

# Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

## Response to the EdF Stage 1 Consultation on Sizewell C

EdF Energy mission - to bring sustainable energy solutions home to everyone

### Preface

We understand that the stage 1 pre-application consultation document sets out EdF's broad plans for the new power station and the associated developments in support of its construction and operation. By its very nature this consultation has been at a high level and therefore has made it very difficult to give detailed responses to many of the issues. Aldringham Parish Council has given comment as far as it has been possible considering the information that has been available in written form, through discussion and via presentations. We thank EdF for the opportunity that has been given for us to make comment and wish to continue to work in partnership with EdF as more detailed proposals are developed following this consultation in preparation for Phase 2.

As part of the preparation for the Stage 2 consultation Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council consider that it is both important and mutually beneficial for EdF energy to work with us and other key stakeholders to optimise the solutions identified in the Stage 1 consultation. This would strengthen EdF's approach which currently appears strong on aspiration and weak on implementation. We recommend that EdF considers the many benefits of the option we describe in Appendix 1.

### 1 Parish Overview

The parish of Aldringham-cum-Thorpe is immediately south of the nuclear site and within the Emergency Zone, it includes the villages of Aldringham and Thorpeness together with parts of Sizewell.

Aldringham has an historical base with a church, school and pub, it consists of an essentially linear settlement between Leiston and Aldeburgh. The coastal hamlet of Thorpe was developed a century ago into the holiday village of Thorpeness which combines residential, second home and rental occupation with a strong cultural heritage and significant tourism activity. There is a 4:1 seasonal population swing with the residential age distribution skewed to the upper quartile.

The future sustainability of the villages is challenging and current work being carried out by the parish council includes a review of coastal impacts, housing and people, business, tourism and community building. Sizewell C could significantly benefit the work the Parish Council is doing to enhance the quality of life of the communities but at the same time it may overwhelm the very limited parish resource we have available.

### 2 Our beliefs

As we are being asked to host two new nuclear reactors it should be recognised by both Central Government and EdF alike, that there are wider implications our local communities will have to bear in accepting the disturbance and consequences of this

nationally significant project. We believe that these communities can reasonably expect some reward for the dis-benefit of living within a nuclear emergency planning zone, this should be given through practical support in order for impacted communities to maintain their quality of life and be assured of a sustainable future.

We need to agree in principle long term benefits for our communities and determine how best they can be sustained, supported possibly by the new nuclear authorities working closely with central government and industry to establish a long-term fund which could be based on generating capacity as distinct from a section 106 agreements negotiated for construction phase.

If EdF's consultation objectives are sincere, more robust proposals are needed to identify how community input can be harnessed between the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultations so they can be worked interactively to obtain a mutually beneficial resolution for Stage 2, rather than "being taken into consideration" with little obvious influence.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council require that EdF following the Stage 1 consultation continue with us and other relevant stakeholders to investigate how every pound spent on supporting the building of Sizewell C, could also deliver lasting legacy benefit, and therefore clearly demonstrate EdF's commitment to sustainability and the goal to reuse and recycle wherever possible.

### **3 The Sizewell C Site**

3.1 The station is located one mile north of our parish boundary and will have significant impact on our communities. Section 3.2.39 of the EdF Environmental Report states that EdF Energy will work to optimise the economic benefits generated by the project for the communities within and surrounding the Sizewell area and where necessary, mitigate potential adverse impacts.

The site is located within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the Suffolk Heritage Coast. It also borders and lies partly within an area of ecological sensitivity, including the Sizewell marshes SSSI and other environmentally designated sites. Because of this very sensitive location we would expect EdF to treat this project including the station design as an environmental exemplar.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council expect EdF to treat this project including the Station Design and its surrounding area as an environmental exemplar.

#### **3.2 Character and Environment**

3.2.1 Loss of designated habitat must be minimised and every attempt made to restore and improve the habitat as soon as possible and where that is not possible seek to provide equivalent or better habitat elsewhere.

3.2.2 Visual impact must be minimised by sympathetic design to the standard set by that applied to Sizewell B. Appropriate landscaping and screening should be introduced to minimise visual impact on the coast and the neighbouring communities.

