woodland that will take at least 30 years??

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

'Normal conditions' as they pertain at the moment are 100% permeable so that water does not just collect in ponds but also enters the ground where it is taken up by trees and grassland or is retained in marshy land etc - the conditions EDF would create are 100% impermeable surfaces so it is obvious that you will have much more water to dispose of. I am extremely concerned that when storms occur, the risk of washing the earth from the work that will need to be done before your pipe is ready into the ditches will be significant. The reason why Sizewell Marshes exist is because the water level is perfect for them, both excess silt or water depletion will destroy them.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) a permanent sea defence will increase the risk to Minsmere and Thorpeness; 'temporary sea defence' is a misnomer as it is needed for the major tunnelling work not 'to simplify structure'! b) Taller cranes and stockpiles in our AONB! c) Coronation Wood has gone, Goose Hill woodland is under threat, some trees have already been removed along Kenton Hills so, tree retention is not what EDF are good at - would these 3 or 4 trees be ecologically highly valuable, mature oaks?? d) And a further area of the Nuttery Belt woodland to go to execute the Boundary changes so folks can drive at speeds that will also increase road kill?? e) Aldhurst Farm was intended as a wildlife reserve. It's been poorly managed for nature so the proposal to increase the use to encourage even more dog walkers and horse riders would ensure its total demise as a nature reserve. The descriptor of 'e' should be Bridleway/recreational routes. As a user of the recreational pathways that currently exist, experience tells me that the new proposals for walkers lead to routes that are far too long to be achievable.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell A is within the designated AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast - surely if the land it is on becomes available it should be returned to green space. Pillbox Field is rough acid grassland, a specialised habitat rare in Suffolk, and it should not be used for tree planting nor as a car park! The training centre and visitor centre could be located in Leiston (in redundant school).

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

b) This change epitomises the callous way in which EDF regard the population of this part of rural Suffolk - no thought for the additional stress that uncertainty and threat brings. c) While welcome in itself, the height of the screening is not the issue - the proximity of the P&R to Wickham Market is. WM has one of the narrowest main roads in Suffolk, the road cannot be widened because it has houses on both sides with only a narrow footpath; at one point, the large Co-op on one side of the street and the Doctors Surgery and Library on the other mean that this area is already well-used by both vehicles and pedestrians who patiently wait in turn for drivers to go up the street, for drivers to go down the street and for pedestrians to walk along the path or cross over. Additional traffic here will lead to an increase of air pollution particles, noise for the residents and danger for the pedestrians not to mention frustration as wait times for all increase.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Thalassa Aldeburgh

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The inconvenience to travellers will be less with a revised train timetable rather than a larger fleet of lorries using the roads

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The more materials brought in by sea the better. However it is not acceptable for piers and beams to remain in situ after construction is complete. These must be removed and the coastline should be restored

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

The fact that the design is improved doesn't make the planned crossing acceptable. This is another example of the EDF project riding roughshod over the environment.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The Sizewell C project is deficient in so many respects. This is but one and again is an example of a proposed mitigation strategy deflecting from the fundamental issues

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

It will be an eyesore. The pipe should be buried under the beach and have its outlet under the sea

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

The scheme is disrespectful to users of the coast and the environment. Mature trees are beneficial in obscuring the site and can not afford to be lost

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

If the sizewell C build goes ahead these would be welcome changes. But they do resolve the complete inadequacy of the A12 from the park and ride through Martlesham, Woodbridge and beyond to cope with the extra Sizewell related traffic

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

The Heveningham Hall Estate

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - Prescribed consultee

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The DCO included insufficient information to fully assess the appropriateness of the rail and marine strategies and it appeared that the latter especially was not adequately exploited. We note that "In principle, it may be possible to increase the proportion of construction materials moved by rail and sea from 40% to 60%" (§2.2.20 of the Consultation report). A more intensive use of these two modes is welcomed as they would reduce HGV movements on the road network. The Transport Assessment should be reviewed and, particularly, the impact assessment and associated mitigation schemes revisited. The need for the mitigation scheme at the Yoxford roundabout should be justified, in terms of scale, as it may be that a

smaller roundabout would be sufficient. The impact on AILs should also be clarified and the need for over-runnable islands at the Yoxford roundabout should similarly be justified.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The highest number of trains possible should be employed in the freight management strategy to reduce impact on the road network. Movements overnight are preferred to those on daytime in order to minimise any impact to passenger trains. We still note that "It is possible that this work could conclude that the additional train capacity cannot be delivered" (§2.2.13 of the Consultation report). We consider that a higher reliance on freight movement by train is essential.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

In the DCO, the BLF was not fully exploited and we consider that the proposed changes would contribute reducing the impact on the road network. We consider it would be important for the BLF to be designed to also accommodate Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), to remove the associated vehicular movements from the road network.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

In the DCO, the BLF was not fully exploited and we consider that the proposed temporary facility would contribute reducing the impact on the road network. We consider it would be important for the temporary BLF to be designed to also accommodate Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), to remove the associated vehicular movements from the road network.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

