



Response to Secretary of State's Request for Information

On behalf of
SIZE-AFP307 John Simon Ilett
SIZE-AFP308 Sally Elizabeth Ilett

Responding also on behalf of
20026022 Cipher Crystal
20026041 Sally Ilett
20026780 Simon Ilett

Water Supply

Since the beginning of the consultation process some 10 years ago EDF have been reassured by EDF that despite the water supply in the East of England being a diminishing commodity there would be sufficient supply to build and safely maintain 2 nuclear reactors for 60 years plus.

However at the very end of the inspection process, EDF finally admit that Northumbrian Water will not be able to supply the demand in the early years of construction and there is currently no assurance that it will ever be possible. At the 11th hour a temporary desalination plant and associated diesel generation plant was proposed to provide sufficient potable water. The Secretary of State has now asked as to the viability of this becoming permanent and EDF are trying to find a site for it on an already constricted site. One option to bury it north of the SSSI crossing is not acceptable and should not be allowed.

An alternative to this is to use parts of the Sizewell A site which are currently proposed to be used to relocate Sizewell B infrastructure to free up space for Sizewell C. This will mean the use of Pill Box field which is currently providing tree planting to mitigate the destruction of Coronation Wood. To revert to using Pill Box field for development would be an ecological backward step.

This application should not be allowed to proceed until and unless a resilient source of potable water is in place.

Transport

EDF have been consistently challenged during the consultation process about the suitability of the B1122 to carry the huge volume of construction traffic along a B class road.

EDF were urged to consider a new route to the site known as the W route which would leave a lasting legacy to the area.

EDF have introduced the Sizewell link road route (SLR), forcing traffic to travel further north than the W route would have only to return south across prime arable land that runs in a large part parallel to the B1122 and will leave no lasting legacy.

In the early years before the SLR and 2 village bypass (2VB) are constructed, all the HGV's will have to use the B1122 in addition to the construction traffic and private vehicles that should be taken away by the park and ride facilities that will also not be available in the early years.

We believe that given the huge loss of prime arable land lost and with no lasting legacy, the SLR should be removed after construction. This is supported by Suffolk County Council.

World events have meant shortages in supply of wheat and other commodities that could be grown locally. There is an urgent need to produce as much home grown food as possible and the loss of this agricultural land will permanently reduce that capacity if the road remains.

The SLR route will sever communities and make it hard for villagers to access local services, community and friends.

EDF say that there is an urgent need for new nuclear. This is not supported by the fact that it will take in excess of a decade to build and, judging by delays seen in their other similar projects, will take far longer.

We take issue that any delay to the construction will impact on the Governments policy to decarbonise the electricity supply as the ESO has already stated that they expect net zero by 2035 which is before SZC will generate any power at all.

In conclusion

This project is being built on a fragile coast, with poor infrastructure and no plan for spent fuel removal or decommissioning.

There is a significant site flood risk beyond 2140 according to EDF's own assessments and will leave a legacy of protecting the site from the sea for generations to come.

There is no agreed potable water supply plan for the operational phase of the Sizewell C reactors

It will significantly increase carbon emissions at the very time that we need to reduce them to avoid a climate disaster.

The cost is unknown and judging by all other nuclear builds in EDF's control will escalate. Likewise delays will be inevitable. The Regulated Asset Base model to help fund this project will add to energy bills at a time when they are spiralling out of control forcing many consumers into fuel poverty.

This project is not a "home grown" energy source. There is no uranium available in the UK and most of this comes from Russia or Chinese controlled mines. Much of the investment will come from abroad and it will be built by a foreign company - EDF.

There will be wholesale destruction of habitat with no net biodiversity gain in a SSSI and AONB.

EDF has **not** taken the community with it in this process indeed quite the opposite it has been arrogant and antagonistic during the last 11 years of consultation.

We urge the Secretary of State to reject the DCO application .