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FREEPOST SZC Consultation

**SIZEWELL C STAGE 3 CONSULTATION - SUDBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL PROPOSED RESPONSE**

**Introduction**

Sudbourne Parish Council has reviewed the Stage 3 consultation documents, and has discussed and agreed a village response at their meeting of January 24th 2017. The Parish Council agreed that it would be realistic to concentrate on a small number of key issues in our response, where we can show that we are genuinely impacted *as a community*, rather than to respond to all fourteen consultation questions in detail. The response therefore prioritises six items in the consultation questionnaire; but we have urged parishioners who wish to make responses on other issues, or more detailed responses on these six areas, to do so within the (unrealistically short) timescale allowed for this stage of consultation.

**The six areas we have made responses on are as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 |  Sizewell C Proposals – Overall |
| 2 | Main Development Site: Environment |
| 7 | Transport: Overall Strategy |
| 8 | Transport: Rail |
| 11 | Transport: Road Improvements – A12 |
| 13 | People and Economy |

**1 Sizewell C Proposals – Overall**

Sudbourne PC recognise the national necessity for a project of this sort, whilst regretting that it has to be placed in an area of extremely high ecological and environmental value which already has significant transport and traffic problems.

The project is very likely to go ahead, and SPC want to help ensure that the worst impacts are minimised or mitigated. At the same time we want to ensure that the parishes affected make the most of the positive impacts on the economy, including skills training, employment, improvements in tourism and **above all** a lasting improvement to transport and other infrastructure. The current proposals do not go nearly far enough in these respects, and we are disappointed that feedback from the first stage of consultation has not had a greater impact on this draft.

**2 Main Development Site: Environment**

 Building a new nuclear power station in an AONB will damage the existing historic environment, the local ecology, and will (in this case) even lead to the removal of part of a SSSI. Local footpaths and bridleways will be closed temporarily (some permanently), and there will be further light, noise and air quality pollution and degradation, and consequent loss of biodiversity. Coastal processes will be affected by the new buildings and the jetty structure and Beach Landing Facility. **All of this is freely admitted in the Stage 2 consultation document, together with mitigation plans; but many of the mitigation plans are weak – for example the reed-bed proposed to compensate for the SSSI loss**. Too many of the other mitigation plans depend on ongoing research and planning that is not yet complete – the document is full of ‘..*We will present more detail…at a later stage of construction*..’ or ‘..*Our continuing studies will help us to determine*…’ or ‘..*we will present further detail at a later stage of consultation*..’. **This is not nearly good enough, and not acceptable at this planning stage,** nor is it clear whether the current plans are properly co-ordinated with decommissioning plans at the existing plant. Moreover, the design of the reactor buildings themselves is being imposed without option or consultation, and will have a huge impact **for the next century** on this stretch of coastline.

**3 Transport: Overall Strategy**

As far as Sudbourne is concerned, the impacts of the transport strategy are secondary; but we will be affected by an overall increase in (a) road traffic on the A12 and (b) rail traffic through Melton to Wickham Market and Sizewell. The impact will be worst in the three central years of a 10-12 year construction period, and although EDF claim the actual increase in road traffic at Woodbridge will be only some 3% and at Farnham about 6%, the actual numbers of journeys are huge – the peak construction workforce of 5,600 and the building works themselves will be serviced by peak HGV movements of 450 a day (double this on the busiest day), 400 Park & Ride bus movements, and up to 700 LGV movements a day, plus of course individual car journeys. The freight management centre S of Woodbridge has been removed from the plans, and EDF will rely on ANPR and mobile freight monitoring to avoid jams and bottlenecks. **EDF must** **ensure that improvements in mobile connectivity to provide mobile monitoring have a positive local impact.**

Plans for rail improvements at Campsea Ashe and for maximising sea freight movements do not seem to be very much further forward than in the stage 1 document, and **it is regrettable that there is not greater certainty in either.**

**Our overall impression is that EDF are trying (quite hard) to deal with an intractable transport problem that will inevitably have serious and negative impacts for communities served by the A12 and local rail services, *unless* we can take this opportunity to achieve the four village bypass around Stratford, Farnham, Little Glemham and Marlesford.**

**4 Transport: Rail**

**The proposal to double the tracks at Campsea Ashe is welcomed,** and EDF should also ensure that there are train movement indicators all along the Lowestoft line (**this will need better mobile communications,** which would have a good knockon effect). We need more information on the effect of freight rail traffic on the frequency and length of Melton level crossing, as this strongly affects access to all the villages along the B1084 and beyond (Butley /Chillesford/Orford/Sudbourne etc).

5 **Transport: Road Improvements – A12**

The four options set out by EDF extend only as far as a two-village bypass around Stratford St Andrew and Farnham. **We strongly agree with SCC and SCDC that the *minimum* acceptable mitigation is option 4, the 2-village bypass, and only on the basis that the funds set aside by EDF are available for transfer into any scheme developed by SCC to build the 4-village bypass, based on the options established in SCC’s 2014 Four Villages Study**. We understand that SCC have received central funding to develop a business case for the four villages bypass, and **strongly support this development.**

**6 People and Economy**

SZC should be required to provide a significant boost to local economies in the longer term, in recognition of the burdens placed on East Suffolk economies over the construction period and beyond. **We strongly support the position taken by SCDC and SCC to hold EDF to their commitments to promote ‘..sustainable careers in the key sectors of the economy that will support the construction of Sizewell C..’, and to recruit at least 36% of the construction workforce from the local area in the peak construction phase.** **SCC/SCDC should put pressure on EDF to maximise inward investment in skills training from the primary school level upwards, to support innovation and the development of new business start-ups locally across a range of business sectors, and to prioritise local *skilled* employment**. We welcome the commitment to work with skills and education providers, and strongly urge EDF to support the *Developing Suffolk Talent* programme as part of this commitment.

We recognise that there may be considerable displacement of tourist activity southwards from the construction area as footpaths and access roads are closed or diverted and the traffic increase discourages travel towards (e.g.) Minsmere; this may provide additional (but unmanaged) activity around Aldeburgh, Orford and the Alde & Ore estuary generally. **The potential impacts should be recognised and quantified in the next stage of consultation.**

Although it will have secondary rather than direct impact on Sudbourne, **it is very disappointing** that the potential impacts on local services (GPs, schools, emergency services) of the relatively vast new construction population (around 10 times the size of Subourne’s own population) are dismissed entirely at this stage of the process with the rather contemptuous phrase ‘..Following Stage 2, we will undertake further detailed analysis…’. The next stage is the submission of the Development Consent Order, which will be a matter for the Planning Inspectorate to review, and not for Parish Councils – so **it is very hard to understand why this has not been dealt with in some detail at this stage.**

I trust that you will take the above comments into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Joanne Peters

Clerk to Sudbourne Parish Council