

Sizewell C Stage 3 Town and Parish Event 22 January 2018

Key Issue Design

| Town/parish | Comments from Table 1 |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council. | <p>Pylons that have been added in this consultation are of a concern from a visual basis. There should be no pylons.</p> <p>Design of the causeway for the beach landing stage and access to and along the beach when operational.</p> <p>Relocation of B car park is a concern along with Gabbard works and interconnectors, how will the C works impact be assessed in conjunction.</p> <p>Sandy colour of buildings preferred.</p> <p>Reduction in height of office blocks is good but location of training centre queried.</p> <p>General site layout queried on how it will work going forward, concern that too much is being built on the site footprint and that footprint is encroaching on the beach.</p> <p>400 caravan spaces is of a concern.</p> |
| | Comments from Table 2 |
| Aldringham Parish Council | Should be pressing exemplar design for AONB. |
| Rendlesham Parish Council | Nuclear regulator is driven by safety not interested in safety. |
| Chillesford Parish meeting | Report dismisses underground cables. |
| Aldringham Parish Council | Detrimental effect on the wildlife – AONB RSPB. |
| Aldeburgh Town Council | Generic design – hasn't been designed for an AONB. |
| Suffolk County Council | Is Hinkley being built with pylons? |
| Aldeburgh Town Council | They're not allowed to clad it or paint it. |
| Aldringham Parish Council | Sizewell B is an iconic building and looks good. This must be the same |
| Southwold Town Council | This design will be based on Hinkley. |
| Aldringham Parish Council | Why are they removing the mound? |
| Chillesford Parish meeting | Mission creep. |
| Aldeburgh Town Council | Lighting (during construction)? – Hinkley is like a beacon at night. |
| Aldringham Parish Council | Car parks etc need sufficient screening so you cannot see the lighting and car parking. |
| Aldeburgh Town Council | Use suitable lighting |

