

Further to my oral submission to the stage 4 hearings, I wish to emphasize my continued concern that neither the rail or sea access options have been sufficiently fully explored. I do not regard 60 per cent of materials coming in by these routes as enough, especially as in your response document you calculate that up to 1000 HGVs per day will be arriving on site. Surely we wish to reduce road use to a minimum as being the least 'green' means of transport?

Furthermore, as a resident of Theberton, very close to the proposed SZC link road- my postcode is IP16 4RR - I am not satisfied that the mitigation measures so often spoken of in your document will adequately protect me from noise, air, light, visual or flood and mud pollution during the construction process. The tranquil environment in my immediate neighbourhood must of necessity be destroyed: last week, walking in the roads and fields in the immediate neighbourhood of Theberton village and Abbey road, I heard 5 different nightingales singing at the end of the day, as well as witnessing the antics of a pair of cuckoos on the Sluice walk. They will all undoubtedly flee the construction process and it is doubtful that your mitigations will lure them back. It may very well be too late for me, in any case, as I am now 74 years old - am I to spend the next decade of my life hemmed in by the virtually industrial development of a project about whose benefits in terms of meeting carbon neutral goals, employment targets and projected energy consumption I remain deeply sceptical?

I do not accept either that the Route Z option for the relief road is the best option, as it is hard to see what substantial longterm benefit it will bring to the communities along its route; many local residents wish to see the relief road removed after construction at SZC is finished. I understand that the route W (N) option is costlier, longer and requires 4 extra crossings of water and rail routes, but it would at least provide a significant longterm benefit to the local communities, while still providing access to SZC for transport needs during the life of the reactor and its decommissioning.

I am very unhappy about the proposed campus; surely it would be better to work towards providing permanent housing which can be utilised after construction ends?

The idea of 4-storey buildings, even if positioned at the edge of the site, is shocking to me, and I do not believe they can be successfully screened off from all points of view to preserve the essential character of the district. I am very anxious at the idea of 2,400 single men being housed close to my home, which is isolated from the village, with a further 600 on a caravan facility on the edge of Leiston. My experience during the construction of Sizewell B was negative, with high levels of recreational drinking, drug use, and venereal disease in the immediate vicinity. I will not feel safe in my own home - am I to turn it into a fortress to feel secure?

I am concerned that there does not seem to be a co-ordinated strategy for the development of this part of the Suffolk coast into what government has termed 'the Energy Coast' - by its very name implying the industrial conversion of rural land and amenity tourism destinations into a jumble of very large industrial buildings at Sizewell alongside land stations for an unspecified number of wind farms on nearby sites. I would want to see a detailed map of what this area will look like if development on all or most of these energy projects proceed., and be satisfied that the different projects have been co-ordinated in good faith to minimize impact on the surrounding district, instead of proceeding piecemeal. A co-ordinated strategy does not seem to have been mentioned anywhere, either by the SZC project or by the various utilities proposing windfarm developments in the area, as far as I can see.

The impact on tourism, a significant source of income for the area, is little considered. I have read that at least a third of our visitors will be driven away by the construction process. It is the very tranquillity of the area and the environment that makes visitors come to East Suffolk. I find it perverse that Central Government, given that it has 7 other sites under consideration, would be pursuing Sizewell as the site for a very large industrial development, which will destroy the unique qualities of the coastal area surrounding the site, not to mention the environmental and ecological

long-term effects on the area. Short term gain, perhaps? I would encourage government and the inspectorate to develop a more co-ordinated longterm view of what will be lost if Sizewell C continues. We are a small island, and the South- Eastern portion of England is already being disproportionately developed as more and more people are drawn to the urban south for work opportunities. Should we not be preserving our unique sites instead of contributing to the destruction of increasingly rare rural habitats, which no amount of mitigation post factum, or of 'Community Fund' projects will be able to replace subsequently.

I am uneasy that building SZC will prolong an uncomfortably close association with China when the government has taken steps recently to distance itself from other activities of a powerful state which does not conform to Western ideas of accountability and good practice - (for example 5G and the loss of democratic processes in HongKong.) How will the relationship with SZC's Chinese partner be managed in the future?

I was aware during the recent stage 4 hearings that EDF was notably absent from the proceedings. Given that they are a major part of the design and construction process (even with the additional design and safety features initiated by HM government for SZC) this seemed to me an ominous sign. There have been repeated protestations, in the response to the earlier hearings, that EDF have profound knowledge of the issues associated with the construction and siting of an EPR reactor at Sizewell, although their record of delays and rising costs at Flamanville, Olkiluoto and even Hinkley C does not inspire me to feel confident about their competence. They seem to have a deep vested interest in getting SZC commissioned in order to improve their own financial situation with regard to their other building projects, and to offset the cost of impending renovations to their domestic reactors in France, and this makes me sceptical of their capacity to hear and address our local and national concerns. Their absence from the last round of oral hearings made me even more sceptical. I should like to hear your take on this please.

I am not satisfied as to arrangements for the interim spent fuel storage on site at Sizewell or for the ultimate decommissioning of the reactor at the end of its functioning life. The lifecycle assessment is brief and leaves many questions unanswered. More details needed please before the construction could safely be authorised.

I am not satisfied that the proposed soft coastal defence is likely to prevent erosion to the south of the Sizewell site, even if you are correct in your assessment that it will protect the hugely precious resource to the north that is Minsmere. There has been dramatic and sudden erosion of the cliffs to the south at Thorpeness in recent years , and I am not satisfied that the proposed development and coastal defences at Sizewell will sufficiently protect the coastal dwellings at Thorpeness and further south at Aldeburgh.

I am uneasy about the escalating costs of recent nuclear site projects, and, particularly if China's contribution is being scaled down, am very unhappy at the proposed RAB which seems to me effectively a hidden levy on all consumers of electricity, whether they agree with the generation of power by nuclear means or not.

Finally I would like to endorse the Relevant Representations made by Stop Sizewell C, RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council, Suffolk DMO, Together Against Sizewell C, AONB Partnership, Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council, Minsmere Levels Stateholder Group, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth, Wickham Market Parish Council and other interested parties at the recent hearings, and hope that cumulatively our shared concerns will give the Sizewell C project pause to consider further.

Thank you for your attention.
Diana Quick

1424 words.