From:
To: SizewellC

**Subject:** Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy – Request for comments on SZC 25.04.2022

**Date:** 20 May 2022 16:48:12

Dear Sir/Madam

## Response to Secretary of State's Request for Comments, 25th April 2022 regarding Sizewell C (SZC)

As an interested party (unique reference 20025830) I am grateful to the Secretary of State (SoS) for giving me the opportunity to consider and comment on the SoS's two sets of questions to the applicant for the Sizewell C (SZC) Development Consent Order Application (DCO) along with the applicant's responses.

The applicant's responses to the SoS's questions still do little to address or inspire confidence that SZC is a wise or tenable project.

It is alarming that at this late stage in the examination, fundamental issues such as securing a potable water supply and whether the underlying substrate at Sizewell can even support the proposed structure are only now being considered.

The applicant's responses to the SOS's questions indicate that neither of the above issues are nearing any resolution, with both requiring considerable further investigation. It calls into question how an informed decision on the DCO can be made whilst there is still such uncertainty on these and many other issues surrounding the proposals.

The applicant's responses give no detail on how they are going to prevent/mitigate the significant detrimental impact of increased road traffic on the surrounding towns and villages, particularly in the early years prior to and during the building of supporting infrastructure.

It should also be noted that building on part of the Sizewell Marsh SSSI (with irreversible loss of statutory designated habitat and with insufficient compensation) fails to meet the Environment Act 2021. This sets a very poor precedent for both applicant and government's regard for such legislation.

In addition to the above, there are still many other concerns relating to the SZC proposals including its siting on an eroding coastline, no clear indication of final cost, many of which I have raised in previous correspondence. No adequate answers to any of these have yet been provided.

TΙ	an day	olonmor	st of \$70	romains the	wrong projec	t in tha	wrong place
Ιľ	ie dev	reiopmer	11 OT SZU	remains the	wrong projec	it in the	wrong place.

Yours faithfully

Susan Stone