

[REDACTED]
Leiston Road, Middleton

email: [REDACTED]@me.com & [REDACTED]@compuserve.com

27th March 2019

Dear EDF

We (Mandy Beaumont and Steve Thorpe of the above address) are writing to express our views as residents and members of the local community. By doing so we wish you to register this letter as views from **two people (rather than one)**.

We are loosely following the format of your Consultation Questionnaire and have made use of Campaign Groups' suggested response documents, but we ask that you please read carefully as we have not simply used 'copy+paste' but have given a personal response based on our knowledge and experience to focus on issues that we feel are most important to us with regard to the Sizewell C project.

We feel it is important to share our personal story with you - not just because it is ours, but because it is one that is remarkably similar for so many people who have specifically chosen to live on the east coast of Suffolk. As we neared retirement in 2015 we researched areas where we wanted to put down roots and embrace a 'forever home'. So - we took our life savings and invested in an ancient and run-down house and garden which we wanted to turn into our home. We chose this area specifically because it is an AONB, SSSI and SPA (all of which are supposed to be protected from environmental damage) as we are both horticulturists and passionate nature lovers. We now live right next to RSPB's prestigious Minsmere site and on a beautiful coastline renowned for its rich diversity of wildlife. Perfect! The only drawback we were aware of was the nuclear power plant nearby with talk of another (one) being built - but after researching further we decided this was a low risk factor because nuclear power is being replaced by renewable energy so unlikely to be expanded, particularly as the surrounding area was already registered 'AONB' (which we saw was in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland "*an area of countryside designated by a government agency as having natural features of exceptional beauty and therefore given a protected status*"). So we obviously felt it was pretty safe to choose this area for us to invest our life savings in.

It wasn't our intention, but we ended up buying a listed property (Grade 2) - of which there are many in this part of Suffolk - and we have to abide by a veritable list of rules & regulations in order to protect it and not allow it to deteriorate. This is not

dissimilar to the principle of the 'protected status' of AONB however, it seems to us that big businesses can completely ignore this rule book - in fact, quite openly stating they'll rip it up and as 'mitigation' will put it back again when they've finished - imagine if we used same approach on our listed property?! We understand we have the threat of hefty fines and even a prison sentence hanging over us if we don't conform to the protections granted to a listed property - why do the same things not apply to companies abusing the protection of AONB? It does not need a scientist to state the obvious that some of these natural areas, their flora and fauna, simply cannot be desecrated and then simply returned to how they once were - ever!

We love our new-found home area so much that we personally re-established and now maintain the public access footpath that runs down the side of our property and have planted more native British hedgerow to support the wildlife that depends on it. We really care about where we live and are happy to do our bit to ensure it continues to be a beautiful part of the country for everyone to enjoy. Middleton has no street lamps at all - we support this and as a consequence the wildlife flourishes in these natural conditions and you can see the night sky in all it's glory. This is just one of many things that your proposals will destroy.

What EDF are now proposing is truly shocking when all factors are taken into account. Nuclear power does not have a place in the 21st century - the way forward is renewable energy.

At the moment we are surrounded by small country roads - they are windy, picturesque and beautiful and they are shared with the local agricultural vehicles ie. tractors etc, all year round...they are not designed for huge amounts of traffic and especially not 21st century HGVs. However by filling the A12 with such enormous numbers of HGVs required for construction traffic it is beyond obvious that all other traffic will go to some lengths to avoid the A12 as much as they possibly can. Our beautiful little lanes will become rat-runs. Your Stage 3 proposals suddenly place a new junction at the end of our road (B1125) which sends an obvious message to encourage absolutely everyone else to make use of this as an alternative route in order to avoid the A12 - right outside our door on a narrow country road with unusually sharp corners. This cannot be deemed safe for pedestrians, cyclists or walkers nor residential traffic. We do not want to be in a position to say we told you so when the accidents occur...

If it is desirable for people to continue to see this tranquil area of Suffolk as a suitable area for those that want to fully embrace the countryside, clean air and all that nature

offers - it cannot be right to not only build another nuclear power station (on top of the two already here) but increase those plans for two more reactors.

Your proposals will cause unacceptable and unnecessary damage and disruption to our local communities and beyond - and not only Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB, but also our SSSI and SPA (all of which are supposed to be protected from damage) - as outlined in the bullet points below.

