

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Feedback requested by 23.5.22
Date: 23 May 2022 19:18:57

Dear Sir,

I am writing with my concerns over 3 points with this application:

1. Water supply to the site for construction purposes and ongoing operational purposes has not been consulted on nor agreed with the water company concerned. This application has been under consultation for the last 10 years but EDF have only just addressed the issue of water supply. A desalination plant will take time to build, is costly in environmental terms especially and there is no room at the Sizewell site for it. It would also be risky given the coastal processes in the area already and the concerns about overfishing and lack of fish stocks for Minsmere.
2. 2140 is very unrealistic for the removal of all spent fuel and decommissioning. There is also the question of UK-wide spent fuel storage capacity. I believe this should be solved before any approval is given to any future form of nuclear reactor otherwise we will end up with spent fuel and nowhere to put it.
3. The Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan does not really address the very real threat of the site being flooded and measures that will need to be taken to ensure that there isn't another Fukushima. Additionally measures need to be taken to protect the railway line against flooding from climate change so that there isn't a rail disaster with removal of waste from construction or spent fuel.

Yours faithfully

Jane Healey

[REDACTED]