We consider that the marine strategy should be exploited as much as possible. The highest capacity provision should be chosen, also accommodating Abnormal Indivisible Loads (ALLs) and remove them from the roads. Given the identified risk of potential for adverse effects to arise to a number of ecological receptors, however, full and detailed consideration will be required.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

In principle, the delivery of additional compensatory fen meadow habitat is positive; however significant work would be required to demonstrate not only that the creation of new areas of fen meadow habitats will be viable and deliverable in this location, but that this is relevant and proportionate for identified adverse impacts to a SSSI arising from the DCO application, with the SZC main site located over 50km away from the additional fen meadow site.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

It is essential that both the design and the long-term use of this area must be directly linked to specific ecological aims and objectives, derived through an assessment of potential effects, rather than be identified through consultation with stakeholders as to what effects they believe this needs to mitigate or compensate for.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes**a) Reduction in land required**

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Re. Reduction in land required We support the reduction in land required for the DCO but also note that it would make very little difference. The scale of the Yoxford roundabout should be justified – for example whether a smaller roundabout could be sufficient to offset the impact of the development. Similarly, the need for a 1,250-space P&R at Darsham should be justified, as it appears, having reviewed the Transport Assessment and supporting Technical Notes, that the northern catchment is smaller than the southern one, so it does not follow that they should be the same size. We note that Figure 2.4 now shows a route for AILs through the access roundabout of the northern P&R. This was not shown in any of the Plans for Approval included in the DCO. We also think that an assessment of the impact at the Darsham level crossing should be undertaken.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.
 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.
 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.
 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Increased traffic on the roads would've be a major objection to the proposed building of Sizewell C

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

If it means less road traffic it is better but it still involves building huge structures in an sensitive land and sea environment.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Against because building large structures in a sensitive landscape

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sea delivery would be preferable to road traffic but would still involve huge disruption next to an RSPB nature reserve and on a fragile coast.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

An improvement

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Recreating an SSSI is almost impossible. Leaving the SSSI alone would be preferable.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Better than previous proposal but not better than leaving it alone

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Better than previous proposal but not better than leaving it alone

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Better than previous proposal but not better than leaving it alone

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These proposals are generally improvements but they don't address the central problems of building a huge and ridiculously expensive structure in a site of wildlife conservation and sensitive habitats, affecting the local tourist industry and impacting on quality of life for local people, funded with

Chinese and French state money and the taxpayer picking up the tab for inevitable over runs. The whole thing is a terrible idea and all these proposals are fiddling with a basically bad and insensitive plan.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Object to the movement of materials by land and sea. Hugely detrimental to the landscape and population of East Suffolk and beyond. Excessive noise, increased traffic on roads that weren't built to cope, and marine erosion/ beach devastation - none of which is desirable or wanted.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

As above. The entire project is too expensive when more suitable, renewable forms of electricity generation are available.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As above. Changes to the beach and coastline towards Thorpness and beyond are certain and, judging by the erosion elsewhere along this coast, the extent of erosion remains unknown, so could be considerable. Modelling of possible effects is an underestimation of what will really happen - view based on 50yrs observation of the erosion along this coastline. Will EDF really repair beach damage further south?

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As in comment to Q3

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Answered in comment to Q3

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The same amount of traffic will cross, causing noise, fumes and dust pollution to the SSSI and beyond.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

A sort of fen habitat might be created but how will EDF ensure that rare invertebrates will appear at these distant, unconnected habitats? Inverts such as the UKBAP species White-mantled Wainscot and Fenn's Wainscot. Also, the nationally rare Monopsis monachella, Reed Dagger, Platytes alpinella, Webb's Wainscot, Water Wainscot. White-mantled Wainscot is known for not favouring wet reed and is of particular concern.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the

existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

A path between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is appropriate, but the building of Sizewell C is inappropriate.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell C is inappropriate and unnecessary. None of the above is required.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.
Sizewell C is unnecessary, consequently none of the above are appropriate.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Have previously supported this approach-less polluting, keep construction traffic off roads

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

It is up to the project to determine what is appropriate. Passenger timetable/services should not be reduced to convenience the project.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Of course; as long as impacts on marine environments are not harmful

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

As above

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Higher costs of these options need to be added in

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

An improvement in ecological and visual terms

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Improved mitigation welcome

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Transition to wet woodland supported

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

If needed- fine but why waste water in the country's driest area. Could it be stored for agric use?

