



# Together Against Sizewell C

TOGETHER AGAINST SIZEWELL C (TASC) DEADLINE 3 SUBMISSION

SIZEWELL C PLANNING APPLICATION INQUIRY (IP no. 20026424)

## COMMENTS ON APPLICANT'S DOCUMENT 9.11 REGARDING AIR QUALITY QUESTIONS & LOCAL IMPACT REPORT

### **Air Quality**

1. After spending a long time reading through the ExA questions and making notes, TASC members have realised that the results of our labours merely serve to highlight the unavoidable conclusions that the Applicant has undertaken insufficient work on many critical issues relating to the project. The comments we arrived at on the issue of worsening air quality in particular, surely one of the most important consequences of the proposed development which has the ability to affect the health of thousands, bring nothing new to the responses the ExA could not read for itself in the answers we and other opposition groups have already provided: if it is not clear to the ExA at this stage that the information provided to justify this project lacks the level of detail required to make informed and accurate comments, we doubt that anything we could add in respect of the air pollution issue could help. We believe we have said everything on air pollution - the lack of adequate testing and lax methodology - in TASC's previously submission and we would not be adding anything other than more papers for the ExA to read that repeat what we have said previously.

We reiterate our view that air quality should be afforded the issue specific hearing status at this inquiry.

### **Local Impact Reports (LIRs)**

2. To read and absorb the 500+ page long LIRs is a task which TASC members have found arduous and time consuming to the point where we have decided to make generalised comments rather than to respond to each and every point individually, a task as which is beyond our resources.
3. The first and perhaps only necessary observation is that the 'benefits' column in the 'Summary of project-wide impacts' table at section 33 is heavily outweighed by the number of 'disbenefits' mentioned in the adjacent column. On the grounds that our councils want to see the benefits that SZC will bring to the area outweigh the disbenefits, the case is clearly not made and therefore official opposition should be forthcoming. It is noticeable that, against such long-term and entirely negative environmental consequences as 'significant impacts on the AONB and its special qualities', '...possible local extinction of populations of various bat

species', 'potential coastal changes... which may result in loss of habitat', are ranged against the comparatively weak 'benefits' of 'marginally' reduced carbon footprint from increased use of electric vehicles, despite the fact that evidence for that increase is difficult to identify.

4. Traffic will have 'a substantial negative impact on the highway network due to additional road traffic from construction activity, with associated impacts on road safety, congestion, noise, air quality, pedestrian amenity, severance and driver delay, as well as carbon footprint', more loss of habitat from coastal changes during construction of the permanent and temporary BLFs are all predicted impacts from the construction of Sizewell C. Against these highly significant and wide-ranging effects which will bring long-term traffic congestion to the region, we can take comfort in the fact that some tourist accommodation, shunned by traditional and repeat visitors to the area, will be taken up by members of the SZC workforce. TASC conclude that this is not a project which ticks the sustainability box for this area.
  
5. Perhaps the most important area to address in passing is the one which dominates the political agenda and which has caused endless claims and counterclaims about the value or otherwise of Sizewell C and its contribution to environmental improvement – CO2. This issue has been first and foremost the primary justification for new nuclear power: the phrases 'low carbon' or 'zero carbon' have adorned every advertisement, document or pamphlet produced by EDF and its supporters, yet the sustainability agenda, requiring the country to 'build back better' and greener, is snubbed by the acknowledgment in the LIRs that, 'Greenhouse gas emissions from construction activity', coupled with the 'use of resources and generation of waste during construction (particularly materials)' will undermine such bold policy objectives. The policy will also suffer at the hands of the operation of the plant when taking into consideration the legally binding net zero carbon target by 2050 for the economy and the carbon-heavy life cycle of the uranium as it goes from cradle to grave – from mining it from the ground to re-committing it as highly radioactive waste spent fuel in a deep geological repository from which, inevitably, it will escape over the millennia of its incarceration.



Pete Wilkinson

Chairman TASC

22 June 2021

