

**APPLICATION FOR A DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER BY NNB GENERATION COMPANY
(SZC)
LIMITED FOR THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT, SUFFOLK
REF. EN010012**

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS OF JAMES MICHAEL RICHARDS
REGISTRATION ID: 20026005**

The proposal is wholly inappropriate for an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The fact there are already two nuclear power stations adjacent is no justification for a third one.

East Anglia already produces much more than its fair share of energy for the national grid.

Transmission of the electricity over long distances to other parts of the country entails a significant voltage drop and would be a total waste.

Siting near the sea is nonsensical having regard to rising sea levels brought about by climate change and the natural sinking in the east of the country due to the tilting of the tectonic plate.

This development would have an enormous detrimental effect on the ecology and wildlife, landscape and cultural heritage in the area. Contributing to this would be the movement of heavy traffic, light, air and noise pollution,

The “temporary” storage of nuclear waste in on-site “ponds” (already a 100-year backlog from the A and B reactors) is a total disgrace and imposes an intolerable burden for future generations. If nuclear power is necessary, it should be generated in a remote location away from human habitation and facilities for the permanent depositing of the waste should be sited nearby.

By the time the new power station would be completed, it will be outmoded.

Advances in solar, wind and wave power, coupled with those in the storage of electricity will render nuclear power defunct.

Even if that were not the case, it would be much more efficient for energy to be generated locally to where it is used, as is proposed with the small modular reactors being developed by Rolls Royce and others.

In addition to the foregoing, nuclear fusion will render fission obsolete and be a much less dangerous method.

If, despite all the compelling reasons against it, consent is given, certain changes have to be made in the construction plan.

The use of roads must be eliminated in the delivery of construction materials.

Over the years, responsible governments will introduce disincentives against the use of private motor vehicles. Improvements will be made in the public transport system. The amount of traffic will reduce substantially and there will be no need for road "improvements" (widening, by-passes, motorways etc.). The railway system will be enlarged and improved.

All changes to the roads and railways must include proper provision for the retention of all public rights of way (footpaths, bridleways etc), not just roads carrying motor traffic and there should be no diversion of footpaths and bridleways unless they make a positive improvement for the walker or horserider. Proper bridges or subways must be built to accommodate them even if the cost is high.

Maximum use of delivery by sea should also be incorporated in the construction traffic.

If consent is given to this huge development then concomitant and proportionately huge planning gains must come out of it. These must include comprehensive improvements to the public rights of way system in the surrounding area as propounded in the submissions of the Ramblers' Association.

I am a member/supporter of TASC (Together against Sizewell C), Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell Ltd (Stop Sizewell C), RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Ramblers Association, Friends of the Earth and Sandlings Safer Cycling Campaign. I endorse all of the arguments put forward by these organizations against the proposed development.

JAMES MICHAEL RICHARDS

[REDACTED]

Aldeburgh
Suffolk

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]