

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Secretary of State's Request for information
Date: 22 May 2022 23:08:45

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to comment under this most recent request. My unique interested person number is 20026343 - William Kendall. I live 4 miles by road from the Sizewell site. Closer as the crow flies and I operate a number of businesses from here involving the direct of employment of around 20 individuals.

The questions raised by the Secretary of State will have been answered by many other parties most cases better qualified to respond in greater detail than I am able. The applicant's inability to answer the issues raised by the Secretary of State in anything like a satisfactory manner provides yet further evidence of their inability to devise a workable manner for developing their project on so complicated a site. It is also a further illustration of how the applicant has failed to take seriously the concerns of many local organisations and individuals over the years and only confronted them very late in the day. The applicant has had a decade to consult and listen to the concerns of a local population which remains supportive of appropriate nuclear development. When Sizewell B was being developed the then developer modified their plans to accommodate the major concerns of local opponents. In the case of Sizewell C the applicant has largely ignored them and thereby created widespread and very active opposition. The only way that this can now be resolved without years of local resistance is either for the applicant, at this very late stage, to devise a plan which does accommodate the major concerns of the local authority, statutory bodies, expert NGOs and private individuals or to surrender the site to a more suitable nuclear project such as one involving small, modular reactors.

My areas of specific knowledge and concern relate to the unsatisfactory road proposals and the threats to biodiversity the current scheme will pose.

The applicant is unwilling to put in place a suitable link road along the route which is preferred by our local authority and which would have considerable amenity value including supporting the development of infrastructure for offshore wind installations. Instead they put forward the totally unacceptable proposal to start major works on the project long before the link road is constructed. This will put an unbearable strain on the existing Yoxford-Leiston road and cause intolerable conditions for local residents like me and for local businesses like my own which rely on this road for access by my staff, suppliers and customers. If the applicant were to be given permission to build their project, it should be a condition precedent that any link road should follow the route promoted by our County Council and that it should be completed before work was started on the actual reactor site. Preferable would be to require the applicant to find a means of access which did not require the widespread destruction caused by a new link road at all. If the applicant were unable to do this then they should explore the opportunity to install small, modular reactors on their site which could be transported via the existing road network. Such reactors would almost certainly be generating electricity many years before Sizewell C and with much greater certainty even though the designs for SMRs are still novel. The applicant's EPR design has been beset with major technical issues from the start and many experts now believe that is a failed design which can never be completed satisfactorily.

The applicant makes a flawed claim that their proposals offer a net gain for biodiversity. This claim is challenged repeatedly by expert organisations and is patently absurd even to the amateur analysis I can offer. It is in any case questionable whether the net gain principle should

be contemplated in the case of enormous infrastructure projects located on sites of unique benefit for nature. It is impossible to imagine how one can enhance biodiversity by gains elsewhere when a project is destined to destroy an area of unique value to biodiversity. The applicant's proposals fall so short on protecting and enhancing biodiversity that this should be grounds alone for refusing permission.

With best wishes

William Kendall