

Examining Authority's Written Questions. Bio.1.27 - Nigel Smith ref: 20025852

A proper jetty would enable virtually all construction material to be brought in by sea.

EDF has blown hot and cold on a marine-led strategy for delivery of construction materials. In Stages 1 and 2 of its so-called consultation exercise it promoted the idea of a jetty as the primary means for delivery and removal of materials. It even asked respondents if they would prefer a long thin pier, or a short fat one. At Stage 3 it dismissed the idea out of hand.

In our response to Stage 3 my wife and I said:

“Like many of our residents faced with the threat of massive traffic movements on roads through or near the village, we had concluded that a marine-led strategy for transporting construction materials to the site should still be pursued.

We note that EDF tenders a scarcely credible excuse that, due to the government's urgency for a new nuclear station, it does not have time to fully evaluate the building of a jetty. Perhaps EDF should have done more during the two years between Stages 2 and 3? It states that *'a marine-led strategy would necessitate the construction, operation and decommissioning of a jetty. The construction activities (including piling) would result in severe underwater noise which is likely to extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This is likely to cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology, fisheries and marine mammals, including porpoise. In order to mitigate the impact, seasonal restrictions on construction and a slower construction method would be necessary, although impacts would remain significant.'*

We accept that adverse impacts on the marine ecology are a good reason not to pursue this option, but note that significant adverse effects of the development elsewhere are considered acceptable. Why, for example, are these impacts seen as more problematic than the potential impact on Minsmere?

EDF needs to:

- clarify the criteria under which it considers some but not all adverse environmental impacts to be acceptable; and
- demonstrate that it has fully investigated alternative, less damaging construction models for the jetty, for example by employing far fewer supports (as can be seen holding up bridges around the world)."

By the time the DOC application was submitted, EDF had changed its tune again. It told us that a jetty (with something like a 6m pile grid) would cause erosion and silting problems. As far as we are aware, it did not properly investigate construction with much wider pile spacing which would mitigate such problems. Such a construction would be more expensive, but viewed against a likely total construction cost of c.£20bn and bearing in mind saving on rail and road modifications, the extra cost would be comparatively small.

Nigel Smith - 10 May 2021