



Sizewell C Written Representation – Deadline 10

Mark Beaumont – Interested Party

Your Ref: 20026787

12 October 2021

Following my Relevant Representation dated 30-Sep-20 and deadline 2 written representation dated 2 June 2021, I raise again the following two unresolved areas of significant concern over the Sizewell C Application specific to the proposed Sizewell Link Road (Work No. 12B) (“**SLR**”) and Theberton Hall, which have, to my knowledge, still not been addressed satisfactorily by the applicant. This is reflective of the applicant’s appalling apathy towards meaningful stakeholder engagement, which has blighted this process for many years.

Of course, these two specific issues sit squarely alongside the enormous, and logically unsurmountable, wider issues facing the construction of two outdated and crippling expensive EPR reactors at this unsuitable location and the associated deleterious impact on communities, ecology, wildlife, tourism and the environment. I trust that the ExA, in its final consideration, will reject the application and force EDF to go back to the drawing board in every material respect and start engaging meaningfully with stakeholders.

1. SLR Long Term Legacy

If planning consent were to be forthcoming, the SLR should be replaced by the cheaper and less disruptive Route W(S) (formerly D2). Route W(S) is shorter (saving millions of kms of emissions per year), will impact fewer Designated Heritage Assets, will be cheaper to maintain, and could provide a long-term legacy.

Local MP, Dr. Therese Coffey, said in Oct-20: *“I have suggested that this [SLR] should be removed on the completion of the project though. A permanent road in that location would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and have no legacy benefit.”*

The SLR should be abandoned on grounds of cost, ecology, heritage and long-term legacy. However, if it is pursued, any consent must be conditional on its removal post construction, in accordance with Dr. Coffey’s suggestion.

2. SLR Impact on Theberton Hall

Theberton Hall is a Grade II Listed Designated Heritage asset built in 1792. It has been in our family for 25 years and has been painstakingly restored. The SLR will pass some 125m from the Hall on a raised 4 metre embankment.

EDF's admits in DCO Volume 6, Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration, Table 4.16, p26 that there will be **major adverse, significant** effects on Theberton Hall during construction. Such effect was then inexplicably changed to 'minor' in the applicant's Relevant Representations Report with no justification or explanation since.

No further detail on mitigation has been given by the applicant. Indeed, the applicant has suggested any planting will only be mature once construction is over. This is unacceptable – the noise impact will be major, adverse and significant during construction, not after when the SLR would be removed. The SLR will cause significant light, noise and air pollution and will impact on privacy. This is all admitted by the applicant per their previous statements and must be addressed.

If the SLR is pursued (see 1 above), mature planting and other acoustic and visual mitigation and compensatory measures must be conditioned to protect this Designated Heritage asset, built some 229 years ago.