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Inappropriate

Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

My views on all the questions should not be taken as support for the project to which I remain firmly opposed for reasons previously expressed. The loss of Coronation Wood is regrettable and should be seen as a cynical presumption of gaining the necessary planning permission.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate

Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

We think all these changes should be considered as part of the general DCO and not dealt with separately by the district planning authority in advance of the main decision.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate X

Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Inappropriate X

Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X

Don't know

Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

As above, a sneaky attempt to subvert the proper planning process.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The proposed siting of a freight management centre at Seven Hills will be severely damaging and disruptive to that area. The location is already scheduled for increased traffic and any possible road changes and retiming of traffic movements would not mitigate against congestion and road safety problems in normal circumstances. In cases where there are additional problems such as port closures or road incidents this additional burden would be severe. The location would also adversely impact rural tranquillity (light and noise pollution) in the nearby AONB.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Road transportation is not suitable as Sizewell is very remote from the UK trunk road network which runs out around Ipswich - Suffolk has no motorways and the only 'A' road heading anywhere near only has a couple of short sections of dual carriageway. Rail transportation is not suitable as the only rail line on the UK network heading anywhere near Sizewell has sections of single line and there's at least one train an hour in both directions between Ipswich and Lowestoft making scheduling difficult - around Ipswich the line is also shared with the Ipswich/ Felixstowe route, with all the container traffic from the Port of Felixstowe to contend with and an additional passenger service. Night time running of rail transportation would be a huge disruption for many residents close to the route. Sea transportation should not be considered because there are no nearby ports to

receive shipments and building beach landing stations will cause great damage to the local marine environment and prevent public access to large areas of the coast.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

See answer to Question 1

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

See answer to Question 1

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See answer to Question 1

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

See answer to Question 1

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

You should not be building across or causing any damage to the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest, or any other designated/environmentally sensitive area, at all. Loss of habitat connectivity caused by building projects is one of the main reasons for the worrying decline in our wildlife numbers and you should not be touching any of this crucial area.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Separate remote sites will be no replacement, as these will not have the same connectivity enjoyed by fen meadow habitat on the SSSI you want to destroy. The replacement sites are close to residential areas and will just become additional dog walking/disturbance sites. Your existing habitat replacement sites already seem to be failing and your attitude enabling the destruction of Coronation Wood well before Sizewell C has gone through the planning/funding steps cast serious doubts over how seriously you are taking peoples' environmental concerns. How can a site in west Suffolk compensate for habitat destroyed on the Suffolk coast?

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

I cannot see how the additional wetland habitats could work due to the constant noise, lighting and disturbance from the construction work. Rare wet woodland habitat lost due to the Sizewell C proposals requires mitigation but such a habitat takes years to establish and so should have been planted at the beginning of the consultations process, so it could be seen if it might be successful? Mitigation guidelines from Natural England emphasise that any compensation habitats must be started well in advance of any construction works.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

There is a concern that surface water run-off would increase significantly due to hard surfaces replacing marshes, grassland and woodland, but the proposal to install a temporary outfall pipe from the construction site to the sea seemingly would not be available for two years. Initial works are likely to create huge amounts of silt during any downpour which could wreck the delicate ecological balance of Sizewell Marshes SSSI and clog up the ditches. Much of the initial works would take place before any outfall pipe is in place. Removing surface water in this way could end up depleting the marshes, where the correct balance of water is crucial to sustain the protected habitats.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) Sea defence - concerns over flanking erosion at either end, with the problem increasing with the rising sea and more frequent storms from climate change. b) Construction activities & height limits - the taller the structures the worse the impact on the AONB. c) Tree retention - seems more trees are to be destroyed than previously planned/already carried out, which surely makes no sense environmentally. d) Boundary changes - seemingly more loss of woodland just to aid visibility of speeding motorists on the proposed Two village bypass - what hope for the local wildlife in the nearby fields and remaining woods? e) Bridleway - Aldhurst Farm has been created as a wildlife reserve, not a country park for local residents and a new linking bridleway will encourage even more intrusion by the public and their companions than that already reported as occurring - it's no good offering one new bridleway when many of the fantastic existing rights way will effectively be put out of use for years by construction work and unrealistic diversion

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:
 Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Sizewell B training centre and visitor centre should be moved to existing unused sites in Leiston if they need relocating, rather than impacting on additional environmentally sensitive land. Sizewell Sizewell A land was supposed to be restored to a green area as it sits within the AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast . There should be no car park on Pillbox Field, nor more land taken from the SSSI for a footpath. Planting of trees on Pillbox Field is also a big mistake as this will mess up this rough acid grassland – a habitat once plentiful but now rare in Suffolk.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

b) Boundary changes - apparently the proposal to change boundaries at such a late stage is causing considerable extra stress to local people involved. c) Southern Park & Ride - apparently most residents of Wickham Market do not want this P & R so close to the town, as it already suffers from a very narrow main street and parking problems, with a fear the site will cause a rat-run through the town - the A12 bypass around Wickham Market was constructed in order to leave the town free of through traffic.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous page 1 of 1 Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

The development of Sizewell C is unnecessary and backward looking. The concept of nuclear energy already outdated. Nuclear energy is not clean energy because there is nothing clean about nuclear waste. Companies should be investing in developing truly clean renewable energy sources.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes**a) Reduction in land required**

