

I have tried to keep abreast of the Planning Examination which has been conducted by the Inspectorate with professionalism and etiquette, however from a lay person perspective it appears that the cards are stacked in the favour of the applicant who has massive resources and motivation to get this application approved, I am sincerely hoping that the Planning Inspectorate are able to assess and reject this application to avoid catastrophic congestion and pollution during the build phase.

I have looked through my relevant representation and detail this below and despite the applicants best efforts our concerns seem all the more relevant now than at the start of the examination, alarmingly the process has uncovered even more negatives than we could possibly have envisaged.

I therefore as a final response, detail further concerns that have been revealed and strongly implore the Examining authority to decline this application

Thank you

Paul Tillcock

New comments:

Nearly ten years ago Together against Sizewell C pointed out to the applicant that there would not be enough potable water for their development, the applicant has ignored this matter until the very latest time and have backed the water authority in to a corner to which they have agreed that they cannot supply the massive amounts of fresh water during construction or for the operational phase. Only after this announcement have they cobbled together a possible solution, which raises additional questions. This is a so typical last minute approach of the applicant and cannot be the correct way to plan a Nuclear power station.

The early years traffic appear to be even more than was first envisaged and it is even more apparent that the Sizewell Link Road should not be built in its current proposed location as it has no legacy value and will be built too late and in the wrong place.

Original Representation:

I wish to raise the following issues of concern about Sizewell C.

The lack of information and depth of the 4 stages of consultation both at a local level me and a county level County Council is staggering.

I also wish to endorse the Relevant Representation submitted by Stop Sizewell C, Together against Sizewell, Suffolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB Minismere, David Grant and Councillor Richard Smith. The recent article by Adnams CEO and the local entrepreneur William Kendall enhance and describe our genuine concerns and should be noted by the examining authority.

Furthermore the recent changes accepted by the examining body have raised additional questions and issues and frankly it is bewildering to try and analyse all the what ifs so I am relying on the The Examining body to resolve these issues

The most important representation I would like to endorse is from Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council who completely understand the massive issues that a project of this size will have on our health and well being, I feel that just because we are small in number and the limited amount of resource available to research and comment on the application, that we have been unfairly singled out for a massive influx of traffic and construction in a un industrialised area. This small peaceful area will be unable to survive the onslaught planned and our voice should be heard loud and clear.

1. Link Road

â—• Both County and district council favour a link road (Formerly known as D2 or W in latest consultation) south of Saxmundham, I cannot see why bringing all traffic virtually to Yoxford helps in keeping pollution to a minimum as it means 1,000s of unnecessary journey.

â—• I understand that the examining authority have requested an answer to the rejected

alternative routes favoured by Suffolk County Council and the majority of other interested parties at previous consultations, once I know the answer (which we have been asking for years) then I would like to make representations about that.

â—• Early years traffic there is no benefit to anyone as the SLR will not be built for several years.

â—• Early years construction and congestion, if this can be managed for the early yearsâ—•. then there is no need for the SLR as by the time it has been built the maximum traffic has already been afflicted on the area. So are there better way to deal with this in the early years(maximum traffic) and therefore the traffic congestion mitigated virtually from day one.

â—• Cumulative effect of this and other energy projects and why the applicant hasn't joined with other major energy Applicants to jointly plan a delivery route (W or similar) with legacy potential

â—• As you will be aware the council instigated research into a relief route and the current route was not the the preferred one, my suspicion is that the current proposed route is the cheapest, but as the majority of residents and the County Council want it removed after construction as it has NO legacy value, then surely a route With Legacy value should be chosen even if more expensive initially but if it serves a legacy benefit then the additional expense maybe more than compensated if you take into account the removal costs. Is the applicant hoping that the County Council will withdraw their insistence of road removal once its built?

â—• There will only be one entry and exit to the site surely a D2/W type relief road which has legacy value and an upgrade of the the Yoxford existing road means that in an emergency the Nuclear power station has two means of evacuation NOT ONE

â—• The proposed link road will not in my opinion help the traffic chaos, there are so many alternate routes available to the majority of the traffic (RAT runs) very few will use this road as I stated before why would you travel several miles out of your way to get to Leiston every single road to the main site will be used appropriately or in appropriately. Once the SLR is opened the harm will already have been done and all the shortcuts will be known to the majority of the workers. Allegedly At a meeting with Theberton & Eastbridge Council in December 2020, in response to a question regarding appropriate controls on traffic, it was stated by THE APPLICANT representatives that â—•it is a free countryâ—• and â—•people can drive where they like'. This cannot be an acceptable approach to traffic management.

â—• Due to the changes and composition of the transport strategy and the length of time taken to construct I believe there is a need to extend the voluntary compensation scheme that THE APPLICANT have offered to a few properties in the area or just slightly outside their â—•ered linesâ—•. It cannot be the case that any properties directly or indirectly affected by this project has to wait until after the construction is completed before asking for compensation for reduced property prices or unable to sell, this should be extended to other properties that may be affected by the new proposals too i.e. along the rail line

â—• I request that the examining authority instruct this â—•voluntary schemeâ—• to be extend further, without the need to wait 10-15 years and prove historic damage.

â—• If marine and rail led are adopted for the bulk materials then would it not make sense to construct the Sizewell Link road from the main construction site (where all the materials are) and work WEST towards the A12. This would dramatically reduce construction traffic on the A12 and avoid accidents due to a temporary turnoff on the top of a busy road with a blind spot (only last week there was a near fatality due to poor visibility due to contours of road)

â—• By allowing route Z south there will be enormous potential for accidents due to the road layout and drivers being distracted by the construction compound, THE APPLICANT have agreed on drawing (Dalcour maclaren 191934_PLN_OP_79.1E) to keep the construction compound 300-400 metres away from the A12 for good reason, please can we have assurances that they will stick to this OR my point above i.e. building from the WEST towards the A12 Is a better option. Build from the main site West towards the A12

â—• How will the applicant manage fly parking (lay-by just south of the proposed SLR outside Fir Tree Farm and on your site visits list) and the entrance to Lodge Lane to avoid accidents and congestion

â€¢ We have virtually perfect night skies here I have no knowledge of how THE APPLICANT are proposing to keep lighting of the new roundabout and general site construction to a minimum. More importantly nor to Suffolk Highways as this is still deemed â€œevolving designâ€•. This should be settled with effected parties forthwith

â€¢ We have no knowledge of any planting of hedges trees etc. or any embankments to reduce noise and light issues. This should be settled with effected parties forthwith

2. Community, Economic and social impacts

I endorse Kelsale cum Carlton RR as they have nailed the issues

3. Transport

â—• Suffolk County Council say that THE APPLICANT have missed many opportunities to deliver the rail/marine led strategy, what are the chances of delivering this please

â—• Even by the applicants estimates it will be at least 6 years until the CO2 emissions only (never mind the other pollutants) will be offset. Can this really be the correct way to head towards a greener and healthy future?

4. Environment and Landscape

Kelsale Cum Carlton, Stop Sizewell C and Together Against Sizewell C and RSPB

5. Marine and Coastal processes

Stop Sizewell C and Together Against Sizewell C

Overall additional comments raised by Interested parties should also be assessed as they cover more in-depth question than I can cover:

â€¢ Sizewell C is slow â€“ it would take 10-12 years to build, so not generate any power until 2034.

â€¢ Sizewell C is expensive, costing Â£20+ billion, which could be invested in renewables such as offshore wind or hydrogen storage.

â€¢ Sizewell C takes a lot of carbon to build. EDF's own estimates are that it would take 6 years to pay this back, meaning Sizewell C wouldn't contribute to net zero until 2040. The govern