

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 10 submission from Frances Crowe, IP 20026749  
**Date:** 12 October 2021 21:17:15  
**Attachments:** [Deadline 10 Sizewell C submission to the planning inspectorate.docx](#)

---

Dear Planning Inspectors

Please find attached my Deadline 10 submission.

kind regards

Frances Crowe  
IP 20026749

## **Deadline 10 Sizewell C submission to the Planning Inspectorate**

**- from Frances Crowe, IP 20026749**

### Initial comments

1. Poor response from EDF

I have engaged with the planning consultations with EDF from the start, and have actively participated in the PINS process, having submitted a range of documents to PINS expressing my concerns and attended several ISHs as well as the initial OFH. I have tried to deal as constructively and thoroughly with the process as possible, despite the personal toll that this has taken. Yet, despite raising well-researched concerns and seeking to communicate these clearly, I remain concerned that these have not been addressed by the applicant during the planning process.

2. Ability of public consultees to participate fully in the process

I am also really concerned about the level of commitment that statutory consultees (public bodies like Natural England, for example) have been able to give to the process. A number of statutory consultees wrote to PINS prior to the start of the 6 month examination to express concerns about their ability to handle the DCO in view of covid and their otherwise already high workloads. In the light of this I was very dismayed that there have been a number of hearings where some seemingly critical consultees were absent, evidently reinforcing this concern. How can we be confident that our interests have been properly considered and defended when public bodies who have these responsibilities appear to be too pressed to engage in full strength with the planning process?

### A summary of specific concerns

I summarise below some of my specific key concerns which I do not believe have been addressed:

- Huge adverse impacts on tourism (I own a holiday let) that certainly cannot be addressed by a tourism fund or similar.
- Sea water quality and impacts on swimmers (swimming is really important for locals and visitors), including potential blooms of jellyfish.
- Air pollution impacts - especially PM2.5 and ozone. I was staggered at how little attention was given to these issues at the ISH, and at EDF's casual approach to this subject, their contempt for our concerns, and their cursory and simplistic responses.
- Traffic issues - delays especially getting to hospital in an emergency; unsuitable roads for HGVs/high numbers of traffic; delays inflating costs/reducing productivity for all workers, especially in the hard-pressed health and social care sector.
- Shipping impacts on immediate coastal area and seawater, especially as deliveries will coincide with the entire tourist season.
- Lack of provision of A&E facilities east of the A12 given journey times to hospital are already among the highest in the country. (Note: Facilities existed in Aldeburgh when SZB was constructed).

- Impact of noise, air, light and visual pollution on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and protected habitats, including marine.
- Coastal erosion - as evidenced by the extreme and unanticipated problems seen at Thorpeness during 2021. It is sheer folly to build an infrastructure project of this scale on one of the fastest eroding coasts in Europe and in the face of what we now know about climate change impacts ( [REDACTED] )
- Flawed sea defence design; and concerns over the cost, capacity and ability to reinforce and raise these in future decades.
- Impact of sea defences on coastal processes, impacting the coast north and south of the site
- The project would have an adverse impact in tackling climate change: the huge carbon footprint of its construction, even according to EDF's own figures, would not be repaid until at least 2040 - much too late!
- The impact of the recently divulged water supply issues - and the proposed desalination plant and pipeline - on traffic congestion, air quality, sea water quality etc. The lack of planning by EDF in this regard - despite it being raised for a decade by many consultees - is appalling and negligent, yet it is local people and habitats that will suffer as a result.
- There is already a severe shortage of high calibre people to fill jobs in building, renewable energy delivery and hospitality in this region - even before the current crisis affecting the country. The negative impact on local people and businesses of 'job steal' could be enormous.
- There is no plan in place for the funding of Sizewell C. It seems that tax payers, energy bill payers, pensioners and our children will have to bear a substantial amount of the costs - and all of the risks - relating to Sizewell C. And yet if things go wrong, nuclear is considered so high risk, we cannot even get insurance for our homes, businesses or health due to industry-wide nuclear exclusion clauses. The ultimate double whammy for local people!

