

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on EDF's response to the Secretary of State's information requests  
**Date:** 20 May 2022 20:53:05

---

Dear Sir, Dear Madam

EDF's responses are inadequate or inaccurate or misleading or unacceptable in the following respects:

1. Transport and roads

It has now become clear why EDF want the Sizewell Link Road, rather than the alternative Route W (previously known as D2) which Suffolk County Council and all local villages favour and which would have a good legacy value. EDF require the aggregates/spoil etc from the SLR for use at the Main Site. But the fact that EDF do not propose building the SLR before the Main Site works commence will lead to huge issues of public safety, noise, disruption and pollution due to the amount of traffic which will use the B1122 and the network of mostly single track surrounding lanes. EDF admit to 600 lorries per day but this figure excludes all the private vehicles which will be using the same roads because of the lack of properly planned parking facilities.

An example (of which there are many) of EDF's lack of proper consultation, engagement and planning.

2. Water

At a comically late stage, EDF admit (having previously and repeatedly denied that there would be a problem) that there will not be enough water, drinkable and otherwise, at the site. EDF has scrambled around to find a solution and, as more expert responders will no doubt explain, it is not clear that any of the solutions are workable. In particular the proposal for a desalination plant would significantly reduce biodiversity over the long term, and perhaps in some ways permanently, at the sites adjacent to the Sizewell Marsh and Minsmere SSSI areas. It also appears to be using the area which EDF have previously proposed as compensation for their destruction of Coronation Wood.

Another example of the negligent lack of consultation, engagement and planning.

3. Flood defences

EDF's proposals are not sufficient to cope with even conservative estimates of future rises in sea levels.

4. Spent nuclear fuel

EDF's claim that spent nuclear fuel will be dealt with by 2140 is bogus. Even EDF has previously stated that the existing spent fuel will not be dealt with until 2135!

5. Cost estimates

It is strange that EDF has not updated its cost estimates since, I believe, 2020. Since that date EDF has regularly announced very substantial corrections and increases in its estimates for the construction of Hinckley C. Any claims relating to Value for Money of the project are therefore highly suspect.

6. Other

Other consultees including Environment Agency, RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife still say that they have not received the information they require in order to respond properly.

EDF's biodiversity proposals do not meet the requirements of current legislation.

And, not of national significance, despite our efforts over the last 11 years to get EDF to engage with us on the

dramatic and damaging effects of many of their proposals on our house and farming enterprise, we have not had any

significant engagement with EDF or its agents, despite EDF's untruthful claims to the contrary in the various Planning

Inspectorate hearings and submissions.

Yours sincerely

Justin Dowley



Interested party numbers SIZE- AFP 123,124,119 and 120