

Reply to Issue Specific Hearing 15. From Alan Hatt. Interested Party No. 20025456.

Dear Planning Inspectorate, before stating reasons why Sizewell is the wrong place to build two nuclear reactors, which as early as 2006 was considered by HMG to be ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of eight possible sites in build desirability I must PROTEST in the strongest terms of the inclusion and acceptance by PINS of an EDF consultation document dated the 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 and considered by PINS in its entirety as a “non- material change.” EDF also provided us the public an illegally short time to consider, engage our experts and comment on the document content.

What part of the following EDF statement do you PINS “not understand the applicant.” as you observe in the rule 17 Request for further information from the applicant when referencing the desalination plant. Annex B Draft requirements. The EDF phrase being “THE PLANT WILL BE USED FOR THE OPERATIONAL PHASE.” It seems a plain enough statement. The repercussions include 70 years of highly salted brine, particulates and toxic trace elements discharged into the sea of our coast and air pollution. The enormity of this makes this alone a material change and therefore another DCO should be instigated as stated by the EA.

WHY SIZEWELL IS THE WRONG PLACE TO BUILD SIZEWELL C.

**Eroding coastline. Flooding** EDF recognise the ever present danger and have proposed building a vast hard coastal defence whose enormity dwarfs the main build itself. 75 years of possible build and construction leaves the legacy of yet further extensions of sea defences due to predicted sea level rises. Predictions, some of which are already happening, offering a scenario where Sizewell would become an island, posing dangers of water ingress into the reactors or into the highly radioactive waste depositories. Recently erosion has happened a few miles either side of Sizewell at Dunwich and Thorpness.

**Transport Strategy.** In ISH15. Q21 A to D contains the elements that show how little information has been collated by EDF to present a comprehensive vehicle impact assessment in the early years. This is indicative of the whole strategy in the round. Rail, sea and road. Rail movements are an aspiration of four trains a night needed to deliver in total 15 million tons of rock from Somerset switched through London. British rail or whoever is running the Ipswich Lowestoft line are particularly shy of involvement as they are protecting Felixstowe requirements first and experts doubt four trains into Sizewell can be achieved. Sea deliveries of rock and aggregate cannot be guaranteed in the heavy North Sea swells that occur in rough weather as deliveries to the proposed inadequate jetty and conveyor must for safety be halted. Road will pick up the shortfall. A 500 mile round trip congesting London and clogging the whole south.

**B1122 early years.** PINS question 21 highlights the total inadequacy of EDFs road implementation plan especially in the **early years when the only route into the area is via the B1122.** This is when building the SLR/haul road commences with its requirement of two bridges one over Pretty Road and the other over the Minsmere Levels and two roundabouts one on the A12 the other nearer Leiston. Concomitant to those HGV's required for the build their will also be 40 HGV movements a day for potable water, Scottish power renewables sub- station Friston build HGV's, HGV rock deliveries from Somerset, Green rail route construction HGV's, construction worker buses and HGV's for the new interconnector cables and huge sub- station that will be built along- side Pretty Road for Nautilus Interconnector. Plus normal traffic to and from the A12 to Leiston, HGV's to and from the Master Lord Estate and farm vehicles especially at harvest time. Couple this with the cars of Sizewell A,B, and C workers and white vans for construction and the whole lot produces the perfect storm of gridlock and chaos. The EDF vehicle models of expected numbers of HGV movements are illegible,

often non-existent, misleading and famously underestimates as those residents of Hinkley have experienced and reported. Minimal base counts have been done along the A12 and B1122 and where they have times of low traffic have been selected. Once again EDF and ESC gaming the system. HGV “cap” or limits have proven unworkable and after two years EDF admitted that controls on traffic at Hinkley had been relaxed. Traffic jams of two hours or more at Bridgewater were unjustifiably blamed on council road works.

**Traffic Conclusion.** The B1122 will be hell on earth with noise and vibration. Undoubtedly the local area adjacent to the road will experience high levels of air pollution exceeding government and world health limits. NOx (Nitrous Oxide), PM10 and PM2.5 particulates especially. There will be injuries and deaths to pedestrians and cyclists as vehicles mount the few pavements along this road. Where there is no pavements, the majority, I leave the reader to imagine. Residents along this road will suffer. Blue light services will be impacted adversely ambulances and fire engines snarled up and in the event of an incident at Sizewell B, evacuation to the A12 impossible.