- 3.2.3 The area is very sensitive and has many designations, SSSI, ANOB, RAMSAR, SAC... The temporary and permanent sites cover large areas of designated land, there is no evidence provided to support the requirement to utilise all of the land identified in the diagrams. EdF should work to reduce the take up of land and where possible seek alternatives where there is no impact on designated sites (see appendix 1).
- 3.2.4 This area supports many recreational activities and EdF must ensure that people can continue to have access to and are able to enjoy their given pursuits.
- 3.2.5 There are a number of historically important sites within the area and EdF must demonstrate their willingness to preserve and protected them as our future heritage
- 3.2.6 Noise, vibration and light pollution all have the potential to inflict a significant impact on the quality of life for residents and visitors to our Parish. There are no details, even from previous construction, of how this may be mitigated. E.g. downward focussed lights may be used but requirements must be assessed to avoid providing more light than is needed for safe operation on the site.

Although EdF recognise the environmental importance of this area and the implications of the Sizewell C development on the issue identified above, there is little detail of how they will be dealt with and the uniqueness of the area will be preserved.

For each of the areas identified above Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council require EdF to work with the local government, statutory agencies, local communities and interest groups to develop acceptable proposals to resolve these issues or mitigate their impact.

### 3.2.7 Coastal Process

The coastal process documentation and presentations provided by EdF as part of stage 1 consultation show information collected over the years for the existing stations, but the design for Sizewell C is not sufficiently advanced for assessment of potential shoreline impacts. Work to date on coastal studies in section 4.12 of the EdF Environmental Report is concentrated on the nuclear site frontage and Minsmere Bay but not beyond the control point at Thorpe Ness (as designated on the accompanying charts). The text refers to Thorpeness which is the village to the south of Thorpe Ness.

It is a key condition of the approval of coastal schemes that they do not cause adverse impacts on the wider shoreline, or that impacts are understood and mitigated. EdF's analysis is primarily directed at the interest of the Sizewell C project and we believe must extend southward to include the Thorpeness village frontage as the nearest substantial settlement. This will demonstrate whether the Coralline Crag feature at Thorpe Ness divides the movement of beach material and wave climate into separate systems, or the process by which they interact.

Residents at Thorpeness have made a substantial contribution to coastal protection in partnership with Suffolk Coastal District Council and the Environment Agency and require quantitatively based assurance that development of the Sizewell nuclear site will not adversely affect their investment, or that EdF will undertake mitigation measures. This could be complementary to material management in the course of

construction. It is also possible that EdF will wish to be kept up to date with any further measures at Thorpeness.

Coastal work at Thorpeness has involved innovative geotextile technology, re-assessment of shoreline management policy development, and an intention to pursue greater understanding of beach profile drivers including the iCOASST project.

As part of EdF's stated purpose of working with the community we wish that our coastal representative should participate in forums which EdF may sponsor, with effect from Stage 1 consultation. This will ensure that options and solutions are explored between us before they become locked down as part of Phase 2.

Section 4.12 identifies influencing factors such as the jetty, thermal plumes and dredging. However the statements are highly qualified in terms of "potential" and consideration being given" so there is a need to consolidate data and quantify design impacts.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council expects robust analysis of potential impacts including the jetty, dredged access channels, thermal plumes and modified shoreline profiles, together with mitigation proposals as required. A defended 160 year nuclear peninsula will need to be considered in relation to the 100 year Shoreline Management Plan.

### 3.2.8 Marine ecology, water quality and fisheries

It is essential that the marine ecology is not adversely affected by any construction or operational activities carried out at Sizewell, including commercial and recreational fishing which is important to preserving the individual character of our coast.

### 3.2.9 Flood risk is an essential part of the Shoreline Management Plan and is covered mainly by the comments on coastal processes in 3.2.7 above

## 3.3 Permanent Development

### 3.3.1 Although the EPR design is largely fixed further work should be carried out to minimise and justify the land take for the permanent development and limit the intrusion to protected areas. The finishes shown do not match the high standard achieved on the Sizewell B station and unless EdF apply additional measures it will fail to meet the standard expected by the local communities.

### 3.3.2 Long term spent fuel storage seems to rely on the availability of a geological repository by describing the on-site storage as interim. The current absence of a plan to achieve this undermines the credibility of EdF's proposal unless a Plan B is included. If, once the ISFS capacity is exceeded, it is proposed to use a dry fuel store on site, it should be shown on the layout in a location where it is robust against coastal change beyond the decommissioning period. The design life of the ISFS also needs to ensure that it is robust against worst case assumptions of sea level rise plus increased frequency of surge events for a period of at least 160 years.