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

These changes do not go nearly far enough if the development of Sizewell C goes ahead and do not take into consideration the full impact the Southern park and ride will have on Wickham Market and the surrounding area. The whole length of the A12 as it bypasses the village needs to be included in the soundproofing measures. The noise from the A12 already adds to sound pollution in and around the village. The additional noise created by thousands of cars and other vehicles (the ones that will park in the 1250 spaces and the buses and vans etc mentioned in the consultation document) over 20 hours each day every day is not going to improve this and is not even mentioned in any of the documents or exhibition displays. Not only will this affect a lot of residents in their own homes and gardens but also in their leisure as one of the most popular walks around the village (namely the Mill Route illustrated on this website: <https://www.visitwickhammarket.co.uk/walking>) which are already blighted by traffic noise from the A12. Please could you tell me what EDF proposes to do about mitigating this as it will be responsible for creating traffic to the park and ride by building it in the first place? There impact of the increase in traffic through the village also needs to be assessed realistically. Human nature dictates that Sizewell staff parking at the park and ride will drive through the village rather than around it on the A12 to get to the park and ride if this is convenient to shorten their journey, avoid traffic congestion, pop into the village to visit the supermarket on their way to or from work or pick up a takeaway etc. The village already struggles with the current volume of traffic passing through especially at the pinch points on the High Street. If there are 1250 car parking spaces proposed at the park and ride that runs night and day to accommodate various shift patterns, this implies that there will be a significantly greater quantity of cars using the park and ride every day. Please could you tell me what EDF proposes to do to ensure that staff will not drive through the village to get to the park and ride? This needs to be more than encouragement. Please could you also give me an estimate of the number of cars expected to use the park and ride in any 24 hour period? Please could you tell me what EDF proposes to do regarding these issues [REDACTED] who will potentially be directly affected in a negative and potentially harmful way by this (due to increased environmental noise and air pollution)? Also, are you able to tell me if EDF will be assisting their staff in being able to afford environmentally friendly cars to mitigate the increase in air and sound pollution that will result from the journeys to the park and ride if the development of Sizewell C goes ahead? Please note that the changes proposed regarding the landscape bund at the Southern Park and Ride site are not really changes as they were on the initial consultation documentation, removed on subsequent documents only to reappear with fanfare in the latest iteration.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous page 1 of 1 Next

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

We do not want the passenger timetable reduced. It is very important to encourage more travel by train rather than on the road.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

It would be advantageous to bring in more material by sea.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

See above answer .

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

The highest capacity BLF would further help reduce movement of materials by road and rail. As long as it's practical to build and safe to use

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

I don't know how the wildlife attracted to the fen meadow habitat would relocate to newly created fen meadow areas.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

It would seem appropriate but I'm sure the experts at Minsmere would know best.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

This sounds like a practical solution.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Any changes that would reduce the loss of yet more trees and unique habitat is to be welcome.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

No

127 File Upload

Select files...

Previous

page 1 of 1

Next

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

I am very unhappy about the prospect of an increase in frequency of freight train movements. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] find this very disruptive.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

I am not in agreement with any of the proposed changes. I am strongly against any further development at Sizewell and would like the entire site to be decommissioned. I do not wish to be subjected to increased rail movements and particularly not at night when the noise is disruptive to sleep and, subsequently, mental health.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

I understand that you are listening to the views of locals on the proposed Sizewell C. Therefore, I hope you will listen to my view. I am not in agreement with any further development at Sizewell and strongly wish for the entire site to be decommissioned.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

train noise at night is particularly disruptive, and its sometimes hard to sleep. more trains will lower my quality of life even further.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

as detailed above, [REDACTED] will mean that my quality of life and overall sleep will dip drastically.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes
 No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Moving freight by rail at night will be massively disruptive for many people living in Woodbridge. This will result in increased stress, leading to related physical illnesses, and physical deterioration in health caused by sleep deprivation.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential

ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

This is inappropriate for a populated area at night.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

This would help to alleviate traffic on the road, and night running of freight trains.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

A good idea to help keep traffic off the road and rail. Also pollution (noise, vibration, nox) would be reduced. This would also reduce congestion, and damage to road surfaces from heavy commercial vehicles on the roads.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Highest capacity facility appropriate, to minimise disruption , ie noise pollution , disturbed nights for residents living near the railway and roads, damage to existing roads, congestion on existing roads

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Must be local.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The railway should be used as much as possible as long as local people are mitigated for any inconvenience.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I think it is appropriate as long as it does no harm to wildlife.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I think they should do option 4 only if it does no harm to wildlife.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

6f Please explain your views.