| | Comments from Table 3 |
|---|---|
| Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council. | The area of the site appears very different from SZ A and B – footprint will be very large. Significant structure of concrete. Doesn't seem like there is anyway to reduce that – far greater impact than A and B. |
| Felixstowe Town Council | Don't have any comment on design. |
| Martlesham Parish Council | No comment on design. |
| Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council. | Anything EDF Energy can do to lesson the impact is welcomed – like that at night there won't be lights on eastern front is positive – not an eyesore. How long will it take to get the mound back, which helps to mitigate the view? The construction is an eyesore anyway you look at it. |
| Personal View – Felixstowe Town Council | Look at Sizewell B – that it an iconic – shame that SZC doesn't have any redeeming architectural feature. |
| Personal View – Suffolk County Council. | Going to look like an industrial unit. |
| Martlesham Parish Council | Concerned over the potential impact of lighting to the north to Dunwich Heath. What is the impact on the wildlife as a result? |
| Felixstowe Town Council | The accommodation campus is temporary in nature? What are the plans to restore the land? Concerns over the implications of this on the land (visual and amenity). |
| Martlesham Parish Council | Very concerned about the extension of the overhead lines (i.e. the pylons) – renewable energy companies are putting all their connections underground – any extension should be underground. |
| Felixstowe Town Council | Suggested that the capacity of the existing pylons was such that they could take on the power that they are proposing to provide, so what is the point? |
| Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council. | Was there an alternative to pylons – must it be pylons -have they considered this? |
| Felixstowe Town Council | Trade off between how much you can hide a thing of this scale against building something that can make a statement. The design makes these things visible and nondescript, but should we consider an iconic design. |
| | Comments from Table 4 |
| Darsham Parish Council | Design of P&R in Darsham: In Stage 3 increased number of vehicles. They moved entrance away from station with new roundabout on A12. Means additional 1200 cars going through on A12. No lights in village so concerned about lighting aspect. Noise and air pollution. Access to P&R from station – proposals mean train passenger need to walk along A12 for several hundred metres to get into P&R site – safety risk. |
| Wickham Market Parish Council | Similar concerns as Hacheston P&R. Also still no scheme of legacy /enhancement of landscaping and hedging. No further detail – EDF “not a detailed scheme yet” – have not looked at landscaping element with enough care. |
| Hacheston Parish Council | Light pollution from P&R sites – not enough detail on this aspect. Also headlights of cars. Concerns. |
| Middleton Parish Council | Proposing changed alignment of link road – parallel to branch line north of Carlton (details provided at meeting Design of accommodation Campus at Easton. No legacy. Next to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | one of the main roads to Minsmere which communities rely on for tourism. Poor design of Campus. |
| Middleton Parish Council | Generally environmental impact on Minsmere. Spoil heaps, borrow pits etc. |
| Wickham Market Parish Council | Northern Mound took a lot of detail to design and many years to evolve. Difficult to recreate and mitigate. |
| Darsham Parish Council | Believe split accommodation campus, with accommodation in Leiston would be better which was completely ignored by EDF. Opportunity for legacy. |
| Middleton Parish Council | Light pollution at the main development site – impact on wildlife and birds. |
| Middleton Parish Council | Importance of Minsmere for wildlife. Tourism impact. |
| Wickham Market Parish Council | Additional facilities – e.g. coronation wood – you are losing more habitats. |
| Middleton Parish Council | Pylons are totally unacceptable. |
| Wickham Market Parish Council | Red line boundary – can this be changed to allow for additional areas for landscape mitigation? |
| | Comments from Table 5 |
| Comment from this table are from Friston Parish council , Knodishall Parish Council , Nacton Parish council and Yoxford Parish council | <p>Is EDF ready to deliver this project when they are not finished consulting?</p> <p>Four overhead pylons are not acceptable and they are not cutting edge design, they are dangerous and they should at very least be buried. This will have a huge impact on the tourism industry and AONB's.</p> <p>Proposed colouring of the building is fine and is not an issue. Colours will blend in with a cloudy, overcast sky.</p> <p>It's inevitable that more parking will be needed but a possibility that they could work with Sizewell B to work together to use outages would be better than a whole new outage. There will be a noticeable influx in additional workers in terms of traffic and think it is more beneficial to use park and rides around the area. Goose Hill will cause more loss of AONB.</p> <p>Beach / freight facilities think the beach is ruined by the site anyway. The facilities provided for Sizewell B didn't work very effectively and fear it won't be used frequently. Another example of cutting corners. Isn't it better to put money towards more roads, major disruption on roads if we don't have this.</p> <p>Can't see how the beach will remain open.</p> <p>Spoil mounds, Abbey Farm – yet another additional development which is making the situation worse and haven't addressed the problem with spoil & borrow pits at all, a lot of criticism on this in Stage 2. Is this the right site to be doing this on doesn't appear to be very suitable. Want to see a lot more work on spoil management, safety and what they will look like.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Suffolk is being industrialised which is a problem.</p> <p>Accommodation campus doesn't make sense with no legacy benefit, there is a current need for more housing. Lots of problems with Hinkley being under subscribed due to family not being able to live there as single occupancy, people turning up with caravans.</p> |
| | Comment from Table 6 |
| Suffolk Coastal District Council | <p>Design cannot be significantly influenced due to being a nuclear build.</p> <p>Encourage EDF to make turbine halls more attractive. Site is an important tourism destination and therefore the design of the development is important.</p> <p>Only equipment and development essential to be located at Sizewell should be located there. Does accommodation campus need to be located on edge of AONB? Is there a better location? Should visitor centre be located on Goose Hill? It is agreed that certain buildings need to be located on the coast at Sizewell but is it essential that all the development proposed is? Facilities not required to be located on the coast in AONB could be relocated.</p> <p>Are pylons necessary? Justification provided by EDF is insufficient. Can the design of the pylons be improved? How can they be mitigated?</p> <p>EDF have improved design of the turbine halls which is a positive. Can further improvements be made?</p> |
| Benhall and Sternfield Parish council | <p>Could campus be disassociated with Leiston? This would allow natural dispersal of people and reduce concentrated effects of the development.</p> <p>Landscaping in strategic places is important. Need to provide landscaping/planting closer to viewing points. Need to consider wider more strategic planting.</p> <p>SZB dome is visible from significant distances but provides an interesting feature in the landscape. SZB has an organic shape. Not comfortable with new pylons. Concerns expressed in relation to pylons and visual impact. Pylons would not form an interesting feature.</p> <p>Has an architect been involved in the pylon design? Architects have influenced the design of the larger buildings on site. An architect could help to improve the visual appearance of the pylons.</p> |
| Peasenhall Parish Council | <p>Need to try and reduce visual impact of the design/development. Potential to look at increasing Northern Mound to screen views from the north. It would not need to be significantly increased in order to provide improved screening.</p> |
| Personal view Rushmere St Andrew Parish council | <p>Concerns in relation to pylons and adverse impact on AONB.</p> |
| Farnham with Stratford St | <p>Concerns expressed in relation to the presence of the pylons and</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Andrew Parish Council | cumulative impacts with other projects. |
| | Comments from Table 7 |
| Swefling Parish Council | Principle that this is not accepted, detail of design the Pylons that impact need consider the effect on wildlife and the beautiful landscape of Suffolk. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Pylons - consequence of two reactors instead of one, so knock-on effect of the closure to the shoreline & into the SSSI, it's too big for the area, need to look at if it makes sense for the area - amount have to move is 50 %. |
| Little Glemham Parish Council | With two reactors only have to shut down half for shut down. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Site is too small to build on, if pylons would go to under ground will take more of SSSI and this loss would not be able to be mitigated. SSSI Causeway, will increase the amount of the water on the SSSI, but starve Minsmere of water. The peat bunds the other side, when it is compressed this will lead to water levels rising. The Causeway will not be secured, need to make sure the area can take the weight. The northern mound – sea defence is only having the rock armour, but the Causeway is not having any such protection. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | The impact of the causeway on the hydrology. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Borrow pits – are any interesting name for quarry, will dig out sand then fill in the peat, visually will change the whole place & will effect why people will come. (Concern re impacts on hydrology). |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Weight of spoil piles. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Height of accommodation block dropped to 4 stories, will you be able to see the building from Minsmere, you will be able to see the borrow pits. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Pylons: not shown clearly in EDF documents |
| Chediston & Linstead Parish Council | Will there be an increase of pylons than what they are already saying. |
| Little Glemham | Universal round table that the pylons – including proliferation: how many more will there be? |
| Snape | Accommodation Block, they are ugly looking. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Unhappy with the word “temporary” as the construction phase will be around for 10 years in areas where there is an old demographic. |
| Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council | 2400 people next to Leiston which, at last census, had a population of 5600; at Hinkley Point C 500 on site, 1000 at Bridgewater - a town of 40000. |
| Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council | Medical facilities will there be services the campus? – so knock on effect. |
| Chediston & Linstead Parish Council | Do not have a manned police station. |
| | Comments from Table 8 |
| Suffolk County Council | TCs and PCs not directly impacted by design. Construction phase |