### 3.3.3 Access to the site is proposed via a new road to the north of the site, this road crosses a sensitive area and no detail is provided how its impact will be mitigated. There are no

details of how the junction with the B1122 and the Eastbridge road will be dealt with in particular to minimise the disruption to the traffic flow on the B1122

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council seek assurance that EdF will demonstrate that the permanent structures and services will be built in such a way as to give maximum respect to the environment in which they sit and afford minimum impact on the surrounding communities.

### 3.3.4 Visitors centre

EdF proposals for a visitors centre to support their communications strategy, is very welcome and should be developed in such a way as to provide a long term facility for the local communities and visitors alike. The visitors centre which opened at the time of the Sizewell B construction proved very successful and remained as a valuable resource for the community into the operational phase, but was unfortunately closed due to security and commercial issues. Location and provision of any new visitors centre should be planned such that it will not suffer a similar fate.

Option 1 Discounted as this is remote from the site and the coast.

Option 2 This may provide a good location for a temporary facility during construction if option C cannot be accessed, but long term would change the character of the Sizewell beach area, in a way that would not be acceptable.

Option 3 The Goose Hill option provides the best long term solution as it is located near to and has a view of the site, it is also near the coast and SSSI thus providing a good location for legacy use as a visitors centre, an energy centre and a field centre, enabling EdF to demonstrate its commitment to all of these areas.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council seek assurance that the Visitors Centre will provide an effective and enduring facility for the area.

## 3.4 Construction and temporary development

### 3.4.1 Clearing the site

In relocating buildings off the designated site area, a number of options south and west of the A site are being considered as suitable locations to accommodate these buildings etc. There are again no detailed proposals on which to comment but we would not wish to see land in this area used as it would have a major visual impact on the road leading to Sizewell Beach and would further contribute to the spread of the site into an area that should remain unaffected by the Sizewell C development.

The site contains a large amount of very toxic peat, we would like to see the proposals for its removal before we make any constructive comment.

### 3.4.2 Temporary construction area

The EdF proposal identifies a temporary construction area of some 140 hectares in the AONB, including good agricultural land and parts of a Site of Special Scientific Interest

(SSSI). For comparison, the construction of Sizewell B only used a temporary construction site of some 30 hectares. Little evidence is presented to justify the need for this large area. Work should be carried out to clarify this requirement, whilst identifying a strategy to reduce its size and reduces its impact.

More investigation should be carried out to see if land outside the AONB could be used to support the construction activities. (see appendix 1).

#### 3.4.3 Beach access

During the construction phase it is essential that access to the beach is maintained at all times, as this area is widely used for recreation by many different people.

#### 3.4.4 Marine Jetty

Although no details are provided, the jetty must be designed in such a way that it has no impact on the coastal processes. (This is a key area where we need to work with EdF on design options for both coastal impacts and the environmental impacts. See 3.2.7 above).

#### 3.4.5 Restoration

Although no details are provided for landscaping in the short and long term, the design must be robust and should be carried out as soon as possible and in such a way that it delivers not only restoration but enhancements to the surrounding area.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council seek assurance that before any activities commence at the Sizewell C Site, agreed detailed arrangements are in place which give confidence that the above issues have been suitably addressed. (See Appendix 1).

## 4 People and Economy

4.1 We commend EdF's determination to build long-term sustainable skills for future generations and its stated commitment to work with local businesses to ensure they are in a strong position to make the most of the all the opportunities available. Again there are no details of how we can locally maximise on these opportunities. Making the most of these opportunities will be critical in ensuring the long term sustainability of our communities and being ones in which a local EdF workforce would be pleased to live.

### 4.2 Workforce

4.2.1 Although we accept that construction shift work is an essential part of working on this scale of project and will help to spread the movement of workers across the day, it is essential the anti-social hours working, particularly at weekends, is kept to a minimum as noise, vibration and light pollution extended over the project life time would have a major impact on the quality of life to both residents and visitors to our Parish.

We agree that it is important that Sizewell workers integrate properly into the local community, but it must be recognised that there will be substantial impact on local services such as health and education, therefore it is essential plans are developed and agreed that will that will seek to resolve these issues.