At a recent meeting we were told at times of flood Eastbridge marshes would flood higher than they do now. That is totally unacceptable. It could increase flood risk for local properties.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Firstly Sizewell C should never be built. Such a massive amount of environmental damage can never be justified or mitigated for. The inability to dispose safely nuclear waste and the costs of running and in future decommissioning at the end of its life mean that not only is it excessively expensive way of generating energy (far greater than renewable energy), with serious environmental detriments to the whole of the East of England, The area is an AONB and the site is adjacent to RSPB Minsmere and will destroy an SSSI which is irreplaceable. While freight is better carried by rail it will require a new green rail rout along the north west edge of Kenton Hills which is on flight routes of many rare bats including Barbastelle. Extra train movements would cause significant disturbance to local residents and ProCorda. I oppose moving more material by sea as this will disrupt

the beach, the rare plants and habitats on the beach, interfere with the public right of access to the beach, serious damage to the marine environment including affecting the currents and the coastal drift as well as sealife. In the early years of construction the burden of incoming freight by road will not be reduced at all until the infrastructure is put in place.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The proposed passenger timetable disruption would further worsen the existing service with increased bus journeys for travellers. this is unacceptable. Increased trains will be disruptive to local residents

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Any projection into the sea disturbs the coastal processes that are based on longshore drift. As the sand and shingle is trapped by the structure, increased erosion is caused further down the coast. The longer this is, the worse the effects. Creating a landing platform on the sea bed would upset the marine ecology and could threaten the stability of the Sizewell-Dunwich offshore banks. These banks are considered to provide protection to the power stations from storms. A road would lead from the BLF to the station platform. This would be directly adjacent to the Minsmere-Walberswick Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar. Deliveries could cause great disturbance to rare birds.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

I do not agree with so much work on the beach. Not only is this greatly valued by walkers along the Coast Path, but there are many rare plants and invertebrates here. This is a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and should be protected. Vegetated shingle supports such rarities as Sea Pea and Yellow Horned Poppy. You say EDF will keep substrate and use it for replanting – but when - what timescale? This could be a decade later. How long would

the seeds last? Under what conditions would they be stored? No information. This is not properly thought through. Butterflies such as the Grayling use this habitat for breeding and basking (thermo-regulating) – as do protected adders and other reptiles. There are plans to translocate reptiles, but that is likely to overload the other habitats, leaving insufficient food for the translocated reptiles.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

A temporary beach landing facility is presumably intended for conveyance of aggregates etc. You do not say where these aggregates are coming from and how would they r – but there is no indication of where these would come from and how and where would they be loaded onto the barges or transporting boats? Any of these four options would cause significant damage to the beach and marine environment. The jetty, originally proposed in the early consultations, had to be abandoned because of the environmental problems it would cause. Piles into the sea bed cause long-term scouring at the base, so that ongoing dredging would be necessary which in itself will be damaging to the seabed. The Southern North Sea is a protected area twice over: it is part of the Outer Thames Special Protection Area (SPA) for birds, especially the red-throated diver, and it is also a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) mainly for harbour porpoise. EDF have not been able to show that no harm would be caused to these species or the protected area.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

There should be no road at all over the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) under any circumstances – It is a unique precious habitat supporting a great many very rare and uncommon species. EDF should have followed the Mitigation Hierarchy. The first stage of this is Avoidance. They have done nothing to avoid this crossing. EDF never presented other less-damaging routes for the access road. The bridge structure is a marginal improvement on the causeway with culvert and is more likely to alleviate problems caused by flooding. The space under the bridge offers the potential for a safe animal crossing – but only if proper fencing is installed to funnel the animals through so that they won't be in danger on the road. EDF are only planning fencing for otters, not for any of the other animals that would be at great risk on the road, e.g. reptiles, deer and other mammals that need special fencing. There would still be a long, dark culvert-like structure, through which all the water from the marshes would have to drain – very ecologically damaging. This is smaller than the DCO one (3.6m as compared with 5m). It would, in effect, act as a barrier to fish and aquatic invertebrates that won't go through it, as they use polarization of light for guidance.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

Newly created habitats to replace SSSI have a very low proven success rate. Even if they are well planned and managed by conservationists, only 26%-45% are successful. Those that are developer-led, as here, do even worse, due to lack of monitoring and poor management. Fen meadow is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to recreate, as it is an ancient habitat that has taken a great many years to evolve. We know of none that has been successful in the long term. None of the proposed sites is really close to Sizewell Marshes – and Pakenham is in West Suffolk! Altering the water levels here, as proposed, will damage the existing fen meadow. EDF should not be building into fen meadow at all. This is a very rare and precious habitat. In England, most equivalent meadows have been lost to drainage for agriculture. The fact is that the site for the twin reactors is too small and totally inappropriate for such a massive and complex structure.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

The proposed 'wetlands during construction', is mainly to provide more marsh harrier foraging area, to help to replace that lost at Sizewell. I do not believe this would work, because of the constant noise, lighting and disturbance during construction. In any case, it will take several years to establish and will not be useful in the short term. Wet woodland is an uncommon Biodiversity Action Plan habitat that, due to the SZC proposals, will go under concrete. We have been pushing for mitigation for some time. EDF is saying there is 'potential' for wet woodland in the water resource area. Such a habitat takes up to 30 years to establish – so why didn't they plant it at the beginning of the consultations, so that we could see if it might be successful? Mitigation guidelines from Natural England emphasise that any compensation habitats must be started well in advance of any construction works. It is not clear whether the area would be allowed to follow natural succession, whereby the wet woodland would eventually establish itself, or whether trees should be planted. It should already be up and running. Any mitigation for wet woodland should be separate from and additional to that for marsh harriers.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

