

Unique Reference Size-AFP167 & Size-AFP 168 Paul & Julie Tillcock

Comments on latest queries regarding this project

The Sizewell Link road, Route W was the preferred route since inception of the idea of a new Nuclear reactor, however it was only at stage 4 consultation that a new route was recommended against all local communities, MP and Councils preferred opinions.

Even more annoying is that until now there was no definitive reason why the latest route was chosen, as it has no legacy value (both County Council and MP are pressing to have it removed after construction) and does not help any of the other Energy projects in East Suffolk. Furthermore being built and commissioned after the early years traffic, it would be virtually irrelevant.

At this late late stage I now understand that the reason for the current SLR route is for a "Mass Balance" requirement for the main development site... Is it the case that a route has been chosen against all the concerns and well being of the communities affected because the route chosen wins aggregates and materials for the applicant than the more appropriate Route W does not.

If this is true this is outrageous, the applicant should choose the best route for the project and for its legacy value not so it can get some free building aggregates/soil

This appears very underhand and sneaky.

If the applicant had our concerns at heart and truly wanted to leave us a positive legacy then the applicant should have said "Route W is the most appropriate but, will cost us more as we will need to import more materials at a cost of ££££", then we could all say yay or nay if it costs more but will be better for the communities and have a legacy value.

I personally asked the Planning Authority to ascertain why Route W was not chosen by the applicant and it is only now that I have by chance found out why... this is an abuse of the planning process in my opinion.

The secretary for State has asked if the SLR and Two village bypass (and the park and ride) could be built prior to the construction of the main development, which seems a very reasonable request. Why is the applicant so against this... Is it because they can then not use the materials excavated from the SLR and TVB on the main site immediately and it will cost more? double handling the materials.

Why cannot they be straight with us instead of telling us that the SLR route is the best for us when clearly it is not

It seems that even after all these years of mooting the building of Sizewell C & D that the applicant has no clue on what affect the colossal building project will have on the communities here in East Suffolk and The Applicant keeps adding additional details peace-meal as and when the planning authority requests additional evidence, another example of this is; where is the sustainable water supplying coming from during construction and throughout the operating phase.

The community has been asking for decades where the additional potable water is coming from and the applicant has ignored (once again) our concerns and ONLY after the planning process was completed did they accept that they didn't have a plan for a water supply.

Now, we do not have the ability to assess the proposal and the environmental impact of a desalination plant, it's significance within the building site and its likely environmental concerns. Just a new raft of documents is to be added to the closed planning process. How can an important major infrastructure element be added at this late stage, surely the water supply is a fundamental aspect of a nuclear power plant and not an afterthought.

Finally as the applicant has just announced another delay and an additional expenditure to Hinckley Point C when are they going to update the likely cost of Sizewell C & D and a realistic build timeframe.

Once you have received those details you will clearly see that this project is too expensive and too slow whereby the Rolls Royce SMR route is clearly quicker and less disruptive to local communities

Sizewell C 26 billion for 3.2 GWH

Rolls Royce SMR 1.8 Billion for .470 GWH

So an alternative strategy would be to build 14 RR SMRs (nationally) for the same price as one Sizewell C BUT producing 6.58 GWH which in my simple equation is twice the energy production for the same price using a UK company and UK workers.

Its not rocket science, EPRs are 20th century unproven technology with 21st century safety standards and expense added on top, there are no EPRs at full output and the only ones that were, now 50% are closed for safety reasons, not a good track record in my opinion.

I am also concerned that EDF are still relying on Russian Uranium to power the UKs nuclear reactors.

I support the responses from Stop Sizewell C, Therberton & Eastbridge Parish Council, Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council, Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group and the B1122 Action Group as they have furnished you with a more in-depth answer to your queries which I trust you will analyse in detail. I also wish to ask you to read the responses from my Parish Council Kelsale Cum Carlton as we are the most adversely affected by the chosen route for the SLR

It is unacceptable that the Applicant has been allowed to go this far with such little details on how they will build the Power station and its required infrastructure.

This planning application should not be approved as the applicant has changed its position so many times and given so little thought to our community's concerns, it is too expensive, too slow and there are other safer home grown alternatives available right now.

Yours faithfully

Paul & Julie Tillcock