

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** SZC responses to EDF answers  
**Date:** 22 May 2022 22:50:01

---

>

> Anthony Holmes

>

> Dear Madam /Sir ,

> I would be most grateful if you would take my comments into consideration to some of the answers given by EDF to the questions asked by the planning inspectorate on the SZC application.

>

> Traffic and Transport

> I am a resident in the local area using the B1122 on a daily basis using it at least two or three times per day . it was given this back ground that I was very disturbed to read EDF s answers that the B1122 in their opinion should be used in the early years of the build with what appears to be little or no alteration . Because the park and rides won't be completed either ....They are proposing that 600 HGV s , all employee traffic , all business traffic and the local residential traffic will be alright to use this road during the early years . it's amazing that this was their first suggestion at the outset 12 years ago and only after consultation stage 2 did they agree that these exact same numbers would need major, major works on the 1122 for the road to manage the early years traffic. I now find that all these numbers will be exactly the same but without the need for major improvement and all because EDF say nuclear must be rushed through to meet the UK s energy crisis!.

> Their forceful reply that you ,as the inspectorate , need to deal with this decision at speed is nothing short of criminal when we as locals have for all these years been trying to get them to listen.

> This road was their very first choice and here we are after four to five consultations .....back where we started just as EDF wanted .....using the B1122.

> The choice of the SLR is flawed .....all the locals wanted the W route which would have been quick to build and by now would have been operative and prevented all this chaos. The B1122 is a twisty ,turny, road with numerous bends and hills , hidden junctions and an accident history of deaths particularly at the bends before Leiston . And EDF believe this road to be adequate for the three or so years of first stage build.

> I would ask that you please make sure that if this application is agreed that an alternative route is put in place before the build is allowed to begin. This application has so many missing bits of information, surveys, coastal testing and data missing that EDF still need to submit that I would suggest that there is plenty of time to build an alternative route . they have sat on their hands for 12 years just so that they can have the first route they wanted in the first place.

> This B1122 is and will still be the main access route for emergency and escaping vehicles in the event of a nuclear emergency and it is effectively just a rural road.

>

>

> Coastal Consideration s

> I would like to challenge EDF answers about the coastal defences required and the assumptions they are making. They do not appear to have done any testing of ,or ,advised us as the public where the actual coastal defence line will be. The result of this is that we do not know what will be required . EDF still do not appear to have answered wether or not our coast can actually stand up to the project without slipping , sliding or moving. ....throughout the whole scenario information has not been forthcoming ....if the coast were shown to move then there is no way this can go ahead .....but we need to know and that is not yet available on informational data.

> The potential for flood risk, sea rise and storm surge has been evaluated till 2140 but given EDF s history of late completion we could be entering unknown territory with unknown issues after this date. it was said in the early years by EDF that once SZC was built it would be sold on and I suspect EDF will be long gone by that date leaving Suffolk , the government and locals to deal with a dreadful legacy.

>

> safety Queries raised by the Austrian Govt

> The Austrians have raised safety concerns on the spent fuel dates and again EDF data appears to be contradictory. To have all fuels cleared from the site by 2140 when their own evidence shows that the spent

fuels from the OLD power stations will not be clear till 2135 and even that's unlikely.....they will only then be starting on the new stuff from C which gives a more probable date of 2200 . this needs to be queried as it is too contradictory to be credible.

> The Austrians have a right to be cautious as we locals do with regard to EDF and their knowledge of how to handle nuclear. Currently they have an issue with spent fuel , which if they can not find a solution will mean they can not refuel in 2023.

> EDF has had to put a new safety case to the ONR requesting to cut the lid off of one of the tech containers . It has never been done before , nor do EDF know the correct dose to use . If they do not get an agreement from the ONR they will have to put a new safety case to them requesting that they move the container to a dry fuel store ....a move that is currently against all UK nuclear regulations. This is a company wanting to build another nuclear power station with a high level safety issue on the existing plant and process that they do not know how to deal with safely.

> The restrictions of the site , their failure to have a potable water source all evidence a company who fly by the seat of their pants .

>

> Finally throughout this process and application history the Secretary of State has said EDF should engage with the local communities . I would tell you that despite what they say it's all lip service. The engagement has been done with their own agenda and they choose the bits they like .

> The example of the road is just that .. they wanted the B1122 from day 1 and here we are going to use the B1122 for several years before completing an alternative route. The late discovery of no potable water , The inability to define the coastal defences and even if the project could go ahead still having to be researched.

> The current safety issue with the SZB that should make us query the safety of SZC and in particular Chinese data problems still to be published. This is a nuclear power plant and I would submit that EDF still has not answered all your questions adequately .