#### 4.3 Skills, education and training for employment

In section 4.3.4 EdF have identified a range of opportunities and initiatives to help deliver skills, education and training necessary for employment. We commend this approach but as stated a strong partnership will have to be developed with all the key stakeholders to deliver these aspirations.

It should also be seen as a real opportunity, using the project as a spring board, to work with all the other local players in the energy sector (e.g. Wind, Solar, etc.) to make East Suffolk a centre of excellence for energy, in which there would be a long term requirement for the skills base that will be created.

Capital investment in a skills academy should be considered as a preferred option for delivering many of these skills.

#### 4.4 Local business opportunities

EdF recognise that a strong local supply chain can have major benefits in supporting the local economy and would play an essential part in supporting the long term viability of our local communities. It is important that these opportunities are well understood and local businesses are given expert support in order that they can compete for business against those from further afield who may be in a much stronger position to identify and succeed in taking on the opportunities.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council would like to see EdF as stated, work with all major players in the education and business sectors to develop robust and effective solutions which will deliver all the aspirations identified in section 4.3. The delivery of these will be essential in enabling us to be a sustainable community in the future and one in which a local EdF workforce would be pleased to live.

### **5 Accommodation**

5.1 The proposed accommodation strategy relies heavily on a large temporary accommodation campus for some 2,000 to 3,000 workers on a single site adjacent to the construction site. This is considered to be an insufficiently thought through solution, designed to minimise commuter impacts, rather than satisfy social need. The workforce will be made up of many social groups with different needs which will be difficult to service on a single campus.

There should be a much more sympathetic and considerate approach to the provision of temporary accommodation, and its permanent legacy use. While a large proportion should be as close to the construction site as possible, it should be dispersed to reduce the impact on the locality, and allow some social and cultural differentiation between campuses. Some of the accommodation should be designated for ongoing EdF use for workers during outages. Some smaller groups of housing could be built as permanent accommodation for future use on completion of the contract, for example as elderly people's or student accommodation.

As suggested a good percentage of the workforce will be seeking off campus accommodation of various sorts. EdF has made no proposals to encourage the development of new dispersed housing. This is seen as a missed opportunity to engage with housing associations and other providers of affordable housing to provide a housing legacy of general benefit to the community.

## 5.2 Campus accommodation

The use of a single, large campus of temporary four story accommodation is not considered to be socially desirable, or a sensible use of resources. (For comparison, the proposals for the construction of Hinkley Point C comprise three separate temporary accommodation locations totalling about 1,900 spaces). Smaller campuses with different facilities to suit different social groups may be more acceptable. No analysis of the social need has been carried out, or alternatives put forward such as those that may be required by a small family group which once may have opted for caravan style accommodation.

## 5.3 Campus site options

All the options put forward present major problems

Option 1 – The Site Campus is adjacent the B1122 and straddles the Eastbridge Road, it will have a major impact on the small communities in this area and offers little potential for legacy value.

Option 2 – Sizewell Gap Campus site is located within the AONB and would have to be removed therefore offers no legacy value.

Option 3 – Leiston East Campus site gives a good opportunity for a smaller campus with potential for legacy use of both the recreation and accommodation facilities.

Other options particularly for smaller more sympathetic style campuses should be considered (See appendix 1).

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council is disappointed at the lack of imagination put into the provision of temporary accommodation and the and the lack of consideration for the dispersed provision of accommodation that is capable of being adapted for useful legacy use as affordable or community style accommodation and would ask EdF to revisit this whole issue.

## 5.4 Other Types of Accommodation

The distribution density in figures 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the EdF Environmental Report demonstrates a compelling case for EdF resource to work with the local parishes sooner rather than later to understand the many issues. For example:

There is a need for appropriate housing development and the creation of an environment which attracts younger working people as a basis for on-going regeneration but it will not happen without added project management for funding, planning and building.

EdF's proposal to take up rented accommodation without detriment to tourism will need specific planning and management.



The potential business benefit to the widely renowned recreational and tourist facilities at Thorpeness would need joint planning.

Optimising the use of rented accommodation between EdF and leisure needs, liaising with developers and landowners to build new homes for the integration of future EdF staff into a sustainable community will require careful planning.