| | |
|--|--|
| | and what it will look like in the end. Associated developments, road improvements, 114 on to A12, where road comes out. |
| Personal view :Halesworth Town council | Main site – huge lump of concrete – is it possible to screen it or use camouflage technique? With wind farms in Germany they are painted earth colours at bottoms and changing as it goes up eventually to sky colour. |
| Personal view: Saxmundham Town Council | SZB is actually quite a nice feature, the SZC seems to lack a design feature. |
| Saxmundham Town Council | The impact of the large new buildings, in combination with the other small areas and facilities where there is currently nothing, will impact a significant number of people. |
| Personal view: Halesworth Town council | Pylon no higher than height of dome? The image did not show this and the pylon looked much higher, concern raised. |
| Personal view : Halesworth Town council | Pylons are significantly taller than a typical pylon, it links across the top of the buildings to link in to the building and substation on the other side. Can this be done in a different way to reduce visual impact? |
| Halesworth Town Council | Request for same attention to be paid to design detail for all buildings.– |
| Brandeston Parish Council | Does this set the area up for just another housing development? Brandeston PC. |
| Personal view:Saxmundham Town Council | Is accommodation campus in the design? Accommodation campus should be in a different location. The DC will come in afterwards to tell EDF where to put the accommodation, but it should be considered in advance. Good planning and design needed for park and ride. |
| All | Group discussed the park and ride as a temporary facility, in location for 10 – 12 or even 15 years. |
| All | Group discussion of design, and of park and ride. It was felt important that most desired and important requests put in to ensure their community not negatively impacted. |
| Halesworth Town Council | Regardless of cost to EDF “if it costs twice as much – don’t care – their problem” |
| All at table agreed | Important to start with top requests and prevent them from taking things away to reduce costs |
| All | Laydown area – this will be dramatically different over construction period. Exhibition gives fly through of this. Stock piles running up in 30 meters height. The group agreed that it would be a challenge. It will be a moonscape for the period of construction. |
| Halesworth Town Council | The marine option seems to have changed. St2 suggested bridges, this time round we are seeing wide causeways. Hope to narrow down and landscape – Less impacting option preferred? |
| Personal view:Halesworth Town council | Discussion of Minsmere levels and Sizewell levels, does not discourage ecological linkage. Footprints of bridges etc – are they mitigating against damage to SSSI? |
| Halesworth Town Council | Some issues have been mitigated but not all |
| | Comments from Table 9 |
| Melton , Kelsale , Pettistree & Rendham Parish councils Shared Comment | Needs to be sympathetic to the area. The proposals for the pylons are not sympathetic. Clarification as to why pylons are actually needed should be provided. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| All from Table 9 | <p>Visually the submitted proposals are much better at this stage of consultation.</p> <p>Level of detail and accuracy of document is poor</p> <p>Tourists come to Suffolk for the AONB. Impact on the landscape need to be as aesthetic as possible or it will impact tourism. Potential impact on Minsmere.</p> <p>Don't know why the training centre needs to be in the AONB.</p> |
| Personal view : Melton Parish Council | No legacy from Eastbridge campus. Would it not be better to look at a permanent solution that can add to local housing stock after construction. |
| Pettistree Parish Council | Poor co-ordination between EDF and SCDC Local Plan. |
| Personal View: Kelsale | Was the land at Bentwaters taken into account for use by EDF? |
| | Height of spoil heaps |