- Construction will damage the very things that make this part of Suffolk so uniquely special; peace, tranquility and dark night skies. Visitors will be driven away by eyesores, closed footpaths and beaches, disruption, noise and pollution which is not only horrendous for those of us that live here, but will hurt the tourism businesses upon which this area relies very heavily.
- No jetty and a dubious rail strategy will put up to 1,500 HGVs a day on our roads.
- Construction will threaten some of the most biodiverse habitats in the UK and the Heritage Coast, including two Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the nationally treasured Minsmere Reserve. It will be impossible to recover from the loss of habitats that host rare birds, animals and plants.
- You have ignored valid opposition to a campus for 2,400 workers at Eastbridge from local people, Councils and our MP, Dr Thérèse Coffey.
- The project is enormous – too big for the setting and land available. The government suggests that a single new nuclear power station should occupy 30 hectares (based on Sizewell B). However, Sizewell C & D are squeezed into only 32 hectares. How on earth do you justify this - the site and its surroundings are so obviously not fit for purpose.

Environmental Impacts

- Your plans will cut the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in half for at least a decade, and threaten to compromise the very purposes of the AONB designation itself - we find it very hard to understand how this can even be considered, let alone allowed.
- Preliminary environmental information is close to non-existent in places, with too much relying on work that it appears you have not yet reported or even started. You should publish a full Environmental Impact Assessment before applying for planning consent, and this should take into account all the other Energy Projects proposed in the area. There is an obvious need to look at all projects together and the combined impact they will have. When we attended our local EDF presentation at Middleton Village Hall - your staff (Mr Tom McGarry, Matt Elliot and Richard Bull) admitted they were not including figures from Scottish Power in these

Consultations. We cannot understand why you are not liaising with others in order to come to collective conclusions.

- Environmental best practice must be followed; when you say that it “will be taken into account” - this is not good enough. There needs to be written guarantees and financial penalties fixed and overseen by a committee of (genuinely) independent environmental auditors - including local representation.
- It is wrong to build a town for 2,400 (single) workers so close to protected areas on top of the obviously negative impact on the local protected environment it is also a recipe for anti-social behaviour.
- The Construction laydown areas, accommodation site, spoil heaps, quarries and causeway crossing of the SSSI will damage the fragile hydrology of the Minsmere Levels, Sizewell Marsh and affect the Minsmere Sluice. Alterations in the management of water run-off could make sensitive ecosystems wetter or drier, while the causeway crossing will impede the drainage of the Sizewell Marsh SSSI habitat.
- Your proposed rock armour defence of the Sizewell C & D platform and Beach Landing Facility is inadequate, stopping above the low water line when it should go below it. Once the sacrificial dune erodes, the sea will be able to undermine the rock armour defence. This coastline is renowned for coastal erosion which is exacerbated by changing environmental conditions.
- When quarry pits are refilled with excavated materials, there is a risk that pollutants will leach into the water table and Minsmere Levels groundwater over decades. Whilst you have stated that you do recognise the potential for pollution you have not proposed anything to stop it - why not?
- Spoil heaps, up to the height of a 10-storey building, will inevitably cause significant dust pollution to the AONB, Minsmere Levels and Sizewell Marsh and, even more importantly, also affect human health. People with chest conditions i.e asthma etc who choose to live on the coastline to help their condition will not only be adversely affected but could lead to life-threatening exacerbation.
- The introduction at Stage 3 Consultation of 4 new pylons - the height of the reactors - was snuck in. This infrastructure should be installed underground.

People and Economy

- We believe the £250m local tourism industry will be hit hard. Eyesores, noise, dust, night light and truck traffic will deter visitors to the coast between Southwold and Aldeburgh. If your project goes ahead there should be recompense to businesses for loss of earnings during construction.
- Having slashed 20% from the cost of Sizewell, in part by using the Hinkley supply chain - it follows that the promised economic and employment benefits for the local

area will not materialise. Yet you are visiting Suffolk schools offering the potential of employment - this is a false promise and one-sided in the advocacy of nuclear energy as a long-term career prospect. How do you justify this?

