

# Sizewell C

## Detailed review of the SZC Co. Public Consultation (11<sup>th</sup> June to 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021)

### Introduction


Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council [**KcCPC**] have participated fully in the Sizewell C Pre-Application Consultations and Process since 2011, including the first 'Post dDCO Application Consultation' which marked the commencement of KcCPC's ninth year of responding to a plethora of; 'possibilities', 'potential', 'opportunities', 'ideas' and 'initiatives' that have subsequently largely been; qualified out, significantly modified, re-badged or still remain subject to 'continuing analysis'.

Nevertheless, KcCPC have once more committed hours of work to review the 48-page document, not only in the context of the previous Pre-Application Consultations, but also the huge volume of documents accompanying the ongoing dDCO Application and Examination.

As is now clear, having set 'hares running', SZC Co. have chosen to further exploit the intense pressure on limited community resources to bring forward yet more 'possibilities', 'potential', 'opportunities', 'ideas' and 'initiatives' that largely remain incomplete or lacking in; underpinning data, detailed analysis, necessary agreements, cumulative impact analysis, any appraisal of likely unforeseen consequences and their wider efficacy.

Nevertheless, KcCPC recognise that it must continue to participate in the prescribed process in order to try to safeguard the community of Kelsale-cum-Carlton and Coastal Suffolk from the worst excesses of SZC Co.

The following pages summarise KcCPC's review of the SZC Co. Consultation Document.

In principle we are in favour of the enhance Pretty Road Bridge Proposals however a number of questions are raised by the Consultation Document and these are identified with a  at the left-hand side. The Council anticipate SZC Co. responding to these questions!

**Note:** The absence of a specific comment in this response does not imply, nor should it be interpreted as implying Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council having no issues pertaining the paragraph where there are no views expressed.

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 No comment

## CHAPTER 2. MAIN DEVELOPMENT SITE PROPOSED CHANGE (PROPOSED CHANGE 16)

2.1 No comment

## CHAPTER 3. TWO VILLAGE BYPASS PROPOSED CHANGE (PROPOSED CHANGE 17)

3.1 No comment

## CHAPTER 4. SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (PROPOSED CHANGE 18)

### 4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Would a road such as the proposed SLR with a speed limit of 60mph, create road safety issues? Moreover would it be possible to include speed enforcement cameras from the outset to stop it becoming a “drag strip” at less busy times.

### 4.2 Description of, and justification for, Proposed Change 18

#### i Pretty Road Bridge

#### 4.2.2

❑ Can SZC confirm the proposed bridge would be available to carry all motorised and non-motorised traffic?

❑ Do SZC anticipate any SZC construction traffic (commercial/HGV and/or worker vehicles) using the Pretty Road/Theberton Bridge. If so under what circumstances and with what safeguards?

#### Figure 4.1A Inset 1

❑ What measures will be in place to prevent ‘stopped up roads’ becoming the target of ‘fly tipping’ and HGV “lay-up” spots? What provisions will SZC make for the clearing of any accumulations and detritus from any HGV “lay-up” (bottles, litter etc)?

❑ What is an ‘accommodation track’ and for what/whom? What restrictions and safeguards will be in place?

#### Figure 4.1B Inset 2

❑ What is the form of ‘pond re-instatement’ to be undertaken to ensure no loss of biodiversity, and ideally increasing? What post re-instatement management and monitoring will be in place until a “stable state” is achieved?

#### Figure 4.1C Inset 3

❑ What traffic management will be in place to permit access/egress of AIL’s without potential ‘black-spot’ being created?

❑ What pollution and other issues do SZC foresee in respect of the route of Minsmere Old River to the north of the SLR? What safeguards will be in place to avoid contamination along its entire course (rubber run-off spills etc)?

Q According to the consultation document Fordley Road South will still be freely accessible from the SLR thus enabling a “rat run” to form through it and through our Parish. Unfettered access is not acceptable to our Parish and we are consulting with residents in respect of this issue via the Summer Edition of Community News.

Q In the early years what are the foreseen impacts to maintaining access on the roads to site?

#### Figure 4.1D Inset 4

Q According to the consultation document Hawthorn Road will not only be accessible to Local Traffic but SZC Construction and Workers traffic. This is not acceptable to local communities and as with Fordley Road, Local residents need to be able to access services but not have the stress and inconvenience and delay of SZC traffic. Potential for “no construction traffic” signage? And/or Local traffic only, with plus and minus analysis by Suffolk Highways or limited width access points for example at points prior to North Green crossing?

#### Figure 4.1E Inset 5

Q What is the evidenced ‘performance’/success of ‘bat hop-over’ planting? (Please see KcCPC Community Impact Report -section on Biodiversity)

#### Figure 4.1F Inset 6

Moat Road being stopped up will cause loss of amenity/utility to Kelsale-cum-Carlton and to other Coastal Suffolk residents. Safeguards would be required as per 4.2.2.

#### i Prow

4.2.6 No doubt the District & County Councils will advise on the safety of pedestrians and other non-motorised road users (including biodiversity – no roadkill if it can be avoided) crossing a busy road with a 60 mph limit.

### 4.3 Environmental impact of Proposed Change 18

#### (4.2.3)

Please note that Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Councils position on the SLR is consistent, as we still are firmly of the opinion that the proposed road is located in the wrong place, severing communities, moreover with no legacy benefit, we still wish it to be removed on completion of construction (or earlier if at all possible)

This is especially relevant as if it was retained, as it would appear that SCC would be required to pay for the upkeep as indeed they are expected to pay for the maintenance of the Highway network in Suffolk (exc A14) at cost to the taxpayer rather than by SZC.

## CHAPTER 5. RESPONDING TO CONSULTATION

### 5.1 No comment

Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council’s review of SZC Co.’s Public Consultation (11th June to 12th July 2021) ends.