

Railfuture response to online supplementary consultation by EDF Energy on Sizewell C – December 2020

Question 1: Freight management

Building Sizewell C will require moving substantial volumes of construction material. In our DCO application, we anticipated around 60% of construction materials would be delivered by HGVs and the remaining 40% by rail and sea. We are now considering options for increasing rail and sea transport which could reduce the amount of material being moved by HGV, however there is a balance to be struck between the benefits and environmental effects of the potential options. In relation to moving construction material for Sizewell C, do you:

a) Support the DCO application approach.

No

b) Support moving more material by rail.

Yes

c) Support moving more material by sea.

Yes

Please explain your views, specifying the potential change to which your comments refer.

a) The application approach places to greater reliance on HGV movements by road

b) This would reduce reliance upon road movements to service the site and if accompanied by additional investment to increase the capability/capacity of the East Suffolk Line would leave a lasting 'legacy benefit' to develop the line for enhanced passenger services

c) While supporting the case for greater use of rail we would support greater transportation of material by sea in addition to making better use of rail as taken in combination, they would minimise reliance on road transport

Question 2: Increased frequency of train movements

Work with suppliers, local councils and Network Rail on detailed site planning and logistics has so far identified three potential ways of bringing more freight to site by train during construction. Trains would mostly run at night.

We are seeking views on the following potential options while continuing to assess their feasibility (which is not guaranteed) and working with Network Rail to understand mainline capacity:

a) Running four trains per day rather than three. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

b) Running trains six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

c) The possibility of operating a fifth train for a short period at the peak of construction. This would require changes to the current passenger timetable on the East Suffolk Line. Do you think this potential change is:

Appropriate

Please explain your views.

Our response is without prejudice to our submission to the Planning Inspectorate. From the limited choice presented by this style of consultation we are generally in favour of all options which avoid the use of HGVs where possible and maximise the use of alternatives, particularly rail. We are disappointed to note that there is no firm commitment on the part of EDF to increase the use of rail, only a statement of 'desire' so to do. We are not yet convinced that the option of creating even greater capacity for rail has been fully explored. The provision of a passing loop between Woodbridge and Saxmundam, as an absolute minimum, would permit more trains to serve the construction site without the restrictions imposed by the present infrastructure. We regret that EDF have not provided any indication as to the costs of the Enhanced Permanent Beach Landing Facility (BLF) nor of the temporary additional BLF, giving us no opportunity to comment upon the relative benefit/cost ratio of these amended proposals. We are therefore unable to evaluate the relative merits of the 'More materials by Sea' option against the costs of providing increased capacity on the East Suffolk 'main line'. If EDF have a genuine interest in leaving a legacy benefit to the local community, we would much prefer there to be investment in additional capacity on the local rail network rather than on a marine landing facility which is of use only to EDF and for a limited period.

No response offered to any of the following questions

Question 3: Enhancing the permanent beach landing facility

Question 4: A new, temporary beach landing facility

Question 5: New, temporary beach landing facility options

Question 6: SSSI crossing

Question 7: Fen meadow replacement

Question 8: Water Resource Storage Area

Question 9: Surface water

Question 10: Other main site changes

- a) Sea defence**
- b) Construction activities and height limits**
- c) Tree retention**
- d) Boundary changes**
- e) Bridleway**

Question 11: Sizewell B relocated facilities

Option 1: changes with use of additional Sizewell A land

Option 2: changes without use of additional Sizewell A land

Question 12: Associated development changes

- a) Reduction in land required**
- b) Boundary changes**
- c) Southern park and ride**

SUB-RWB-20201218-A