

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: EN010012 – The Sizewell C Project My reference: 20026263
Date: 24 June 2021 10:10:47

Dear Sir/Madam

The proposed Sizewell C development must be turned down. It will be very destructive to East Suffolk AONB and cause serious devastation to the biodiversity of RSPB Minsmere and Sizewell Marshes SSSI. It will disrupt and ruin Suffolk for the rest of my life. I do not believe the evidence of the need for nuclear power and feel that renewable energy generation is the only sensible way forward for the future.

I have written before of my concerns about the destruction of large areas of Sizewell Marshes SSSI and M22 Fen Meadow and I wish to comment yet again.

The formation of the Fen has taken place over thousands of years through the natural succession of wetland plant habitats (open water, reed swamp, sedge fen fen Carr fen woods) known as hydrosere, which laid down deposits of plant debris in the waterlogged conditions. The anaerobic environment (lacking atmospheric oxygen) under the surface of the water discourages decomposition of the plant material, which becomes compressed and preserved as peat. It binds carbon dioxide into the ground and is a potent reducer of carbon in the atmosphere.

The conservation management of these wetlands by Suffolk Wildlife trust has ensured that the biodiversity there continues to thrive and complements the management of RSPB Minsmere.

No attempts at mitigation by EDF can possibly compensate for the loss of this.

Friends of the Earth's critical review of SZC Co.'s site characterisation, impact assessment, and proposals for impact mitigation, in relation to the risks posed to the ecohydrological integrity of Sizewell Marshes SSSI by the development of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station shows that it is seriously misleading. Sizewell Marshes SSSI is a 'large area of lowland, unimproved meadows which supports outstanding assemblages of invertebrates and breeding birds' with 'an extensive network of ditches across the site'. A number of key species, which have been recorded through SZC Co. and other surveys, are considered sensitive to changes in the water supply mechanism or water chemistry and/or are listed as Red Data species.

The vegetation of Sizewell Marshes is of exceptional importance especially in the context of East England and it is this vegetation that supports the equally exceptional invertebrate and bird interests. Particularly the loss of wildlife corridors needs highlighting.

The scientists have shown that SZC Co.'s understanding of the environmental processes which support M22 and associated communities within Sizewell Marshes SSSI is flawed, because up-to-date ecohydrological knowledge and techniques have not been applied. This has led to ill-informed impact prediction, which has resulted in the likelihood, magnitude and significance of potential impacts being significantly underestimated. These problems have been compounded by SZC Co.'s proposal of a mitigation technique which would actually cause further damage to the SSSI, rather than mitigating any unexpectedly large impacts. Sizewell C Co's claims for net gain in biodiversity units is completely unrealistic and the tool used, namely Defra's Metric 2.0, is flawed.

EDF's claims of successful recreation of such fen meadows is nonsense. It has never been successful to try to recreate something that takes thousands of years. Thelnetham Fen was not successful as it became overgrown with rushes. A few attempts to restore fen have been successful but only by conservation organisations.

The new roads would all cause chronic damage to the environment, not just in terms of the inevitable roadkill, but because of fragmentation, barrier effect, noise and pollution. Peer-reviewed research confirms a loss of wildlife populations of up to 30% either side of any road with moderate use. It is incomprehensible that BNG should be claimed for the two bypasses and roundabout. The remaining arc of the bypasses between the old and new roads is too small for thriving wildlife populations. Fauna are unable to disperse and find mates, resulting in in-breeding, weakening of the colony and eventual collapse. No such effects are taken into account in the company's calculations.

The only EPNR actually up and running is in Taishan in China, where radiation levels have recently been raised around the plant. There is long history of technical problems and budget over runs with Hinckley C. Can it be seriously considered putting the local population of Suffolk Norfolk Essex and London (less than 100 miles) and the Netherlands at risk of serious radiation leaks. Can building a nuclear power station on marsh, on a rapidly eroding coast line with massive sea defences, which will have to be added to over the next few centuries, be seriously considered? The environmental disaster will be as bad as that at Chernobyl.

EDF is in financial difficulties and there seems to be an expectation that the British tax pay will pay their financial shortfall. This is not justifiable for any reason and should not be considered.

I hope that the Planning Inspectorate will view very seriously the facts and make the right decision to turn down this environmental destruction.

Yours faithfully

Dr Annette Abbott