

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Response to Preliminary Meeting part 1  
**Date:** 07 April 2021 15:19:29

---

#### Item 5 proposed changes

I'm cannot say whether the changes are material or not but I would like to state why I believe these amendments have been submitted.

These changes are designed to pacify the climate change faction and local residents by pretending that they want to take some of the lorries off the Suffolk roads and particularly the (totally inadequate) B1122. Suddenly both the BLF and rail options which had been dismissed as unviable, too expensive or undeliverable at the stage 3 consultation are back on the table. The creation of these alternative transport methods will actually generate even more road traffic in the so-called early years than they are seeking to alleviate.

The applicant is also trying to humour the bio-diversity/environmental faction and create a new wildlife habitat 50 miles away. This will mean a net gain in bio-diversity! Really? I don't think it quite works that way. I hope they're going to send change of address cards to the Sizewell wildlife or does this qualify as compulsory purchase?

The proposed changes are extremely woolly and are clearly not well thought out alterations to the project. The applicant clearly doesn't know what it wants to do or can get away with and are now hoping to squeeze through on the Rochdale envelope. This is inexcusable given where they are with Hinkley C, many of the reports and details will be the same for Sizewell C.

There are several question marks over the applicants finances and they'd be well advised to concentrate on finishing their 3 concurrent, over-budget by billions, behind schedule by years and so far unsuccessful EPR builds before starting in on Sizewell C. Would you employ a builder who was already building 3 other houses and had never successfully finished building any of them?

I believe it makes sense to only give a second new nuclear build the go ahead once Hinkley C has been successfully completed. The applicant has already missed the 2025 deadline so there is no urgency. The country does not need yet another white elephant. And, in any case, a new nuclear build should be completed on a brown field site and not protected green field land.

#### Item 8

I want to confirm everyone's complaints about the applicant's attitude towards the local residents.

My experience over the last 8 years is that they have been patronising and dismissive of the little people. The applicant has run a charm offensive with the major stakeholders, holding meetings behind closed doors but when it has come to the statutory consultations they have paid lip service to their legal obligations while totally ignoring any requests and (some very sensible) suggestions from the residents most affected by the build. They have their own agenda and are determined to follow it come what may and any contribution we have made has been dismissed as nimbyism.

Some of the questions they have specifically asked during the consultations have been laughable and are clearly token questions in order to comply with their statutory obligations e.g. stage 3 consultation q8: transport: rail-led strategy, Buckleswood road - we were asked if we thought temporarily closing Buckleswood road was more appropriate than putting in a new level crossing. In the scheme of things this is an extremely minor consideration. The consultations are littered with equally mundane questions.

Apologies if these comments are in the wrong place/time, I will no doubt be submitting them again if the opportunity presents itself.

Gwen Erskine-Hill

