

Judith M. Croton and W. John Rea Price



23 May 2022

To The Planning Inspectorate

Our unique PINS reference: 2002 5737

For onward transmission to :

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

The Proposed Development of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station

We write in response to the Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy's request of 25 April for comments on the applicant's responses to a series of questions raised with him. We are fully in support of the points made by Theberton and Eastbridge Council - and others - in their response of 23 May. This personal submission focuses on three principal aspects:-

- The applicant's approach to his application
- Water supply for the project
- Transport and Traffic on the B1122

The applicants approach

We are interested that the Department had raised so many significant questions of the applicant regarding water supply and the impact of traffic on the B1122 road as the applicant's approach to both these issue have been matters of great concern to our communities.

At the start of our engagement with the series of Sizewell consultations we were not opposed to the principle of a new nuclear power station. However, after ten years of deception, evasiveness, denial of community concerns and sheer incompetence we have become progressively more opposed to this applicant being entrusted with the complexity

of this enormous project .We now seriously doubt whether the applicant has the capability to safely deliver it.

Water supply for the project

We live in the driest part of England. Our water supply is dependant on artesian wells which we know were severely challenged during the construction of the much smaller Sizewell B. From the outset we have raised questions as how underground water can continue to supply the needs of a fast growing population as well as provide for Sizewell C. We were repeatedly told there would be no problem. Then, lo and behold, a month before the conclusion of the Examination, Northumbria Water, our water supplier, threatened a statutory stop to the process because it could not meet the applicant's ever increasing demands. Until that point all our challenging questions about water supply had been met with evasiveness and/or denial.

At this extremely late stage in the public examination we were presented with a proposal for a desalination plant of which no details were given nor were any questions answered about the environmental impact, particularly as to the consequences of the discharge of large volumes of brine. We were also told that in the years before the desalination plant was operational, water was to be trucked in along the already overstressed B1122. We have been given no information about the long term water strategy, beyond that there might be a new pipeline for 20 kilometres from the Waveney Valley.

It will not surprise you that the absence of any detailed information of long term arrangements for water supply in the applicant's response to you have only added to our concerns.

Transport and Traffic on the B1122

From the moment the construction of Sizewell C and D became a possibility we were raising questions about the impact of heavy goods vehicles on our already overloaded road network. We were aware that this had become a major issue during the construction of the much smaller Sizewell B to the point that the provision of a relief road had been planned, then called the D2, but now described in the present examination as Route W. During early statutory consultations, the applicant was pressed that the provision of the D2 (Route W) relief road, well in advance of any work on the new power station, should be a precondition of any planning approval.

For perhaps seven years the applicant totally rejected the need for any relief road as the bulk of materials would be delivered by either rail or sea. As this progressively became less and less likely and it became evident even to the applicant that the B1122 simply would not cope, and it was only at the Stage 3 consultation, of the pre-application period, that the proposal of the Sizewell Link Road emerged. Whilst we were glad that the need for a relief road had been recognised, we were mystified why the proposed route had been selected when Route W2 (D2) would have provided a much more direct passage onto the site and significantly reduce the mileage for the majority of vehicles that would be travelling northwards up the A12. It would also have had much less impact on surrounding communities. Despite W2 being the much preferred route of the County

Council as Highway Authority, the applicant adamantly refused to give any justification for its rejection.

In the course of this examination, Mr Humphrey, the Planning Inspector, quite rightly raised his great concern that the B1122 would have to carry a large volume for up to three years before the SLR was in place. He made it very clear that in the development of large infrastructure project it was normal for the mitigation to be in place before the circumstances, causing there to be a need for it, arose. The applicant's barrister persisted with a series of bald responses that this was the only way that the project could be delivered by 2035 and the overriding national necessity met of having Sizewell C and D on stream by then.

It was only at this late stage in the public examination that a representative of the applicant inadvertently revealed under questioning by Mr Humphrey, the Planning Inspector, the real reason for the choice of the present route of the SLR, namely in the early stages it would act as a haul road and be an essential source of excavated material that would be required on the site during the first two or three years of work on the site.

At no point during the extensive pre-consultation process had the applicant ever revealed why it would not be possible to have the SLR in place before construction work commenced. Here, the reason was disclosed.

Mr Humphrey then further challenged the applicant as to why the SLR route had been chosen, which requires the majority of heavy vehicles to travel three miles further north plus another two miles south compared to Route W (D2) and how this met the applicant's obligation to minimise carbon emissions. We cannot recollect any response from the applicant to this challenge, other than it is the only way the project can be delivered.

Even at this late stage, mitigations along the B1122, within both Theberton and at Middleton Moor, remain unresolved for those early years before the Sizewell Link Road is completed. This is unacceptable. Were the Sizewell Link Road to be provided before work on the main site starts, it would allow the current B1122 to be downgraded to a pedestrian and cyclist friendly route earlier.

Conclusion

We send you this as a personal commentary of our experience of the applicant over more than ten years. We hope the Secretary of State can see why we have lost any confidence in EDF's competence and capacity to complete this project safely, on budget and on time. We have told you of the dismissiveness, the denial, evasion they have subjected us to. We are grateful to his department for confronting the applicant with some very challenging questions, that remained unanswered during both consultations and examination.

If, after all, he is still minded to grant the Development Consent Order, we plead with Secretary of State not to permit work to start until the Sizewell Link Road is in place. Life for those who live in Theberton, and elsewhere along the B1122, with an additional

600 heavy goods vehicles plus other Sizewell related traffic per day, for up to three years will become absolutely intolerable.

Judith M. Croton

W. John Rea Price