

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Response to Secretary of State's Request for information 25th April 2022. Interested parties Ref Number 20026011  
**Date:** 22 May 2022 18:27:36

---

Good Afternoon,

I am grateful that the Secretary of State has given interested parties an opportunity to respond to the questions he raised with the Applicant and others regarding the Sizewell C DCO. I am an interested party and my Ref Number is 20026011.

I live directly on the B1122 in Theberton in a property which has been owned by my family for around 100 years and is over 200 years old. I have actively engaged in the planning process from the beginning and have major concerns about the proposed development of Sizewell C none of which have been adequately addressed by the Applicant during the consultation process.

#### Traffic and Transport

In all of my previous submissions I have raised concerns regarding the huge increase in road traffic and the suitability of the infra structure to safely manage the volume of traffic on rural roads. The concerns I have raised are in relation to safety, noise and vibration along with the adverse impacts on both the physical and mental health of people living alongside the B1122.

I note that the Applicant has been asked to provide details of any further mitigation that could be provided in relation to noise and vibration impacts on the B1122 before the SLR is in place.

As far as I can determine from the Applicant's reply the B1122 will continue to be used for the transport of the majority of materials during the early years and the only new mitigation for those of us living on the B1122 is the offer of structural surveys to our properties one at the start of the project and another six months after the opening of the Sizewell Link road. I fail to understand how this can seriously be seen as answering the question raised by the Secretary of State or addressing the concerns of local communities.

At every turn the Applicant has rejected the concerns of local communities and any proposals they have made in relation to the most suitable route for road traffic have been ignored. The Applicant's route W (previously known as the D2 route for Sizewell B) was the route local communities and Suffolk County Council preferred as its impact on local communities would be significantly less than the SLR. This route would better serve the future needs of local communities and other energy projects proposed for the area.

Until very recently the Applicant has insisted that no relief roads were necessary and that the B1122 was suitable to carry the huge number of HGVs and other increased traffic. Many members of the local community were surprised to hear that a link road was now on the table and wondered why. It would appear that the only reason that the Applicant is now offering a relief road is because it fits with the "Mass balance requirements of the project.

Local people call it the Sizewell relief Road the road to "No where" Suffolk County Council and the local MP Theresa Coffey are requesting that the road be removed once the build is completed as it has no lasting legacy.

If this project is given development consent then at the very least this should be with the proviso that the SLR and TVB are built before the start of construction of the main project and that the SLR is removed at the end of the build.

#### Water supply

I was appalled to find that the lack of a portable water supply was not addressed much earlier in the consultation process given that East Anglia is one of the driest parts of the UK. Throughout the consultation process both the Applicant and NWL assured interested parties that water supply was not an issue. While I appreciate that the Applicant and Northumbrian Water are working towards the provision of potable water one has to ask the questions

Where will it be sorted from?

how it will get to site ?

how long will it take to build the required infra structure ?

how much will it cost ?

What impacts will it have on the environment.?

It is a concern that the current solution to the lack of water to serve the site is the proposal to construct either a temporary or permanent desalination plant. Given the huge environmental impacts of constructing such a plant it is imperative that the Applicant carries out further environmental impact studies and shares these with local communities. A further concern is where the desalination plant will be built the Applicant is already attempting to shoehorn the biggest development in Europe onto a site which is not fit for purpose either in relation to its size or the availability of the infrastructure to support it.

Over a period of eleven years EDF have failed to engage with local communities or to produce a credible project plan they now seem to believe that in order for the UK to meet its carbon emission targets and the need for energy security that they can pressurise the Government to nod through a dangerously inadequately planned project.

EDF have yet to convince private investors to commit to Sizewell C and given the current economic crisis and today's announcement of the increased cost of building Hinkley point they are unlikely to generate any enthusiasm from the private market . If this project is approved using the RAB funding model this will mean that the British consumer will be liable for funding the horrendously expensive, unproven project.

Our Prime Minister has extolled Nuclear energy as a means of generating clean secure energy both of which should mean that the building of Sizewell is not approved.

The Carbon footprint of Sizewell C will be astronomical and the uranium needed to generate Nuclear power is not available within the UK. The majority of the supply of uranium is within the areas of the world under Russian influence so this is hardly secure. EDF continue to source uranium to power its plants including Sizewell B from Russia as it has an ongoing relationship with Rosatom and Rosenergoatom due to of recently signed agreements.

Truly secure energy can only come from truly renewable sources which do not rely on funding, development or provision of resources from other countries.

I once again urge you to reject the application and protect future generations from the environmental and financial disaster that agreeing the development of Sizewell C will be.