Sizewell C has the potential to provide longer term demographic and re-generation benefits for the future sustainability of local communities. Rented holiday accommodation, second homes, housing development including legacy and affordable housing, provision for leisure and heritage are all issues which already challenge our parish resources. Our ability to project manage these issues whilst trying to resolve the impact of Sizewell C is likely to overwhelm our local resources unless extra help is available from EdF in addition to the role of the planning authority.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council believe one of EdF's contributions to the community should include the provision of suitably qualified people to work with parishes to ensure that their future plans for sustainable communities can be successfully delivered.

#### 5.5 Accommodation Office

We believe this is an essential element in dealing with the large influx of workers.

### **6 Transport**

6.1 EdF have recognised that potential transport and traffic issues are of concern to local people and have produced a high level strategy which identifies a number of options that will help to mitigate these impacts. Although all offer practical solutions many are dependent on other infrastructure proposals being adopted such as the jetty, park and ride, the lorry park and a passing loop at Wickham Market. Therefore until more detailed analysis becomes available and these options start to be firmed up it is difficult to have any confidence that the holistic solution will be effective.

Following the Stage 1 Consultation Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council wish to continue working with EdF as analysis is undertaken and solutions are developed to be assured that the Stage 2 proposals being developed for transport will address the concerns of local people.

#### 6.2 Moving the workers

##### Park and ride

We support the principle of a Park and Ride approach as this will reduce the volume of traffic approaching the site, however it will increase the number of HGVs (Buses) on the road and it should be noted that for residents adjacent to the proposed routes the impact of an HGV is considerably greater than that of smaller vehicles as it creates much more intrusive noise and vibration. HGV's also cause considerably more wear and tear to the highways.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council request EdF to carry out detailed analysis in order to understand the impacts of HGVs relative to smaller vehicles before a final strategy is adopted.

Options for the location of both Northern and Southern Park and Ride sites have no direct impact on Aldringham-cum-Thorpe and should be largely a matter for the local parishes, however we believe as previously stated legacy value should be an important factor when making the decision. (See also Appendix 1).

#### Northern options

Option 1 – Yoxford Road - This is very close to the site and will bring traffic past the level crossing and have a major impact on B1122. There is no opportunity to derive legacy benefit.

Option 2 – Darsham – Although adjacent to the level crossing where it may cause some disruption, there is potential to link with the travellers by train and it could deliver legacy benefit providing a larger permanent car park and some housing and/or small business development opportunity.

Option 3 - A12/A144 – Careful considerations would need to be given to the road junction as this is an accident black spot, this site could deliver legacy benefit as a small business area.

Southern options – All these options have some issues and none of them appear to offer any opportunity to provide legacy value.

Option 1 – Wickham Market

Option 2 – Woodbridge

Option 3 –Potash Corner

#### Workers east of A12

As it is inappropriate for these individuals to travel out to a Park and Ride, provision needs to be identified for parking which does not compromise travel to site by the existing workforces of Sizewell A & B and does not significantly impact on the mass transport proposals.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council request EdF review the proposals for remote park and ride and carefully consider the proposals put forward in Appendix 1.

### 6.3 Moving freight

The aspiration to deliver freight to the site by the most environmentally advantages means is to be commended. Without some details of the assumptions and analyses, however, only limited comments can be offered.

#### 6.3.1 By sea

The provision of a marine jetty to reduce road and rail traffic is commendable but as EdF states it would be a significant development in its own right and although the design requires to be optimised to facilitate the import and export of materials it is even more important that it is designed in such a way that there is no impact on the coastal processes particularly as it may be maintained for future use See section 3.2.7 above.

### 6.3.2 By rail

The provision of a passing loop with re-commissioning the up platform at Wickham Market is likely to provide legacy benefit in reducing service perturbation delay. It is essential for EdF and Network Rail to demonstrate that a timetable including Sizewell and the future Felixstowe freight paths has sufficient allowance for perturbation recovery so that Ipswich main line connections are not eroded. The condition of track and structures also needs to be assessed for freight loading. It should be noted Network rail project lead times are long and must allow for freight provision being ready for Sizewell C construction start.

