

Submission ID: 2801

Dear Sirs

I have attached my open floor statement (scan 0053) to my representation
this now includes some additional information

I would also convey that I was both surprised and frustrated that EDF made no effort to respond
to the statements made at the open floor meeting

Graham Bickers (20026345)

OPEN FLOOR PRESENTATION

Sizewell C Accommodation **Graham I Bickers** **20026345**

It is clear EDF's are seeking to service all elements of the construction site through one entrance, which will create a major pinch point on the B1122

With the support of an independent report by Boyer and Cannon and my planning knowledge I am focusing on the siting of the workers accommodation,

To demonstrate the total lack of consideration & concern EDF has given to this report, which was commissioned by both Suffolk County Council and the District Council, from which they made the following statement.

"While the councils understands the rationale of an accommodation campus located at, or close to the construction site, we remain concerned about the Environmental impacts of the proposed site location which may cause an overload on the sensitive environment of the AONB"

The community believes the impact cannot in anyway be resolved or mitigated in its proposed setting. The accommodation will be the population of a town! Significantly adding to the cumulative impact on the surrounding environment

This is surely the overload that the councils and I are referring to, so the accommodation siting needs to be revisited. It is set in a remote rural location with limited infrastructure, which will result in at least 400 additional car movements in and out of a congested access every day

It will be with us for more than 12 years and is a facility that requires proper planning criteria to be applied, when considering this accommodation, as it can hardly be considered temporary.

The entrance, will at present service the 2400 workers, all HGVs and park and ride buses, so why not reduce the impact of the accommodation workers and their cars Hinkley residents report, long tailbacks into site can be expected on daily basis even with EDF traffic management.

Sound evidence has never been produced by EDF as to why they dropped the Leiston East Campus option and never considered other options also why do EDF expect us to believe, workers even prefer to work, sleep and play on a remote construction site. Would you want to be in the same place 24/7, where is that evidence EDF, it beggars belief, what about their mental well being.

The consultants supported the Lewiston East campus, as it has less environmental impact, believing it to have, good access for workers via the existing Sizewell B entrance and a newly formed access to the South side of the site, this must have benefits in regard to vehicular impact. The Leiston campus has good connectivity to the town to serve all the needs of construction workers.

So I would ask the inspectorate to visit the proposed sites including Leiston East If planning were to be given, we ask the inspectorate to condition the final approval in regard to the re-siting of the accommodations

Con't

Sizewell C Accommodation Graham I Bickers 20026345

In closing I would ask all the inspectors, who are evaluating this DCO to take a quiet moment and paint their own picture. Imagine you have a son, a daughter, a mother, or a father living within this area, close to the proposed site, consider the impact this will have on their family lives, Yes your family! As we are all part of someone's family

- This will represent the lose of large swathes of their human habitat, yes humans have habitats.
- The loss of the dawn chorus to sound of impact machinery
- To witness the stress and the mental pressure this construction will bring to your family.
- To see your grandchildren, unable to gaze in wonderment at our amazing the dark skies.
- To see your family's wildlife habitats and beaches ravaged by construction machinery.
- To look out on the ever changing and diminishing landscape, with its spoil heaps, that rise higher than a block of flats
- To have 2400 workers come to live within your community, can you imagine that, can you see that, the impact on a hamlet of 70 people and many more people within this rural area
- Imagine the effect on the wildlife, they have no voice, you are their voice and they are losing their homes, their habitat, they may never come back, what are you going to do?

Finally just live in this moment!

Imagine that your parents are frail and elderly, your dad has just rung 999 from Eastbridge, your mother is seriously ill the ambulance cannot get through, what next! Will your mother live or die, that could be a reality, will EDF care!

Our families will be living that nightmare and may well pay that ultimate price

Thank you

Additional Information Con't

Additional Information

Graham Bickers 20026345

This additional representation is in two parts, one in relationship to the accommodation and secondly the cumulative impact this would have on the blighting of our community and properties