It is likely that surface water run-off would increase significantly due to hard surfaces- large areas of concrete - replacing marshes, grassland and woodland. EDF are proposing to install a temporary outfall pipe from the construction site to the sea, to take the extra water during storms. However, this would not be available for two years. The earth works to create the construction area, roads etc would cause huge amounts of silt during any downpour. All of this could wreck the delicate ecological balance of Sizewell Marshes SSSI and clog up the ditches, despite what EDF says about

best practice and SuDs drainage systems. Much of this work would take place before any outfall pipe is in place. Removing surface water in this way could end up depleting the marshes, where the correct balance of water is crucial to sustain the protected habitats.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) Sea defence: It is well known that hard coastal defences cause flanking erosion at either end, as the energy of the waves has nowhere else to go. With climate change, this problem will increase with the rising sea and more frequent storms. This could speed up erosion at Minsmere and also at Thorpeness, both already under pressure. The idea of the 'temporary sea defence' is to provide a clear space behind it for the major tunnelling works of the cooling infrastructure – not to 'simplify its structure'. This is dishonest of EDF. b) Construction activities & height limits The taller the cranes and the stock piles, the worse the impact on the protected landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Cranes could be up to 70m high. c) Tree retention EDF means tree removal! A great many hectares of woodland will go under concrete, including nearly all of Goose Hill and Coronation Wood - as has already happened at Coronation Wood without the appropriate wildlife licenses EDF has already committed wildlife crime removing trees which support a population of Barbastelle bats, in spite of being advised to stop by the police. Trees have also been cut down in Kenton Hills woodland and at St James' Covert and elsewhere. I am opposed to loss of woodland. A further '3 to 4' trees would go – but they don't say what they are. Loss of oaks, for example, or veteran trees could significantly affect the ecology of the area. d) Boundary changes Two village bypass: to expand the Order Limits to the west of the existing access road would mean cutting down 245sqm of Nuttery Belt woodland. This is simply to improve visibility at 60mph. I cannot support yet more loss of woodland. I am also opposed to such speeds, which greatly increases risk of road kill to wildlife. Wild animals and birds have not evolved to be able to assess these high speeds and react accordingly. e) Bridleway I wish to support ramblers and horse riders and this proposal would certainly increase recreational enjoyment. However, Aldhurst Farm has been created as a wildlife reserve. How would users of the bridleway be prevented from straying over the site and causing disturbance to the wildlife? Introduction of

the bridleway would reduce the biodiversity net gain being claimed by EDF. Aldhurst Farm cannot be both a wildlife reserve and a country park for local residents. Much of it is already seriously disturbed by dog walkers –particularly ground-nesting birds which have no hope of successful nesting.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

I totally oppose putting the training centre and visitor centre at Sizewell, both of which take up a considerable amount of land. I believe they should be in Leiston, where there is a very large redundant school building with extensive grounds. This is by far the best way to free up land so that Coronation Wood can be restored as EDF have already cut it down. There are problems with both options. Sizewell A land should be restored to a green recreational area for local people and visitors, especially bearing in mind its location within the AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast. There should be no car park on Pillbox Field nor more land take from the SSSI for a footpath. I am opposed to the planting of trees on Pillbox Field. This is rough acid grassland – a habitat now sorely missing from Suffolk. This provides important shelter for insects that feed birds and bats. Small mammals thrive here that are food for the owls hunting over it. Any mitigation planting should be elsewhere, preferably on low-grade agricultural land.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

a) Reduction in land required. I am in favour of any reduction in land take. b) Boundary changes Changing boundaries at such a late stage is causing considerable extra stress to local people involved. As regards the public rights of way around Walk Barn, walkers generally alter the footpath route spontaneously for good reason. I need to know more detail to be able to comment. c) Southern Park & Ride Residents of Wickham Market are generally in favour of these landscaping changes, but most do not want this P & R so close to the town. It already suffers from a very narrow main street and parking problems and they fear it will be used as a rat-run by Sizewell workers. None of the traffic solutions provided is acceptable. The A12 bypass around Wickham Market was constructed in order to leave the town free of through traffic.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes
 No X

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S42(a) - [REDACTED]

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes
 No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes X
 No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes X
 No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

100% of materials to be transported by rail and sea

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

No night trains; use sea instead

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

As long as concealed

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Full protection against pollution of sea and protection of all wildlife

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Bridge very bad impact on environment

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

No loss

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Wetland habitats preserved

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Don't know Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Reduce all impact on Yoxford and villages and much more traffic by sea

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes X No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes X No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes X No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Too many HGV vehicles on the road will have a devastating effect on people and villages.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Anything to take lorries off the roads.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

No habitat should be lost due to this development. When you destroy the habitat you loose species. It is irrevocable.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Question 12: Associated development changes

a) Reduction in land required

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know Inappropriate X

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes No

If so, which?

