

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Comments from Interested Party on Procedures re Sizewell C
Date: 02 April 2021 19:18:01

Dear Planning Inspectorate Case Team,

Before making my comments, I would like to point out that many of us ordinary citizens were not brought up in the worlds either of IT or bureaucratic jargon.

To come face to face with this procedure of Rule 6 Letter (?), Items, Agendas, Annexes, and acronyms, will surely put off many people who wish to have their say - there is a lot of dense verbiage and strict instructions to plough through and get to grips with in this alien world of dos and don'ts, let alone battling with Microsoft Teams.

We are a motley assortment of individuals: amateurs who are having to learn as we go in our endeavours to campaign for the social, economic and ecological integrity of this unique, wild area that is already protected by AONB and SSSI orders (so some people agree with us!) against a Corporate World giant with its army of lawyers and PR consultants.

But to my points:

To begin with, I endorse the other speakers from Part 1 of the Preliminary meeting, specifically on: geomorphology, biodiversity, and safe containment of radioactive waste.

I would also like the PI to consider in detail:

1. Traffic. Much of the A12 leading to Sizewell from Felixstowe and the A14 is single-carriageway. Travelling on this road as I do frequently, I have noticed that even one cyclist or towed caravan can cause a large backlog of traffic, as there are very few passing places in either direction. Even given the 2 bypasses EDF have indicated they will construct, the build-up of traffic, particularly in the summer, with c 900 lorry journeys per day will be horrendous. I would like the PI to consider:

a) the effect of these delays and inevitable traffic jams on the tourist numbers visiting Suffolk Coastal, and hence our lifeline/economy. Has this been considered, calculated and costed in to the overall impact of building Sizewell C?

b) Roadworks. I have not heard of any consideration being given to the effect of all these lorry journeys, day in, day out, over more than a decade, on the infrastructure of our roads- from A to B grades. There will inevitably be continuous roadworks, after the first several months, at one or more points along these routes, leading to further and increased traffic jams for the entire construction period of this Nuclear Power Station. The financial cost to the nation and who pays for these ongoing works; the cost to the health of all the people living along the routes, in terms of poor air quality from the diesel fumes of queueing traffic; the potential cost in lives caused by these delays to the Emergency Services must all be considered by the Planning Inspectorate, I would submit.

2. Lorry Parking on site at Sizewell during the building of 'C'.

I do not consider that much attention has been paid to the size of this facility.

With all the lorries arriving and unloading on a daily basis, and the needs of the drivers (450 per day?) to have the requisite break time and refreshments, would the PI please look at the information and plans that EDF have provided for these amenities (the parking area and the rest areas for the drivers) and determine if they are adequate and up to expectations and legal requirements. If not, where will these facilities be located, given the fact that the sea, Minsmere Marshes and the village of Sizewell leave little room for expansion?

3. Finally, should this misguided construction be given the go-ahead, I would urgently request that the PI put into place inspections (preferably unannounced to the applicant), to be made on a regular basis to ensure that it is toeing any and all of the lines that have been drawn in the sand by yourselves, in all aspects of the building of Sizewell C, and to take firm action against the applicant if it is not found to be doing so.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Ann Mitchem. (Mrs)