### Three overwhelming key concerns

I want to draw the inspectors' attention three overwhelmingly important issues in more detail:

#### 1. Biodiversity loss and habitat destruction

I am really concerned about the impact on precious local protected habitats and the industrialisation and destruction of our beautiful heritage coast and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I find it incomprehensible that at a time when nature is under such assault and we live a country which is already one of the most nature-depleted in the world, we should be considering destruction on this scale in such a sensitive and valuable place - and this despite the Prime Minister's public commitment to enhance wildlife in this country. The impact on mental health for local people witnessing this needless destruction cannot be over-estimated.

NOTE: EDF's claims of biodiversity increases in the face of concreting over vast tracts of land are extraordinary and ridiculous, and are absolutely typical of the distorted 'story' that EDF offer on so many issues. As an organisation, EDF have a culture of obfuscation, avoiding giving the whole story, shifting the goal posts and 'airbrushing'

the truth. This has been evident right from the start with their very poor consultations: poorly presented information, lack of openness, and failure to share feedback - let alone respond to it. Whether this is deliberate or incompetence is for the Inspectors to decide but I urge that these half-truths are not allowed to drive a decision with such far-reaching impact on vital habitats at a time when they, more than ever, need our genuine protection.

## 2. Failed and perhaps undeliverable technology

The EPR reactor is not deliverable - certainly not at a cost or on a timescale that is useful. It can neither provide energy to UK consumers nor help to tackle the climate emergency in time.

EDF's record is one of abject failure, exemplified by the problems besetting their supposedly flagship site, Flamanville 3, in Normandy. Following a series of really serious build blunders, Flamanville 3 is already more than a decade late and 500% over budget. Flamanville 3 was originally intended as a fore-runner which would be swiftly followed by the roll-out of the EPR reactor to upgrade up to 58 ageing reactors from 2020 in France ( [REDACTED] ). Yet to date, the French government have not committed to build any more EPR reactors at all.

Olkiluoto, too, is a decade late and 200% over budget.

The only operational reactors in the world, Taishan 1 & 2, were also delivered 5 years late. Worse still, Taishan 1 was shut down in July 2021 due to unexplained radioactive emissions. We still do not know exactly what has caused the problems, what it will take to put it right, and its possible impact on the design and operation of other EPR reactors.

Confidence is rightly very low in this failed technology. Why on earth would the UK want to invest in this expensive, high risk and ineffective reactor that will be obsolete by the time it is complete, when even the French government lacks confidence in it - and when investing in it starves other genuinely renewable and proven technologies of the necessary funds to scale up and help *now* to tackle the climate emergency? Two EPR reactors under construction at Hinkley Point (and already delayed and running over budget) are surely risk enough.

Furthermore, nuclear does not provide the reliable energy supply claimed. As well as scheduled outages for several weeks every 18-24 months for fuel replacement, unplanned outages have recently plagued EDF's reactors, with Sizewell B shut down earlier this year and Hinkley B currently out of action. Moreover, Dungeness B, out of action since 2018 after a Level 2 incident due to corrosion, has this year been taken out of commission permanently, 7 years earlier than planned. These persistent problems have undoubtedly contributed in some part to the current energy crisis. Nuclear cannot provide the flexible and reliable energy required to meet the UK's future demand.

## 3. Nuclear waste

This project is neither green nor renewable despite claims by EDF and lobbyists. The issue of safe waste and spent fuel storage is unresolved, and sourcing of uranium is

both highly damaging to the environment and extremely carbon intensive. Moreover, uranium is also a depleting resource. This project would leave a legacy of 4000 tonnes of spent fuel and other waste, stored for well over 100 years on a fast eroding coastline in the face of unprecedented sea level rises of 1 meter before the end of this century and perhaps 5 meters by 2150

[REDACTED], p.53). This waste would need to be safely secured for thousands of years. Yet, despite talk (for half a century, in fact) of a geological waste storage facility, no such facility yet exists anywhere in the world and many technical concerns remain about whether this solution even could safely secure the type of spent fuel generated by the EPR reactor. This is a totally unacceptable legacy to leave to future generations.

### Conclusion

I genuinely believe it would be recklessness of the highest order to proceed with this project and urge you to make the right decision for the UK, for Suffolk - especially for its rich, unique, precious and supposedly protected wildlife and habitats - and for future generations by rejecting this poorly planned and ill-judged project, which is based on hugely expensive yet failed technology that cannot be relied on to deliver on time, on budget or without error - if delivered at all.

Frances Crowe  
IP 20026749