- At Stage 2 the joint Councils were “unconvinced” the benefits of Sizewell outweighed the impacts. Now the impacts have increased and the benefits seem to have decreased. How is that an improvement to the local people or the local economy?
- This is an agricultural area of small towns and villages with outlying residential properties & farms that form the communities. Your proposed Link Road will split parishes, cut off homes and farmhouses from village centres, close off well-used country roads and footpaths as well as devastate the farming community, making their farms unviable.
- We understand you haven't yet conducted many of the vital studies required - including Health and Community. The project must not reduce locals' access to emergency services and healthcare - this is something of enormous concern to all locals as to quite how you might try to squeeze the workforce (& some of their families) into the existing local Doctors, Dentists, Opticians, Pharmacies, Hospitals, School and Nursery places etcetc
- As the only nearby Police Station at Leiston was recently closed (thorough lack of need, precisely because this is a relatively peaceful country environment) - how do EDF propose to manage the enormous influx of workers squeezed into the proposed campus - with all its frustrations and excess energy from young, single workers? Have you made representation to the Police Force and put forward an action plan for the inevitability of anti-social behaviour by a percentage, however small?

Accommodation

- To place a new ‘town’ for 2,400 Construction workers, of 3-4 storey blocks with car parks and leisure facilities, on a greenfield site close to Minsmere and next to Eastbridge, a hamlet of 50 people - sounds like science fiction! Eastbridge will be destroyed. The legacy being that housing developers will use the site with its already-provided facilities of drainage, water, electricity etc - it will never go back to being a small hamlet.
- You do not mention how you are planning to provide facilities to this proposed new ‘town’, in particular the sewage arrangements?
- As use of the campus is not compulsory and, in any case, is only available for single occupancy - workers must go out to socialise with anyone other than immediate colleagues - the local infrastructure simply cannot accommodate such numbers. Not everybody wants to go to a gym or play football Any one of these ‘single workers’ who wants to socialise outside the campus will have to travel by road as

venues for night life here are far away and far apart. Night traffic, as a result, will increase. Drink and driving do not mix - and small roads are an additional hazard. It is obvious this will increase accidents and anti-social behaviour will inevitably follow.

- Having consistently refused to consider splitting the site or to consider locating workers in urban areas with suitable social infrastructure and potential for legacy, you have failed to justify why you are not using the same approach from Hinkley (i.e. 500 workers onsite and 1,000 in Bridgwater where the site has been laid out for new housing afterwards).
- As the campus will bring noise, air and light pollution, a massive increase in traffic, the potential for anti-social behaviour is increased - as experienced previously with Sizewell B construction. This will affect the health and wellbeing of all locals as well as place an unfair burden on Leiston, Eastbridge, Theberton, Yoxford and other smaller local villages.
- We believe EDF must make a cast-iron guarantee with financial penalties that all the development site land would be fully restored and not become 'brownfield'.

Transport Issues

- This area has changed - it is no longer as it was when Sizewell B was constructed - more people live here now, people's expectations are different and we have become a renowned music and arts festival area (Latitude, FolkEast, Maui Wau, Snape Proms, Aldeburgh Food Festival and many more). It is hard to see how your traffic predictions for Sizewell could integrate with these on the A12 and surrounding roads.
- You refer to your Stage 3 options as 'Rail-Led' vs 'Road-Led' which is enormously misleading as both use mainly road. You admit your 'Rail-led' strategy is uncertain but even that means up to 900 HGVs a day, plus Park & Ride busses, on the B1122 through the quiet villages of Yoxford and Middleton Moor, albeit bypassing Theberton.
- The Theberton bypass affects far too many residents and still places unfair congestion, noise, pollution, vibration damage and accidents on residents and visitors. Local groups have never advocated bypasses around B1122 villages because the 'D2' route is obviously a more sensible way to direct traffic to Sizewell...and it is possible to further remove your traffic from the B1122 if there was an underpass below the B1122. It therefore follows that all traffic for Sizewell could be channelled down the D2 without impinging on other roads. Local traffic could then still use the B1122 without congestion. In the long-term the D2 road could alleviate congestion on all roads in the area and be a worthwhile legacy.