Accommodation

- No statement regarding the increase in work force from 5400 -7900 has been made in respect of resolving the additional accommodation problem. At this stage it can only be assumed a significant increase in the workforce will result in the pressure to expand the onsite accommodation which would further impact the ANOB and the community.
- EDF who say they wish to protect the environment and the local community have failed to justify their reasoning for the siting of this accommodation, apart from a commercial perspective.
- Overall the B & C report (2017) questions what criteria were used to select the original 3 option sites.
- Comparing EDF’s original 3 option sites and the proposed B&C sites The table below, (produced by both SCC & B&C) clearly show the impact of siting of the accommodation in its proposed setting, as other options produce less cumulative impact.
- Also an additional option was proposed by SCC (Leiston Airfield) but this was rejected by EDF
- Even as early as Stage 1 the response by SCC (6th February 2013) sought the comparative merits of option I (Eastbridge) and option 3 (Leiston East) to be re-accessed
- This was underpinned again in the B&C report (2017. 16.12) in which it confirmed a full and proper “Accommodation Strategy” must be undertaken.
- The joined Stage 3 response (March 2019) from SCC & ESC confirms they still seek further evidence regarding this matter.
- EDF have never changed their stance on this, although evidence strongly supports their option has little or no credibility.
- The siting of the accommodation will add significantly to the blighting of our area, on housing and landscape and therefore at this time the word “commercial” is seen as the only evidenced reason for EDF’s decision.
- We would ask that EDF’s selection criteria be thoroughly examined together with its setting and the associated cumulative impacts this would bring to our community, are fully investigated.

B & C’s summary table of suitability – in which a range of factors are “graded” - is given below but with Sizewell Gap (Option 2) and Sizewell Gap (Coast) omitted as they are considered by both EDF and/or the B&C report to be unsuitable. Both are fully contained within the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB and the coastal site is also partly within the Leiston and Aldeburgh SSSI and would be very visible to the north as far as Southwold.

Site	Area (Ha)	Proximity to Site	Environmental Impacts	Transport Impacts (site)	Transport Impacts (external)	Amenity effects	Legacy potential	Possible split site
Eastbridge Lane (Stages 1 & 2 Option 1)	34	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Y
Saxmundham South	42	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N
Leiston Airfield	101	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N
Leiston West	32	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Y
Leiston East (Stage 1 Option 3)	33	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Y
Lovers Lane (Stage 2 Caravan Site)	31	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Y
Impact Levels								
Limited		Green						
Moderate		Yellow						
Significant		Red						

The three issues that cause concern throughout B & C’s report are environmental impacts, transport impacts, suitability for legacy and cumulative impacts at some of the sites.

Blighting

Given the additional impact of all the elements of the construction including the proposed accommodation on our community, property blight should be recognised, as with National Infrastructure Plans such as HS2

Since EDF confirmed their intention to build Sizewell C, we as a community have become increasingly concerned with the impact and blighting on properties close to the proposed site. Having taken professional advice in respect of our property values in our parish, over the consultation period (9 years) and subsequently they believe properties although selling, but at a much slower rate, have already potentially lost value of up to 10% against other areas outside those effected by Sizewell C.

It is evident that many properties within our parish are within metres of the proposed development, it is clear that properties in close proximity (1½ mile) to the development area will experience unacceptable levels of disturbance from dust, noise, light pollution, traffic volumes within our parish.

Having approached EDF regarding these concerns in the meeting on behalf of the community to seek common ground, this issue being a very important area we feel EDF should be supportive in, as this will result in residents being unable to move because of the financial implications or just the inability to sell.

Amazingly they say they do not recognise blighting, although we can report this was not the case at Hinkley, where it might be considered less than on our community. EDF offered various options in regard to supporting the blight on the communities & their properties.

Although we are the closest parish to the development we have never had an impact assessment carried out specifically on our community. It is totally unacceptable as it would appear that the only impact statement on Eastbridge is buried away in the DCO ref 5.13 (Impact Report) Section 4 under Saxmundham, which has a population of 4913 (census 2011) and is 5 miles away from our community. Reference 4:6:77 & 4:6:78 in which it says combined noise and vibration and / or landscape will have significant adverse effect.

Do we not deserve better?

Conclusion

- EDF should be required to do a full "Impact Assessment" on our community which should include: - Pollution, Noise, Vibration, Traffic flows, Light pollution, Dust, Social cohesion & Mental Health
- EDF should be required to evidence why and on what basis within an agreed radius, property prices will not be effected by blighting due to their project, caused by the period leading up to and over the construction phase
- As part of the condition of planning an Independent Monitoring Body should be required to be put in place to protect our community against Property Blighting by EDF or any successive owner

Thank You **Graham Bickers** 200226345