[REDACTED]

Job title

[REDACTED]

128 Stakeholder Type:

S47 - Public

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

Yes No

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes No

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes No

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

Rail and Sea should unquestionably be the principal modes of transport for the majority of bulk delivery traffic. Despite your intent for specific road upgrades the additional longer term chronic degradation of East Suffolk roads will be massive hit for the taxpayer purse, and one that should be minimized as much as possible.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

The transportational requirement for serving Sizewell C should wherever possible focused onto rail. So as to minimise the otherwise intolerable pressures imposed on our local road network and hopefully leave the region with the benefits of a more robust rail system.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

Yes, providing that hydraulic modelling can prove there are no major detrimental effects to the adjacent coast line (in terms of increased erosional effects from changes in current patterns etc) then enhanced BLF is the rightful and appropriate option for major freight and aggregate supplies.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils - to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

Having regard to environmental sensitivities of SSSI & Minsmere located immediately to the north, both short and longer term BLF facilities should be located as far away to the south as possible.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

If your taking the trouble to provide BLF, then it makes obvious sense to maximise the economies of scale and provide the fullest capacity and capabilities for the future so as to minimise the need for alternative modes of bulk transport.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate X Inappropriate Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

You should not be building on nor affecting a SSSI site in the first place. The whole site layout configuration being located on the north of Sizewell B demonstrates scant regard for internationally designate wild life reserves. and begs the question of what is the purpose of such status in the first place if it can't ensure meaningful protection in the face of such development. However, should SZC go ahead, then obviously every measure possible to minimise impact is worth taking. However it would be useful to demonstrate the specific features and measures being applied that differentiate the proposed structure from what could otherwise be just another highway culvert. What specific Wildlife Design Guides are being adopted to facilitate best suitability to your principal target species etc. The following Design guide could be a good place to start > The IENE (Infrastructure and Ecology Network Europe / Wildlife & Traffic A European Handbook for Identifying Conflicts and Designing Solutions <https://handbookwildlifetraffic.info/ch-7-fauna-passages-and-other-solutions/7-3-reducing-the-barrier-effect-underpasses/>

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

7f Please explain your views.

Should Sizewell B go ahead, then Yes you should be made to do everything possible to create habitat of equivalent area & value at the most suitable alternative locations in the region. Furthermore, the replacement sites should be purchased by EDF, and the newly acquired landownership be given to the most appropriate regional wildlife body / organisation for the purposes of wildlife management in perpetuity... Clearly if such land acquisitions were instead passed into Local Authority ownership then there forever remains the likelihood of them being subsequently sold off for housing development, and thus defeating the whole purpose of wildlife habitat replacement.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

8f Please provide your views on the long-term use of this area, particularly whether wetland habitats should be retained or a transition to wet woodland supported.

Speak to the RSPB and AONB on such matters.

Question 9: Surface water

Under normal conditions, surface water would collect in ponds and filter into the ground. During very heavy rainfall, excess water would need to be discharged from the site. We are proposing to use a temporary drainage pipe that would pass over the temporary sea defences to release water onto the beach. The pipe would be up to half a metre in diameter and would not disrupt users of the diverted coast path.

9a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

9f Please explain your views.

If nothing is adversely affected why ask the question. and What are the alt options if everyone objected. Probably none.

Question 10: Other main site changes

a) Sea defence

We are proposing an increase in the minimum and maximum crest height of the permanent sea defence to provide further protection and allow for landscaping. We are also proposing a change to the temporary sea defence to simplify its construction.

10a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Construction activities and height limits

Changes to some height limits and activities during construction are proposed to allow for the potential increase in materials being delivered by sea. These include space in the temporary construction area for an additional stockpile, working heights at the BLF and to allow cranes to operate in the relocated marine tunnelling works area.

10b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Tree retention

We are proposing changes to tree retention on the main development site to support construction activity in three locations. Two of the changes will not result in any additional net loss of trees and the other proposes removal of three or four trees.

10c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

d) Boundary changes

Minor boundary changes (reductions and additions) to the main development site and the off-site habitat creation sites are proposed, including at the temporary construction area, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area west of Westleton, and the Benhall and Halesworth fen meadow compensation sites.

10d Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

e) Bridleway

A new bridleway link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills is proposed to improve recreational connectivity and enhance the north-south recreational routes within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.

10e Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

10f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Some existing Sizewell B facilities need to be relocated to build Sizewell C.

We are proposing to change the location of the administration building, reduce the height of the training centre to two storeys and change the layout of the Coronation Wood development area. There are two options for the location of the Sizewell B outage car park, depending on whether land is available at Sizewell A.

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Should we reach an agreement for its use, land at Sizewell A would be used for the Sizewell B outage car park. Pillbox Field would be used for the planting of trees only and Rosery Cottages garage would not be demolished.

11a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

In this scenario, the layout changes would be made, but the Sizewell B outage car park and pedestrian connection to the Coronation Wood development area would remain in Pillbox Field as previously proposed.