- On your own estimation, 'Road-Led' means up to 1,500 HGVs a day on a Link Road from the A12, close to all three villages, potentially operating 24/7. The route is a bad choice, runs too close to many homes and listed buildings, with substantial embankments, cuttings, road and footpath closures, breaking up communities and making farms unviable. Parallel to the B1122, it will be of little use once the power station is built and so all that disruption and destruction of habitat will have been for nothing. In particular, the destruction of the historic 'Yew Tree Corner' must not be allowed to happen - there are ancient oaks here that would need to be felled according to your plan, completely unnecessarily, when D2 is a far better route for a multitude of reasons.
- In your 'Early Years', up to 600 HGVs/day, plus hundreds of vehicles for other Energy Projects would have to use the current B1122, before any new roads or Park & Rides are ready which means a nightmare for all locals using those roads or living near to them.
- Even with a new roundabout, Yoxford will become horrendously congested and a pollution blackspot - this is where the 'tourist route' (A1120) currently meets the A12 - how can that be appealing to tourists?!
- No figures are provided for the site entrance roundabout. It is estimated there could be up to 6,470 Sizewell vehicle movements (including 1,500 HGVs) per day, plus a forecast 6,800 passing non-Sizewell vehicles at peak. It is obvious much of this non EDF controlled traffic will use smaller roads, specifically the B1125 (pulling off the A12 at Blythburgh) through Westleton - right past our own listed (no foundations!) home - the road itself being narrow and windy at the Middleton end.
- Sizewell C & D need a proper, low-impact Relief Road, such as 'D2' or EDF's route W, and it needs to be built before main Construction starts. D2 is a more strategic route, serving multiple Energy Projects and providing a strong legacy for Leiston and Saxmundham. A D2 legacy being the route for all Sizewell traffic, thus freeing traffic on the B1122 and adjoining routes - especially if an underpass was also included.
- Normal transport to Leiston from either end of the B1122 for local people will become a nightmare - there are no other roads that allow access. Your HGVs and other vehicles obviously need their own access i.e. the D2 route.
- Around Hinkley, rat-running on country lanes and congestion in villages from flyparking by workers have become serious problems. There is no mention about what EDF is doing to prevent the same happening here.
- What is the purpose of the helipad? Are we to expect constant helicopter flights in and out of the area - you do not give figures for this? Not only will you be congesting the roads, but blighting air space as well.
- We oppose all road and footpath closures, and are concerned about the impact of Darsham's Park & Ride on dark skies designation.

Some comments on your ‘Consultation Process’

- Sizewell C & D is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. EDF’s Consultations have not been detailed enough for a project of this importance, with little evidence that you have listened to the concerns of local people, Councils or Groups.
- There is very little mention of cumulative environmental, traffic, social and other impacts, and no assessment of the combined impact of overlapping Energy Projects.
- You have presented new roads and massive traffic increases at the very last stage of public Consultation, resulting in considerable shock. Now admitting that your ‘Rail-Led’ strategy may not be feasible undermines your Consultation process.
- In Stage 1 and 2, you failed to present adequate comparisons; e.g. between proposed accommodation sites or between relief road proposals. This denied the public the ability to respond in an informed manner, resulting in an inadequate Consultation process.
- The model at your exhibitions does not show the Construction phase, despite previous suggestions. EDF’s computer-generated videos are over-simplistic and misleading. This is totally unacceptable in today’s age of advanced technology. Some of your documentation uses outdated aerial maps from 2004/07, despite 2016 maps being available.
- Why is there no visible central Government oversight and coordinated planning of all proposed ‘Energy Coast’ projects?
- We feel strongly that China General Nuclear is not a reliable partner. There are security concerns, and state investment is used by China to wield political influence. As stated by Alex Younger (Head of the UK’s Foreign Intelligence Agency) , in response to the BT and Huawei mobile technology cancellation - *“We need to decide the extent to which we are going to be comfortable with Chinese ownership of these technologies It’s not wholly straightforward”*.
- Spent fuel will be kept onsite – there is no long-term nuclear waste facility available. How will you cater for this?
- Surely you should be demonstrating your ability and desire to learn from other projects in order to make positive steps to improve your consultation procedures? We have not seen evidence of this here.

We look forward to hearing your considered response to our concerns - and hope very much to hear of your changed plans, based on all the feedback you receive.

Yours faithfully

Mr Steve Thorpe & Mrs Mandy Beaumont