As a Leiston resident, I am one of the 'Additional Consultees' referred to in the second version of the consultee cover letter posted on the documents tab. However, I would like to highlight the fact that this is not the letter I received; I received a very different form of letter (accompanied by a leaflet and the public notice) instead, and one which is not included in the list of documents at all.

Does this indicate that the Planning Inspectorate is not aware of it and has not accepted it as being an appropriate way of following the agreed consultation process?

I respectfully request that the 'Dear local resident' letter and accompanying leaflet actually sent out be examined by your office in order to determine whether they are acceptable.

I believe they are not acceptable for the following reasons:

The letter refers to a number of things which are not part of the NMC application, the consultation relevant text being reduced to just two paragraphs amongst a total of 18. Surely a more straight forward approach should have been used in order to alert residents (and businesses) to the weight of the matter in hand. Instead they are presented with what appears to be yet another progress update.

Taken together with the tone and spin of the accompanying leaflet, the reader is being lead to believe the is nothing of particular note deserving their further attention.

For instance, there is no mention of the fact that one of the most significant parts of what is planned is to carry out noisy activities in and around a large building day and night. Not even the fact that building is to be erected is mentioned.

Additionally

Having the reinforcement yard on the ACA/LEEIE instead of the TCA as previously intended will result in a great many more HGV movements on the public road (Lover's Lane), not fewer as is being claimed: the TCA allows direct access to the MCA without having to use the public road system.

The changes proposed I now understand result from the need to accommodate the planned relocated desalination plant within the TCA instead of the reinforcement processing facility.

Throughout the period since that decision was made, extensive construction and civil engineering work has been progressing on the ACA/LEEIE, specific to the requirements of the reinforcement yard, and the longer term use of the railway serving it.

My wife and I became aware that caravan accommodation was no longer going to be provided there. We live close to the site, so we're concerned about what was intended. Several times we asked at the Sizewell C information office what was planned, asked for an explanation. Each time we were told that no decision had been made, and our request for information about the possibilities was refused.

It now clear to us that all along Sizewell C had decided on the nature and use of the site, they just intended to prevent the information becoming more widely known for as long as possible.

Similarly with the use of the existing railway to the site: the plan to use it only in the early-years until the green route was ready had been abandoned. This is obvious from the fact that the green route was built first.

Also on the subject of the use of an upgraded version of the old railway line to the ACA site over many years, the frequent closing of the road at the Leiston crossing will create additional disruption to the flow of vehicles at this crucial point of access in and out of the town. From recent experience of the crossing being closed for a two-month period for essential works, this will result in the use of an unofficial and dangerous diversion route.

I am anxious to submit this email before the consultation deadline, so I apologise that I do not have time to check and polish what I have written. I may write further after the deadline has passed in the hope that my further comments can still be included.

Sincerely, Glenn King