11b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

11f Please explain your views. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

Considering the wider context of what is actually being lost in terms of wildlife habitat elsewhere around this dev.,, inviting the public to comment on the loss of 2 or 3 trees within a particular proposed work area is utterly ridiculous. In reality this can only be seen as pointless padding as a smoke screen to detract from the massive destruction being proposed elsewhere.

Question 12: Associated development changes**a) Reduction in land required**

We are proposing potential reductions in land required, including a parcel of land at the A12/B1119 junction near Saxmundham no longer needed for highway improvements, minor reductions at the northern park and ride, and other small areas of land.

12a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

b) Boundary changes

We are proposing minor boundary changes (extension of the Order Limits) and/or additional land for the proposed Sizewell Link Road, Yoxford Roundabout, the Two Village Bypass (including two options for a proposed change to the public rights of way around Walk Barn Farm) and to support the accommodation works.

12b Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate Don't know X

c) Southern park and ride

An extension of the landscaping is proposed at the southern park and ride to provide additional screening for views from the B1116 and a nearby footpath, along with other potential minor design changes.

12c Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Don't know X Inappropriate

12f Please provide comments on any or all of these proposed changes. Please specify the change to which your comments refer.

127 File Upload

Select files...

[Previous](#) page 1 of 1 [Next](#)

Your details

Name

Email

Address

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

 Yes No X

If so, which?

Job title

128 Stakeholder Type:

129 Non-fitting

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options.

In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

1a a) Support the DCO application approach.

 Yes No X

1b b) Support moving more material by rail.

 Yes No X

1c c) Support moving more material by sea.

 Yes No X

1f Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

The building should not go ahead. It will cause massive disruption regardless.

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

2a a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2b b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2c c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

2f Please explain your views.

All options will cause disruption to residents and potential visitors.

Sea freight

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

We are proposing design changes to double the capacity of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) to receive very large or oversized loads and make deliveries safer. Enhancements would include adding submerged beams on piled foundations to create a temporary landing platform on the seabed, and extending the BLF by around 30m.

Further site planning and logistics work has identified potential for increasing the amount of material brought to the site by sea by:

- enhancing the design of the permanent beach landing facility (BLF) (see question 3); and
- providing a new, temporary additional BLF (see question 4).

3a Do you think enhancing the permanent BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

3f Please explain your views.

It will negatively impact the shoreline and cause potential damage to wildlife.

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

We have continued seeking ways to bring bulk materials - such as aggregate and backfill soils – to site by sea. A second, temporary BLF located to the south of the permanent facility could be used to do this.

4a Do you think providing a new, temporary additional BLF is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

4f Please explain your views.

It will negatively impact the shoreline and cause potential damage to wildlife.

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

We are consulting on four potential designs for the temporary, additional BLF.

Option 1: lowest capacity

Around 120m long and similar to the permanent BLF, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 200 deliveries per year.

5a Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 2: short pier, low capacity

A 150m BLF with similar design to Option 1 and with a T-shape pier, this facility could allow faster unloading and has the capacity to receive up to 260 deliveries per year.

5b Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 3: medium pier, high capacity

A 270m BLF combining Option 2 with one or two self-elevating platforms, this facility would allow two barges at a time to be unloaded in deeper water and has the capacity to receive up to 520 deliveries per year.

5c Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

Option 4: long pier, highest capacity

A 400m BLF similar to Option 3, but with four self-elevating platforms, this single berth facility has the capacity to receive up to 590 deliveries per year.

5d Do you think this option is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

5f Please provide comments on any or all of the potential design options. Please specify the option to which your comments refer.

All options will negatively impact the shoreline and cause potential damage to wildlife.

Question 6: SSSI crossing

We are proposing a new design for the crossing of the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) where two embankments – one at either end of the SSSI crossing – would be connected by a 30m long single-span bridge. This design would use less SSSI land than the previous proposal and provide additional flood relief, reducing water levels near to the SSSI crossing and further afield at RSPB Minsmere and parts of Eastbridge. Changes to the embankment slopes would allow taller, more substantial trees to be planted, better integrating the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints.

6a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

6f Please explain your views.

It will negatively impact the AONB and cause untold damage to wildlife habitats.

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

A small amount of fen meadow habitat on the SSSI will be lost due to Sizewell C. Our DCO application included two sites – at Benhall and Halesworth – to compensate for this. As fen meadow habitats are challenging to create, we are now also proposing an additional site near Pakenham, West Suffolk, to ensure we can create replacement habitat of the same quality and distinctiveness.

7a Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate Inappropriate X Don't know

7f Please explain your views.

It will negatively impact the AONB and cause untold damage to wildlife habitats.

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

We are proposing to change the location of the temporary area for water that will be used during construction, with the existing location used as a permanent flood mitigation area. This offers opportunities to create additional wetland habitats during construction and the potential for permanent wet woodland habitats once construction is complete.

8a Do you think this potential change is: