

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: IP no: 20026229: Response to SoS questions
Date: 23 May 2022 20:02:00

Thank you for yet another opportunity to re-iterate, albeit with a little more information now, the points I have been making throughout the DCO process. We all know of the many outstanding issues yet to be resolved around the entire SZC project. My particular concerns are:

Traffic: The traffic situation in East Suffolk and the county as a whole will be horrendous. There are multiple other infrastructure projects due to commence across the area, as well as new housing developments from Felixstowe and Ipswich to Lowestoft. This alone will massively increase vehicle numbers, without the additional 600 HGVs, bus movements, SZC work vehicles and private cars that we know will occur. For the 'early years' the A12, A1120 and the 1122 will be extremely difficult for locals to use with all that implies for emergency situations of all types, as well as normal everyday life. People living close to or along these roads are going to be really badly impacted and their property values will plummet. I personally have felt forced to move from my home of 25 years in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for these reasons. All local communities will suffer negative impacts and many small businesses will have to close down. There can be no mitigation for that.

My conclusion is that SZC should not be build, but if it is forced through, then the road and rail infrastructure should be in place before the build begins.

Water Supply: Everything about this is ridiculous. We have so little water in East Suffolk and this fact is so well known that EDF must either be totally complacent or totally incompetent or both to have only discovered so recently that they have no firm supply, may never have one, and may have to build a permanent desalination plant - something they publicly stated was **not** a possibility for several reasons including ecological ones. This lack of water has been brought to their and your attention over and over during the last 11 years. Now they will encroach and damage even more of our AONB than previously planned. Appalling.

My conclusion: the site is completely wrong for this project. No fixed water supply supports this. No water = no SZC.

Coastal erosion: I fully support Nick Scarr's submission.

Fish and marine life: how illogical to tell the public we need worry about food security, become more self sufficient, eat local products, watch food miles etc, and simultaneously advocate roads to be cut through perfectly good farmland and the killing of millions of small fish, shell fish and marine biota, some of which would have grown to maturity which would then provide more food for the nation. The amount of fish to be killed will rise considerably with a desalination plant - which will be generator led for the first few years, adding to pollution of land, the AONB, air (we all breathe that) and sea, as chemical waste is put into it. This is on top of the possible ruination of the marshes and of knowingly despoiling RSPB Minsmere.

My conclusion is that this is not the right site for SZC or any other large project of this nature.

Security risk: where to start? Two new reactors being built so close to one that is still operational is dangerous to begin with. It is in the public domain that the site is considerably smaller than that at Hinkley Point C. I don't believe there is an emergency

evacuation plan yet, and the one for SZB is not fit for purpose as it is. Nuclear power plants are intrinsically dangerous - 5 Mile Island, Chernobyl, Fukushima were all unforeseen accidents. Now nuclear plants have become politicised by Putin, as we have seen in the Ukraine war, the threat of attack could so easily come our way if world diplomacy fails. Finally, radioactive waste is already stored on our shore. No one asked if we wanted it or not. We don't. However, it now looks as though there will be waste here until at least the 2090s. It's all very well waving DGRs at us, but there aren't any, nobody wants them in their areas, they take years to create and cost a fortune, so we aren't holding our breaths on that.

My conclusion is, finish dismantling SZA, concentrate on closing SZB and don't build SZC.

This proposal is disgraceful. It means agreeing to pass on insuperable problems to generations of people who will never have gained anything from SZC except centuries of paying more and more for this terrible, reckless mistake. The cost of the build will crucify us all via RAB. Imagine the point when seven or eight RAB funded projects are running simultaneously. How much is that going to add to our bills for decades and all this at a time when apocalyptic energy price rises are still coming down the road and millions of people are slipping into poverty? The overall cost of the build will certainly be billions more than currently stated and SZC will come on stream years later than hoped for, if it ever does. The EPR design has such a disastrous record it astounds me Mr Johnson and his government want to try to build one at all.

I fully support the submission from TASC.

My view is that it is absolutely morally wrong to build SZC.

I sincerely hope you reach the same conclusion and refuse consent for this ill-conceived project.

Jackum Brown