

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Written Representation, following the Open Floor Hearings  
**Date:** 25 May 2021 11:58:04  
**Attachments:** [Open floor Hearing 19.5.21 - Expanded.docx](#)

---

Dear Sirs,

I have today submitted the fuller version of my oral presentation made on Wednesday 19th May, using the submission form from your website.

This has been acknowledged, but I note I have been allocated a 'new' Interested Party Reference Number: 20028128

However, I already had been given the number 20025930, which is stated in my written representation.

For the sake of good order, I have attached that Representation to this email.

Kind regards,

Roy Dowding

I'd like to start by challenging the need for Sizewell C. By the time it comes on stream and has compensated for its own CO2 emissions during construction, it will be well into the 2040s before the plant contributes to low carbon criteria. Long before then, more truly green methods of power generation and proven energy storage methods will have become readily available, at far less cost, rendering Sizewell C superfluous.

As for its location, Sizewell was described within NPS EN-1 and EN-6 as a "potential" site. For that matter, so would a site near any major city, with good road access and at the very heart of where the power would be needed. But clearly that would never get approval! Sizewell is not suitable either:

- It's on one of the most threatened coasts in the UK.
- In an area exposed to flooding.
- With inadequate existing infrastructure for delivering materials.
- In a location that will see untold damage to delicate wildlife, local communities, agriculture and commerce.

What must also be borne in mind is that EN-1 and EN-6 are now out of date with respect to the parameters of current energy usage, means of production and protection measures for the environment. The recent decision by ExA to reject the Wylfa Nuclear Power Station DCO on the grounds of the harmful effects to the local environment and wildlife is testament to the gross unsuitability of Sizewell as a potential site, given the even greater level of threat posed by SZC.

Others will better explain the dire ramifications of siting Sizewell C on the East Suffolk coast, and the destructive effects that construction will have on flora and fauna. But it is worth highlighting some of the issues that the choice of Sizewell will raise.

- The effects on the land and life will be felt long after construction has finished.
- Some wildlife will never return, and it's unlikely many will find their way to the alternative wetland site, dozens of miles away, being proposed by the applicant.
- Land used for the construction lay-down area and campus could take up to 30 years after completion (ie: around 2065) to recover sufficiently to enable its previous uses – look at the situation that was left by so many East Anglian WWII airfields, the land under runways and taxiways impacted to such a degree that re-cultivation was severely curtailed for many years. The land cannot simply be 'handed back'.

I would draw attention to the 'black hole' presented by the applicant's transport strategy, which shows a lack of appreciation or even understanding of natural forces, prevailing conditions and the existing fine balance of daily life, tourism and agriculture.

- As yet unsubstantiated and frequently revised assurances by the applicant that up to 60% of materials will come by rail and sea without regard to their viability.
- The capacity of the rail network to support meaningful numbers of deliveries has been questioned by several parties and would, in any event, cause widespread noise and vibration nuisance at night to communities along the line.
- The continuous availability of the beach landing facility for seaborne deliveries will be seriously hampered by severe weather events, the frequency of which appears to be on the increase.
- The applicant has, after much persuasion, now accepted that existing roads are not capable of carrying the remaining 40% (that's assuming rail and sea are fully playing their part) without amendments or augmentation.
- The applicant's proposed Sizewell Link Road (SLR) falls way short of acceptance by local communities, due to the severance of many side roads and footpaths, bisecting productive farmland leaving untenable patches, the dramatic visual effect on the landscape, disturbance to water courses and levels, and the creation of several poorly-conceived junctions that will cause delays and accidents.
- The applicant has dismissed, for reasons that are not considered sound, the suggested alternative route D2, favoured by many parties, that is more direct, thus saving fuel and minimising pollution, with fewer junctions, affecting far fewer houses and of long term future benefit to the two local towns of Saxmundham and Leiston.

But it's not only the transport strategy that raises serious doubts. Among the pledges made by the applicant that are impossible to achieve, such as 'gains for wildlife' and 'reinstatement of the AONB', there are others:

- There will be a reduction in tourism, which is acknowledged by the applicant's own research as being a least 16%. According to Destination Management Organisation this could be a net loss of £40 million per annum in the tourist economy during the build and probably for some time thereafter. This effectively wipes out any gains to the local economy claimed by the applicant. The applicant has pledged to provide a Tourism Fund, though no details of its amount or method of allocation are known.
- Likewise, there will be a loss of jobs in tourism, which undermines the claim for great employment opportunities for local people made by the applicant. Many of those promised jobs will simply be workers temporarily poached, such as plumbers, builders or electricians, which could lead to an inability of local residents to have necessary work done. Others will be those displaced from other existing positions, such as the tourism trade. In other words, a vast proportion of the promised

vacancies are neither permanent nor additional jobs. Both the applicant and unions have stated quite clearly that the bulk of the jobs arising from the SZC project, particularly those requiring skills, will be brought in from Hinkley Point or elsewhere, and not awarded to locals.

**If Sizewell C proceeds, we face widespread loss of habitat for wildlife, huge increases in lethal airborne pollution caused by the vast numbers of extra vehicles and life-endangering delays and disruption caused to the emergency services through congestion in the region.**

The applicant's choice of route for the SLR presents little advantage over the existing B1122 in terms of danger to pedestrians or serious accidents at its many junctions. A study by AECOM for Suffolk County Council some six years ago found that, if the route D2 was used rather than the B1122, at least 150 life-changing road accidents would be prevented over the course of construction. The SLR, as currently proposed by the applicant, offers very little improvement in safety over the B1122, which will lead to unnecessary deaths and injuries.

**What is clearly emerging is a vision of the future where East Suffolk is subjected to unnecessary levels of danger to life and wholesale destruction, directly attributable to Sizewell C, for several decades to come.**

This process has already begun with the outrageous felling of Coronation Wood, to make way for a project that has not yet even been given approval. This wood, which served to camouflage parts of the current nuclear site at Sizewell, was destroyed before a licence had been granted, following a disgracefully mismanaged planning and committee appeal procedure by East Suffolk Council.