

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C Response to SoS 25-Apr-22 Questions - IP 20026787 Beaumont  
**Date:** 20 May 2022 12:20:25

---

Your Ref/ Interested Party: 20026787

## **Response to Secretary of State's Request for Information 25 April 2022**

Dear Madams/ Sirs,

Writing on the morning that EDF admits Hinkley C will be £8bn over budget, please find below my comments, which are entirely consistent with my Relevant Representation (30-Sep-20), my response to EDF's Nov-Dec 2020 'consultation' (18-Dec-20), deadline 2 written representation (2-Jun-21) and deadline 10 written representation (12-Oct-21), all of which have drawn no response from the applicant.

Again, I focus on the impact of the Sizewell Link Road on local communities and rely on others better placed to comment on the myriad of headline defects inherent in this scheme notably ESG red flags such as encroaching on an SSSI, AONB and RSPB Minsmere.

### **Summary**

**Sizewell Link Road: PINS should require the applicant to use alternative relief route W on grounds of cost, ecology, heritage and long term legacy. Alternatively, if the SLR is pursued, at the very minimum, PINS must insist on:**

- 1. the SLR's removal post construction; and**
- 2. precise and explicit mitigation measures to be implemented pre-construction to protect the local community and Designated Heritage Assets.**

### **Comment**

#### **1. SLR – Net Zero Long Term Legacy**

There has been no meaningful comment or engagement from EDF or PINS on the SLR's re-routing. The SLR is not the favoured relief road of Suffolk County Council and the local MP, Therese Coffey, has insisted on its removal upon completion, conditioning her approval in October 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."*

As PINS is fully aware from its site tour and multiple local submissions, the SLR will divide Theberton and carve up valuable agricultural land. The local community has been telling this to EDF for years without any meaningful engagement or response. The SLR's long term legacy would be net negative.

The Route W is shorter, cheaper to build and would impact fewer Designated Heritage Assets. Route W would also provide longer term legacy and its use transferable for the multiple local wind farm developments proposed by Scottish Power.

The SLR would therefore maximise impact on local communities for no net long term benefit and should be rejected. From cost, amenity and ESG perspectives, the SLR is a highly destructive white elephant.

## **2. SLR Impact on local community and Designated Heritage Assets**

If the SLR is constructed, it will cause significant light, noise and air pollution to several homes in Theberton including Grade II listed Theberton Hall, built in 1792, which it is planned to pass on a 4 metre high embankment. The applicant admits in DCO Volume 6, Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration, Table 4.16, p26 that Theberton Hall would suffer **major, adverse significant effect**.

Therefore, PINS should condition any approval by forcing the applicant to properly mitigate such effects on all potential victims in Theberton and elsewhere. PINS should insist on sensitive re-siting of the SLR, mature planting and acoustic protection measures to be in place pre-construction and require the applicant to provide appropriate compensation for homeowners and local businesses for loss of value.

Regards,  
Mark Beaumont