

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy - Request for Comments - EN010012 - The SizewellC Project. Letter dated 25th April 2002.  
**Date:** 21 May 2022 17:50:40  
**Attachments:** [Response to the Secretary of State.docx](#)

---

Dear Sirs

My Unique Reference is 20025779.

Thank you for your letter regarding the Secretary of State's request for comments from all interested parties, NNB Generation Company (SZC), and Natural Britain.

I have attached my comments on the Secretary of State's questions but would like to add that I have, as a private individual, invested much time, effort and energy in submitting earlier comments to the, so called, consultations, by EDF and later to the Examination process which the Planning Inspectorate have now concluded.

During this time I have commented, to you, the following:

"EDF's attitude in the whole process has been uncaring, derisory and incomplete. The areas of environmental impact, affect on the local transport structure, tourism (a huge part of the local economy), effects on the community (especially a huge influx of workers on a tiny rural community) and health impacts have been brushed aside. The threat of these works to the RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve, which is a site of worldwide importance, has been completely ignored.

Aside from all of these concerns there are many issues that surround whether there is still need for nuclear power in the UK with the rise in renewable energy, the incredibly high cost of nuclear electricity against other means of provision, the issues of siting another nuclear facility on a coast which is increasingly going to be affected by incursion from the sea, and the fact that the government still have no solution to where the increasing amount of spent nuclear fuel is to be stored.

As a Suffolk MP. Dr. Dan Poulter put it recently the behaviour of EDF during their, so called, consultation process has been "disdainful". After four rounds of "public consultations" they have not provided much of the information required nor has they adequately consulted on many of the issues. One might think that EDF were paying only lip service to this vital process and believe that this is a "tick box" exercise leading to a foregone conclusion."

It is my contention that if the Planning Process had not allowed the applicant to behave in this way the Secretary of State would not now be needing to ask these questions, that should have been covered in the examination. Also that many of the council's in the local areas affected, the institutions like the RSPB and Environment groups would not now still be awaiting vital information from the applicant that is still needed to assist in their input to the process.

Finally I believe that the applicant's attitude has been reinforced by the statements made by the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister in public and to the Press that the construction of Sizewell C is going ahead even before the decision from the Planning Inspectorate.

Yours

Ian Rose

Response to the Secretary of State's request for comments on replies from the applicant to his questions in his Letters of 18<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> March on EN010012 Sizewell C Project

From Ian Rose

Unique Reference:20025779

### 1. Water Supply, Desalination Plant and Drainage;

It is almost unbelievable that the applicant has failed to identify a potable water supply for the project and only announced this almost at the very end of the Examination. A desalination plant is generally agreed not to be a solution for a huge project such as this and that there may be many environmental related to the effects of the brine produced by the process. The possible effects on Minsmere and the surrounding areas is of great concern. If the desalination plant were to be allowed its siting is of great concern and should not, in any circumstances be allowed near to the Minsmere reserve, This is a site of world interest and its effective destruction would have ripples throughout the world.

### 2. Traffic and Transport

This is an issue that has never been properly considered by the applicant and now the effects of two years of pre-construction traffic on the B1122 without any changes to existing route would have huge safety and health issues for the local area.

Phase 1 should, under no circumstances, be allowed to commence without mitigation in place. The applicant has continually ignored to assess alternative options.

The preferred route put forward by Suffolk County Council has not been properly considered and the hugely increased traffic on the B1122 would have to pass along a stretch of the A12 that is narrow, slow that passes a number of small villages that would be very badly affected.

This is a tourist route that brings a great deal of income into the county and if subject to issues and delays would mean that this part of the County would suffer greatly.

### 3. Coastal Considerations

This is a subject that I believe has been covered in Mr.Nick Scarr's submissions that I have read with admiration. I would content myself with observing that the whole of this coast is considered to be affected by serious erosion that will only be made worse by the continuation of climate change. I would like to remind the Secretary of State of two points

The effects on Japan and the world of the destruction of Fukushima.

The fact that Dunwich, at the time the largest port on the East coast was completely destroyed by two great storms in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. This may seem too long ago to be worried about but who would have thought we be now on the brink of a third world war back in 1945.

#### 4. Questions from the Government of Austria

The question on what to do with Nuclear waste has not been answered to date and is not likely to be solved soon. There is nuclear waste stored at Sizewell B and at Bradwell. The applicants plan to have all waste removed by 2140 is ridiculous when the ONR is speculating dates around 2190.

#### 5. Habitats Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity and Ecology.

This is a subject best left to those who understand the effects on the Environment and Ecology and I am aware that the RSPB are expressing their huge concerns of the building of Sizewell C on the wildlife and especially on the Marshes.

I understand that new laws on Environment have been passed since this project has been under way and I believe that a number of items connected with the plans would not now be legal.

#### 6. Harbour Byelaws and Powers

No comment

#### 7. Statements of Common Ground

No comment

#### 8. Control Documents

No comment

#### 9. Soil Management Plan

No comment

#### 10. Habitat Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity and Ecology

See 5 above

#### 11. Other Matters

I am now retired but during my working life I was a Risk and Business Continuity specialist working with major financial institutions and public organisations such as Universities.

I would like to comment that if there was a major incident at Sizewell B during the construction of Sizewell C the effects of traffic congestion on the roads around would mean that the existing plans for evacuation of the local population would be totally inadequate.