> I would be most grateful if you would take my objections to EDFs answers into consideration when assessing this DCO application

>

> Yours faithfully

> A Holmes

>

>

>

**From:** [REDACTED] [izewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C planning application ...response to their answers  
**Date:** 22 May 2022 20:50:25

---

Anthony Holmes  
[REDACTED]

Dear Madam/Sir

I would be most grateful if you would take my comments into consideration with regard to the answers that have been given by EDF in the request by the planning inspectorate to give additional information on the Sizewell C planning application.

#### 1 Traffic and transport mitigation

I am a member of the public that uses the B 1120 every day 2 and often three times a day. it is a road that is twisty , turny, has blind bends ,hills with hidden junctions and in winter can be very hazardous. Accidents historically have happened with deaths occurring around the bend area before Leiston. I am extremely astonished therefore

to learn that the B 1122 proposals now given by EDF show that they want to use this road for the early years without first building an alternative route. EDF say the B1122 will carry 600 heavy goods vehicles a day, together with the fact that park and rides will not be complete means that there will be many more private vehicles as well as those like myself from the normal traffic usage. It will be absolute chaos again.

In the initial consultations these figures of 600 vehicles was initially to be accompanied by heavy roadworks to the 1122 and be completed on the road prior to work starting on the powerstation ....what I now learn is that this road is to have very little other than cosmetic improvement and they want to use this road without starting the link road . How can this be correct ?

The SLR is a choice that has never been popular with local people and the original proposed W route would have been built far quicker and with less inconvenience to residents, locals , business in the locality or the travelling public.

EDF have shilled and shallied for nearly twelve years in a determined effort to only ever use the B1122 which has always been their initial intention and fallback plan. Their tone of their reply that the build needs to be hurried , because they will save the world and the UK with their nuclear energy is ludicrous , and the B1122 used to effect this speed of building is no excuse to allow them to evade building an alternative route to the 1122.

This whole planning application is awash with areas that have not been filled in by the applicant some so serious ...eg coastal defence tests And trials still to be undertaken that this excuse of shortage of time is not a valid reason to let them proceed to commence such a huge build using this road . EDF and it's history will show a dragging of it's feet on any alternative route if you allow them to commence without putting a suitable and safe alternative route in place.

I object most strongly to their answers and should this application go ahead I believe there is time for an alternative route to be built and the B1122 not be the main arterial road. you should also bear in mind in the event of an emergency on the nuclear plant this rural road will be the main access for emergency and escaping vehicles.

#### 2 Coastal Defence

I see that EDF have still not actually done any testing as to where the hard coastal defence is to be and so it would appear that they still do not know what will be required. I am deeply concerned that our coastline can actually stand up and in fact could potentially move or slide . Throughout the whole consultation and the submitted planning applications EDF has failed to show a substantive coastal defence strategy and their answers do not believe me to think they are any further along the line .

Their evaluations only appear to give data till 2140 and given their history of late target achievement , sea rise and storm surge will be in unknown territory and a major issue for our engineers to pick up . There was talk at one time EDF would sell this on once it had been built so really they have very little incentive to take care of the finer details of coastal defence for Suffolk as I don't believe they will be around. You should not allow them to negate their responsibilities on the coast defences.

#### 3 EDF s Competency and Safety Strategy raised by the Austrian Govt.

You as the planning inspectorate should be aware that EDF currently has a problem with this style of Nuclear reactor as well as the issue yet to be disclosed on the same Chinese model . Their problems are with spent fuel and unless they can find workable and safe solutions they will not be doing their anticipated refuel in 2023. The issue has arisen that has made them have to put a safety case to the ONR to get a sanction to cut the lid off of one of the tech containers . Issues are this ...it's has never been done before and EDF and the nuclear industry do not know what is the correct dose to use to effect the solution. If they don't get the agreement the only solution will be to put a further case to the ONR to move the container to a dry fuel store .which is currently against all UK regulations.

This is a company who will cut corners on surveys , on road building , on liaisons with local communities , on coastal and environmental safety in the push to get their agenda through profitably and now we have a company working in an unknown area that they are supposed to be BUT clearly NOT experts in . They are repeatedly late meeting targets and have no transparent figures for the public on cost. The Austrian government are right to be cautious in their areas of concern , we live within a few miles of a company who repeatedly tells us to trust them and yet they are working with a technology about which they are not sure because they have got themselves into a situation they have no solution for without putting us at risk or breaking sound UK nuclear regulations .

I would be most grateful if you would refuse this application by EDF , it is a project that has so many flaws in its preparation in so many serious areas . It is a project that will blight the Suffolk coast and regrettably is being undertaken by a company that will push this project through despite what we as locals say in mitigation . They were told to bring the local populace on board but what ever we say is overlooked and their original plans just implemented .

Local opposition is huge to EDF and I would ask that you give credence to these views

Yours faithfully

A. Holmes