The new rail head options all provide workable alternatives but all have significant environmental impacts and are largely a matter of local interest.(See Appendix 1)The legacy of the Leiston Branch line providing a rail passenger service or a tourist option is an attractive community ambition which might be helped by the number of people who will need to visit the site professionally. The options of upgrading the branch line and integrating additional train paths into the East Suffolk line or alternatively providing an interchange at Saxmundham should be fully evaluated for feasibility.

### 6.3.3 By road

#### Freight management facility

The use of a freight management facility (FMF) and the enforcement of approved routes are to be commended and would be best located with an associated lorry park. However it is unclear why, with a sophisticated 'just in time' freight supply chain and a FMF there is a need for such a vast temporary construction area adjacent to the site.

#### Lorry Park

Options for the location of the lorry park has no direct impact on us and should be largely a matter for the local interest, however we have a preference for option 1 or 2. We believe as previously stated, Legacy value should be an important factor when making the decision.

Option1 – Orwell Lorry Park West – Allocated as employment land.

Option 2 - Orwell Lorry Park East – Part of AONB.

Option 3 – Seven Hills Junction – This would Impact on an already busy junction as well as the surrounding natural and historic environment.

## 6.4 Traffic impacts

6.4.1 As the traffic impact assessment is still being carried out it is difficult to give an informed view of any proposals to mitigate the impact. However EdF do not dispute that the A12 and the B1122 will be under increased stress and measures need to be put in place to mitigate this. The uncertainty is the scale of mitigation that is required and should be the subject for continuing discussion. We believe that a four villages bypass and a new link road from the A12 direct to the site would give the most effect solution (See Appendix 1).

Farnham–of the three options proposed for Farnham we believe option 1 is the only practical solution but in itself does not completely address the issues as it will still be necessary to enter the 30mph restriction through the south of the village passing the garage and the turning into Low Road. The existing A12/A1094 junction north of the

proposal would also require to be reworked to accommodate additional traffic flow not using the A12/B1122 route.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council recognise that transport assessment work will continue through the pre-application phase and request to be consulted at each step as proposals are developed and refined.

## Appendix 1

### An integrated approach to Transport, Accommodation and Laydown for Sizewell C

We believe the County Council are now looking again at a new road route direct from the A12 into the Sizewell site, as was proposed at the time of the consultation for Sizewell B. They are also considering a proposal by Middleton Parish Council, to bring a new road in from the A12 at Saxmundham direct into the site, following the existing railway for most of its way. We have also considered this as an option and would like to make the following observations.

A new road direct from the A12 does not only deal with the obvious issue of the B1122 which is clearly not fit for purpose to take the heavy construction traffic and park and ride coaches, it would satisfy all of the other traffic requirements, including; construction traffic access, emergency vehicle use, a much better link for local people between Leiston and the A12. In addition to the traffic issues if the correct route is chosen it would provide an opportunity to satisfy many more of the infrastructure issues in a much more integrated way.

As indicated above the CEGB at the time of the consultation for Sizewell B made a proposal for a new link road direct from the A12 to the site. The proposal identified four alternative routes, we believe consideration should be given to reworking these proposals, specifically identifying a route which would cross the old Leiston airfield. If such a route was chosen together with the Blue option proposed for the rail extension, which also crosses the old airfield, an opportunity would be presented which has the potential to resolve many of the other infrastructure issues. For example:

Accommodation campus(es) could be sited along the route of the new road or on the old airfield site itself.

Park and ride facilities could also be sited along the new road or on the old airfield site.

Some laydown and temporary construction areas could be located on the old airfield thus reducing the impact on the AONB.

The rail link could terminate on the airfield or be extended into the site.

There could be a private dedicated, secure road link from the airfield onto the site. This could enable in processing to be carried out remote from site.

Local parking could be accommodated on the old airfield.

There would only be need for a single improved junction to A12.

### Potential for Legacy Use:

Accommodation could be retained by EdF for use by workers during outages.

The site could be developed to support local industry and/or become an energy technology park, with an historic link to the age of steam via Leiston's long association with steam engine production.

An energy academy could be developed on the site.

The new road and rail links would support growth on both the old airfield site and the Leiston area in general.

Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council request that following the Stage 1 Consultation EdF recognise as indicated in the responses above that there are other options available which may deliver better solutions to the issues than those put forward in the Stage 1 Consultation documentation. We would like to continue to work with EdF prior to Stage 2 Consultation to explore all the options and in assist in the preparation of the Phase 2 proposals where practicable.