

Sizewell C

Written Submission to Deadline 10

On behalf of David and Belinda Grant

We are writing to provide a summary of our outstanding concerns on behalf of our clients, David and Belinda Grant of Fordley Hall, Middleton.

This submission should be read in conjunction with our submission, Deadline 7.

Since that date, the applicant through their agents Dalcour MacLaren have indicated a willingness to discuss how the physical impact of the Sizewell Link Road (SLR) (in terms of both its construction and subsequent use) can be mitigated in relation to our clients property. These impacts include:-

- Noise
- Light
- Physical severance

Our clients have engaged Create Consulting, who have also been involved in the dialogue with Dalcour MacLaren and the applicant's consultants.

It has been an ongoing concern that our client's consultants have had to practically lead the reaching of solutions which, although they are clearly capable of doing so, should not be their prime role in the process.

Throughout the engagement on these impacts, significant costs have been incurred by our clients undertaking a leading role in the dialogue with us commenting on erroneous methodologies which have been adopted by the applicant's consultants.

We consider it appropriate, that our client's full costs are settled by the applicant and we would ask that this is noted in the DCO process of determination.

Having met with the applicants agent and consultants at Fordley Hall on 2nd September, when the various mitigation measures were discussed, we were promised new proposals both in terms of landscaping and design of an underpass to assist with the reducing effect of the severance of our clients access across their property.

Despite providing additional ideas in relation to certain aspects of the underpass (in particular on drainage which was quoted to us as a limiting factor on the underpasses' height), we heard nothing from the applicant consultants with new proposals until the week commencing 2nd October, over a

month later and within 10 days of the last Deadline. We question why it has taken so long to return to us. Although it has been confirmed by the applicants agents, that the discussions will be ongoing after the closing of the examination, we have concerns that there will be no formal recourse should their final offer be unacceptable.

We fully appreciate the nature of what the applicant considers accommodation works and in theory, the extent, or rather the lack of it, may give rise to compensation under the Compensation Code. That said, in our professional opinion the lack of satisfactory accommodation works has never adequately been covered by any subsequent compensation payment. Indeed it cannot cover some of the non-financial aspects of the impact on our client's property.

We are facing issues in relation to the conclusion of the option arrangement presently being negotiated between the applicants and our clients respective solicitors. That document provides for agreed accommodation works but given that there are penalty clauses for late signing of the option passed its 12th November deadline, we very much hope the applicants will provide sufficient input to agree acceptable accommodation works allowing that to be completed in time.

We also would like to raise the issue of an interface document which is part of the negotiations with the applicant through the option mechanism.

The reason for raising this, is that the applicant has expressed a view that the contents of the interface agreement, a copy of which we attach, should not be linked to any document in the DCO arena.

The interface document deals with issues such as soil treatment and drainage, in effect how the construction of the SLR will be managed and land reinstated thereafter.

We would expect to see the wording of these various issues covered in the Code of Construction Practice and we would ask, that the contents of the interface agreement are taken into account when considering the conditions applied to the DCO granted.

In summary, the whole process has been very disruptive to our clients as you can imagine given the uncertainty involved in the inherent proposal but also the substantive physical impact the SLR will have if built.

There has been a general wish to resolve issues with the applicant and although their conduct over the last few weeks has been productive, it has taken months to reach this point which coincides, with the end of the examination process.

Our clients have incurred substantive expense and have not objected to the scheme in principle which was made clear in our previous submissions. Notable expense has been incurred by our clients as a result of the lack of detail and initiatives by the applicant and we would ask for these costs to be fully reimbursed by them accordingly.

Encs Interface Document

E/C/EDF/Grant/Deadline 10
11th October 2021