

MOAT FARM

Final Submission to the Examining Authority

We have followed the inspection process closely over the last 6 months participating as much as we could as the 19 changes were submitted by EDF reacting to scrutiny of the application.

We have seen nothing to change our opposition to this project which remains too enormous to be delivered in a remote part of Suffolk with poor infrastructure.

The cost to deliver is rising all the time and the final cost is not confirmed. Funding is far from clear with the Chinese company CGN unlikely to be involved, the Government has not committed to taking its share. Pension funds are unhappy to invest in this risky technology exposing themselves to an unknown decommissioning cost. A petition is about to be delivered to the government, signed by in excess of 80,000 people, opposing the idea of a Regulated Asset Base guarantee to pay for the build as well as any cost overruns to be added to already increasingly unaffordable electricity bills.

Nuclear Energy is not green as the fuel must still be mined and transported to site. There is no policy in place for dealing with Nuclear waste and this will be left to future generations to sort out. Toxic nuclear waste would have to remain on site for well over 100 years.

The EPR reactor EDF wants to build has an appalling track record. The few EPRs under construction are all well over budget and in France and Finland running a decade late. The only operating EPR in China has reported degraded fuel rod seals and has been closed for investigation and maintenance following international attention.

This project is simply in the wrong place. It will do nothing for the Governments levelling up agenda with sites further north better suited to achieve this goal.

EDF's claims that there will be thousands of jobs for locals and billions of pounds spent locally but why is it necessary for a campus to house 2,400 workers and EDF's definition of local is a commute of 1 1/2 hours.

It will affect local tourism as visitors stay away and local businesses will suffer an employment vacuum as workers migrate to Sizewell.

Road and Rail links are poor with much of the A12 north of Ipswich being single carriageway. This is expected to take the majority of the 12,000 extra vehicles a day, including 700 HGVs.

The Sizewell C site is on an eroding coastline and surrounded by protected wildlife habitats and adjoins the internationally famous RSPB Minsmere reserve. The site is wholly within the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and construction will cut the AONB in half for a decade and some of the Sizewell Marshes will be built on and lost forever.

The build will take between 10 and 12 years to complete. Lorries, buses, construction vehicles and cars will add to CO2 emissions at the very time that we need to reduce them. It will take 6 years after the power plant starts producing electricity (if it ever does) to pay back it's carbon debt.

The Suffolk coastline is being labelled the energy coast and there are many energy projects proposed alongside Sizewell C's build. If all these proceed, the combination will push the local infrastructure to breaking point!

A recent report by the Natural History Museum highlighted that the UK was in the bottom 10% of countries in the world for Biodiversity. Almost half has disappeared since the industrial revolution. Whilst the world's overall biodiversity intactness is estimated at 75%, the UK's index reading was 53%! Sizewell C will further destroy this fragile biodiversity which cannot be replaced.

The climate crisis is the defining issue of our time. Mega-droughts, wildfires, flooding and extreme heat are making parts of our planet uninhabitable. As we emerge from the pandemic, carbon emissions are rising and action is needed now. Sizewell C will not be producing electricity for 12 years at best and during construction will be adding to Carbon emissions at a time when we need to reduce them.

There are alternatives to produce carbon free electricity available right now - wind, solar, hydrogen and storage to name a few. These are the technologies that should be invested in and not the same old dinosaur technologies of the past.

We urge the Examining Authority to refuse the Development Consent Order taking into account the financial cost, impact on the local economy, housing stock, poor infrastructure and Environmental grounds.

Simon and Sally Ilett
Responding on behalf of

20026022 Cipher Crystal
20026041 Sally Ilett
20026780 Simon Ilett
20025843 St Peter's Church

SIZE-AFP307 John Simon Ilett
SIZE-AFP308 Sally Elizabeth Ilett