

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C - request for information - Unique Reference 20025860  
**Date:** 23 May 2022 17:44:06

---

## **Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

### **Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited (“the Applicant”) for an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station (“the proposed Development”)**

I am writing in response to the Request for Information issued by the Secretary of State on April 25<sup>th</sup>, and am grateful for the opportunity to comment.

I have set out below brief comments on the areas for which further information has been specifically requested, and append some very short but deeply felt general comments on the situation in which residents of East Suffolk now find themselves after a decade or more of flawed consultation and evasive and incomplete information offered by the Applicant.

- Water Supply
  - The Applicant has ignored repeated requests over the years for detail on their plans for potable water supply both during the construction and then for the operational life of the project; and now relies on the statutory duties of other organisations to supply the assurances missing through their own lack of openness. In addition they risk causing environmental impacts which they cannot at this time quantify or risk assess. To allow EDFE to proceed whilst in the dark on this matter is to assume that the organisation will quite suddenly (and quite improbably) change the way they have done business throughout the application period. I remain sceptical.
- Traffic and Transport
  - In section 3.1.4 of their response, the Applicant states: *‘The plate shows Phase 3 works commencing in quarter 3 2025. If it was necessary for any reason to take the whole period up to the back-stop date to complete either road, the construction of the power station could not then start until quarter 1 2026, a delay of three years.’* Their argument is then that the ‘urgency’ of the nation’s requirement for ‘clean’ energy is such that almost *any* harm should be caused to local residents and the landscape of East Suffolk rather than imperil their programme of work. Reading through the list of 82 properties who will suffer at the least gross inconvenience and in reality serious damage to their way of life, it is hard to imagine that they agree. Nor do I, and nor should you, on the grounds that it was entirely the duty of the Applicant to ensure that mitigation was in place in advance of their works; nor have they provided any sort of assessment of the alternatives that would allow them, as I understand it, to present this situation to you. It is also hard to believe, given the dreadful history of delay and overrun with this company and this type of reactor, that they will not be able to conjure up for themselves (and at public expense) more serious delays than this, through basic lack of good programme management.
- Coastal processes and considerations

It is ironic that the Applicant trumpets dubious claims about carbon neutrality in support of action on climate change, whilst building on a site where currently predicted (and inevitable) climate change will leave them, *absit omen*, managing a nuclear reactor on an island with insufficient 'landward' defences; and that they continue to rely so heavily on a Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan that has been very effectively criticised in Mr Nick Scarr's submissions recently and during the application process.

- Spent Fuel and Waste storage
  - Mr Scarr's Appendix 4 in his most recent submission also points out the Applicant is about 50 years in error in choosing the date 2140 for the removal of all spent fuel, with ONR using the date 2190. This is quite a strange and very serious error.

In conclusion: like many others, I have been engaged in this matter either on my own account or as a Parish Councillor since the start of consultation. It will be well-known to you that throughout the consultations, there have been steady and consistent complaints from a very wide range of organisations and individuals that the Applicant has been slow to respond, has ignored consultation issues or deferred responses until later stages, has ignored difficult matters, especially in respect of environmental impacts, and has shown a stubborn belief that the project will go ahead whatever defects there may be in the application process.

Perhaps this same attitude, as well as technical defects, has been partly responsible for the terrible record they have had in getting EPRs built and into operation over the last twenty years. The claim that Hinkley Point would show the way forward has been exploded, with costs out of control and further delays to add to the dismal record of Olkiluoto and Flamerville; and the chance to simply decant skilled workers from Hinkley to Sizewell is now as unrealistic as the jobs on offer for Suffolk locals were in the first place. But of course with RAB funding, the excess costs about to be incurred if this application is accepted would fall onto the consumer, and not the investors – if any are seriously considering investing by now.

As the French politician said the other day – 'Ten years ago I used to think that wind power was complex and risky, and nuclear a safe bet; now I know it's the other way around...'

Many thanks for this final opportunity to comment,

Andrew McDonald

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.  
For more info visit 