



Interested Party ID: 20025904

**The Sizewell C Project: EN010012**

**Deadline 10 submission**

**COMMENTS on submissions at D8 and D9 made by Sylvia Ballard concerning BRIDLEWAY 19**

*Rachel Fulcher, BA (Hons), MPhil  
Coordinator*

We wish to support the submissions made by Sylvia Ballard at Deadlines 8 and 9, together with her previous submissions, concerning Bridleway 19. We also wish to add our own comment regarding Sizewell beach.

Copied below is an email sent on 12 July 2021 on behalf of our members to the Sizewell C Project, regarding Consultation Change 16 in relation to Bridleway 19. Despite our own request and the various submissions made by Sylvia Ballard (AS-333, REP7-265, REP8-271 and REP9-043), a local horse rider, the concerns of members of Suffolk Coastal Friend of the Earth and local equestrians remain outstanding and unresolved as they have not been properly subject to examination.

At ISH12 on 15 September 2021 Bridleway 19 was agenda item 4 (ii). It remains unclear from the SZC Project submission responses REP8-122 and REP8-126 how the rights of the users of Bridleway 19 will be protected as required under the terms of the DCO.

The proposed temporary diversion route for Bridleway 19 on to the combined bridleway and cycleway cannot be completed until the initial stages of proposed construction of SZC are completed, but as Bridleway 19 currently runs through the centre of the construction site this popular public right of way will need to be diverted on safety grounds before any works on the SZC development site can commence.

The route of Bridleway 19 is regularly used, and during the proposed construction of SZC this right of way, or its temporary diversion, will also carry the many walkers diverted from using the Coastal Path and Sandlings Walk. A suitable and safe alternative must be provided for Bridleway 19 that is open and available at all times, with no temporary closures of any kind or duration.

We note that the provision of mounting blocks for horse riders are now included at the Beach Landing Facility, implying that an alternative route for Bridleway 19 may be proposed along the alignment of Footpath 21 on the dunes and foreshore. Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth have already expressed concern about the damage to the fragile vegetated shingle and dune habitats, a County Wildlife Site of National Importance (see REP2-454, REP5-274 and our SoCG).

Using the dunes and foreshore as an alternative route for Bridleway 19 is therefore totally unsuitable. The shingle bank of the sea defence fronting RSPB Minsmere is also unsuitable for the passage of horses, and any damage caused could seriously affect the integrity of this natural sea defence.

We therefore look forward to a more satisfactory alternative being proposed.

.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Rachel Fulcher [REDACTED]  
**To:** Sizewell C. [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 12 July 2021, 11:49:58 BST  
**Subject:** Consultation on further proposed changes:

Dear Sizewell C Co

I am writing on behalf of the members of Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth, of which I am Coordinator.

Our main concern involves Bridleway 19 (change 16), as this is regularly used by a good number of our members, some of whom are horse riders.

Local equestrians have been asking for some time that the original Bridleway 19 that became the road of Lovers Lane for the construction of Sizewell B be made much safer. It is currently extremely hazardous for pedestrians and horse riders alike, as well as cyclists. Sizewell C would indeed provide such an opportunity.

Local horse riders have been hopeful of a link to Bridleways 27 and 26. The route you are suggesting around Paines Plantation is not the one preferred by these users, although from our perspective we

would not be in favour of the removal of so many trees. We suggest that you speak to local horse riders to find the best way forward.

Our main concern is further north, where Bridleway 19 passes through the proposed construction site. As it is so regularly used, a suitable and safe alternative must be provided to any part of it stopped up. Yet, according to AS-261, the proposed alternative route would not be in place for pedestrians until after the initial construction stage and not at all for equestrians until the entire construction of SZC is complete. Needless to say, this does not comply with highways regulations.

We therefore look forward to a more satisfactory alternative being proposed.

Yours sincerely  
Rachel Fulcher

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.