

Open Floor Hearing on Sizewell C proposals. Statement made by William John Rea Price, registered number 20025737

This statement focuses on the Impact of Sizewell C on Eastbridge and its community and EDF's apparent rejection of any responsibility and liability for mitigation or compensation

I strongly support all the representations that have been made so far by Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council and Stop Sizewell. However I want here to focus on EDF's apparent disinterest in mitigating the impact of its development on local communities and the implications of this for residential property values.

I have lived in Eastbridge for over 20 years. It is small hamlet and has a permanent population of approximately 50, many elderly and retired. It will be completely overshadowed by Sizewell C's vast campus for 2500 workers and the towering storage heaps of peat and clay barely a quarter of a mile distant.

We are threatened with years of dust, noise, light pollution, vibration and heavy road traffic on our network of very narrow roads. We fear for our safety and security as well as for the destruction of the tourist trade upon which our local economy depends.

The catastrophe facing our community has been raised repeatedly with EDF over the last decade at every stage of its public consultation but at no point has there been any apparent recognition by it of our fears. The one exception, in a rare moment of candour, was a members of EDF's staff at the Stage 3 consultation responding to a questioner "let's face it; Eastbridge is going to be shafted".

EDF has not been short on general statements of its commitment to mitigation. Its managing director Mr Cadoux Hudson declares in one document that "the overarching aim of EDF 's development proposals is mitigating adverse effects of construction on local people" Ms Julia Pyke its Nuclear Development Director declares in the first of her eleven pledges to local people her commitment to "minimise disruption on local people during the construction of Sizewell C".

However when it comes to specific and concrete initiatives that would reassure our community there is denial of the real issues and then silence when further challenged.

Almost all of us want passionately to stay here in Eastbridge. However the overriding concern now is that life for many will just become so unbearable at various points of the construction phase that they will be forced to get out. They fear that their houses, which for most are the only real capital they possess, will be impossible to sell at anything like their true value. The number of houses that have recently been up for sale, the time that it has taken for them to be sold and the price reductions that have had to be accepted at a time when the property market elsewhere in Suffolk is vibrant is some evidence of the extent of the blight that has already descended in Eastbridge and which will only get worse.

EDF has declared that it only recognises blight when it can be defined as 'statutory' (whatever that is) and the situation in Eastbridge does not, and will not, qualify. Its local representative, Ms Lidia Bosa stated very clearly during a Zoom meeting with my wife and I and some of our neighbours on 1 February that EDF would not in any circumstances be buying our houses from us. A detailed letter sent to Ms Pyke on 1 March this year asking her to explain why this is the case has not even met with an acknowledgement, let alone a response..

W. John Rea Price

19 May 2021

We do urge the Examining Authority to challenge the applicant on what is actually the substance of commitment to mitigation

Sizewell C Proposal

Representation for Deadline 2 from William John Rea Price, your reference number 20025737

The representation focuses on the obligation of EDF to mitigate the impact of the development of Sizewell C on the hamlet of Eastbridge. I ask that it be read alongside my statement at the Open Floor Hearing on Wednesday 19 May, a copy of which accompanies this submission

In that statement, I said that we had lived in Eastbridge for over 21 years and that we faced the prospect of years of noise, dust, vibration, light pollution, heavy traffic and being completely overshadowed by Sizewell C's vast campus for 2400 workers and the towering storage heaps of peat and clay that will stand in front of it –all just 200 metres from our village.

At the time of the launch of EDF's Stage One consultation in November 2012 we were not in principle opposed to a third nuclear power station at Sizewell. However, as the scale of development began to emerge, our doubts grew from the moment in February 2013 when we first underlined our need for clarity about the social impacts, consequences for the local communities. We stressed the importance of ensuring a significant long term legacy which included much needed affordable housing as had been provided after the 2012 London Olympics. We expressed concerns about the absence of any apparent plans to mitigate and compensate for the negative impact both in the short and long term.

Dissatisfaction gradually turned to hostility as we moved over the next six or seven years into Stage Two, and then Stage Three consultations. At meetings of the Parish Council and elsewhere our reasonable questions were rebuffed by EDF's officers in a dismissive and often truculent manner as just being those of self interested "NIMBYS". It became increasingly clear that this had become a dialogue of the deaf. The sacrifice of Eastbridge was seen by the company as inevitable collateral damage if it was to realise its objectives. Its officers were not going to enter into any discussion in which they might recognize any

negative impact on our community, except that in a rare moment of candour one of them responded to some persistent question at the start of Stage Three by saying 'Let's face it , Eastbridge is going to be shafted'.

By this time any faith in the integrity of EDF had totally evaporated, well illustrated by the company's deliberate deception by booking our, as well as all surrounding village halls for a 'photographic exhibition' to take place on 7 January 2019 when in reality it was to be for the launch of the Stage Three, news of which EDF wished to conceal from local communities until the last moment.

A trivial matter perhaps, but this accompanied growing confusion about the whole nature of the project, already years in the planning. The proposed jetty for marine deliveries had disappeared, but we were now to have the vast storage heaps and borrow pits. Then with the final Stage Four consultation completed, and its application for the DCO submitted, which our Relevant Representation had been based, EDF suddenly announced some very material modifications of its proposals based on the possibility (no more than that) of increasing the number of train deliveries and reinstating the proposal for marine deliveries and a jetty.

This was now beginning to look a very flawed project. It became clear to us that if the opposition of ourselves and others to Sizewell C failed to halt it, our only hope for survival was in getting EDF to make a serious and watertight commitment to mitigate, and compensate for, its catastrophic impact throughout the many years of construction, and beyond. The undertakings by EDF senior managers to mitigate the impact on surrounding communities referred in my accompanying statement have revealed themselves to be completely hollow. EDF has made it clear that it will not regard Eastbridge as blighted, now or in the future, as it does not meet the criteria of 'statutory blight', whatever these may be .EDF's local representative, Ms Lidia Bosa has stated quite definitely that we will not qualify for the company's 'Property Price Support Scheme' and that it will not under any circumstance be buying our unsalable houses from us.

Having repeatedly dismissed our concerns (apart from in unwise moments of candour), buried away in two small paragraphs of its Community Impact Statement dated May 2020, but only made available to us , long after as part of its DCO application, we have found a clear admission by EDF of the negative impact on Eastbridge. Paragraphs 4.6.77 and 4.6.78 acknowledge that the effects of noise and vibration on Eastbridge would be significantly adverse.

Even if EDF did at this late stage commit itself to a realistic and credible for mitigation and compensation, such is the distrust of EDF is that it would be seen as a meaningless undertaking unless it was secured as a condition of the Development Consent Order. This would require the establishment of an independent monitoring body, the role of which would be to determine fair and equitable levels of mitigation and compensation to surrounding communities adversely affected by the development. The decisions of this body should also be binding on any successors to EDF as owners and managers of Sizewell C. We say this as we realise that there is considerable uncertainty as to what the long term responsibility for, and governance of, Sizewell C will be.

On behalf of my wife and family, as well as the community of Eastbridge, I do earnestly hope that the Examining Authority will recognise just how important these issues are.

W. John Rea Price

30 May 2021