The SLR has a projected completion time of eighteen months to two years. Taking just the above congestion into consideration this would probably lengthen to three or even four years. The overall build 10 -12 years can only be a wild guess. Given the track record of the applicants other completion dates in the nuclear industry this could easily extend to 15-18 years or maybe never finish. With a nuclear tax on consumer bills there is no incentive to finish and with the many hundreds of miles of single track road servicing Sizewell including that on the A12 and with the nearest motorway 80 miles away 2035 completion seems a mile away. Then of course we will be at zero carbon anyway.

**Destruction of habitat and wildlife.** The RSPB bird and nature reserve employees and experts (2000 in all) are appalled at the level of habitat destruction as are the 18750 volunteers and the 1.1 million members. A significant number of these having visited the area and the reserve along with the general public. How can it be justified to cover this adjacent area with dust and subject it to noise and high levels of light pollution? Many migrant species of bird will never come back such as stone curlew, sandpipers, fly catchers, warblers, terns, avocet and sand martin. A number of sensitive British resident birds will also be affected, marsh harrier, goldcrest, nuthatch, tree creeper etc. The Suffolk Wildlife Trust manage 50 reserves throughout Suffolk including the Sizewell Belts. They say of this reserve it contains “marsh, reed bed and wet woodland with adjacent heathland and beach - Sizewell Belts has just about everything.” Yet the Sizewell link Road will carve straight through it. Water extraction and drainage will parch it. With the site being too small for twin reactors building material will encroach on it. Birds from Minsmere and Sizewell such as marsh harriers, kestrels, owls and curlew will lose vital foraging areas. The beach frontage contain scarce crickets and grass hoppers often home to visiting wheatears now behind the hard coastal defence wall and rock armour and will be lost for ever.

**Destruction of fish and marine life. EDF rejection of a fish deterrent Coastal geomorphology.** A suction pipe the size of a London double decker bus will provide cooling water and a similar pipe its discharge. A sonar fish deterrent similar to Hinkley was to be provided however as Hinkley feels it cannot accommodate such a minor improvement Sizewell similarly cannot provide such. Instead it relies on the movable screen and filter meshes with a hopeful return fish catch trough most of which will be dead. Estimates of yearly fish mortality could be based to some extent on Sizewell B records but surprisingly(sic) meaningful records do not exist. Suffice it to say in the 60 year lifetime of SZC billions of fish will be destroyed together with fry, eggs and other sea bed creatures little sea life will be left along our coast.

**Coastal geomorphology. How large physical features shape our coastlines.** Geomorphologists do just such a thing. There are not many of them and a significant number seem to be engaged by corporations and company's hoping to justify how large builds in the sea have little effect on shorelines. That's probably why I could not engage one to survey our coast for data. Conflict of interest don't you know was the mantra, I was told. What would be the effect of placing two massive pipes in the sea, a jetty which is constantly being dredged, a hard coastal defence, where the sea pounds against in bad weather on an extensive sandy eroding cost line from Lowestoft to Felixstowe. Southwold and Aldeburgh are worried their rivers may be silted. RSPB are worried that such activity may encourage extensive scouring as are Dunwich, and all those conurbations near the sea are sure flooding will be exacerbated. Once again little detail has been given by EDF to satisfy such fears and those old fisher folk that know the coast are preparing for the worst.

**Summary.** I return to the table of desirable nuclear power generation sites and look at why Sizewell was the least but one of the eight for desirability. Advisers that compounded the list for HMG knew what they were doing. The best site selected by the advisers used the following criteria. Sits on rock, has an estuary position that protects an already existing jetty from bad weather, has no running nuclear power station next to it only one shut down for good. Is reasonably close to Somerset rock quarries for sea going deliveries. Is in a location of reasonably low population. Has an annual rainfall of 1.5 meters double East Anglia and therefore ample fresh water, is in an area of high unemployment and sits in a far less sensitive ecological location, That's why other nuclear constructors are now interested in the site.

**Sizewell C is in the wrong place, being built by an incompetent arrogant company to a design that is both flawed and outdated. Served by an infrastructure DCO that is bereft of detail, often making little sense and manipulated by the applicant within planning rules to hide major flaws.**

**THIS DCO SHOULD BE REJECTED AND THROWN OUT AND HMG ADVISED THAT SIZEWELL IS THE WRONG PLACE.**