

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to the SoS Request for Information, 25th April 2022 re. Sizewell C (deadline end 23rd May)
Date: 23 May 2022 22:11:34

In response to the Secretary of State's Request for Information, 25th April 2022, please register this email as a response from both Mandy Beaumont (URN: 22026477) and Steve Thorpe (URN: 20026448) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] we wish to comment on the following (ie. please register this as two individual responses):

2. Water Supply, Desalination Plant and Drainage

It seems ludicrous that EDF had not taken this issue on board - in fact assured interested parties in 2016 that there was no concern over water supply to the project. This was either a planning incompetence on their behalf, or a total lack of understanding of how water is supplied across the country. We can't help but notice that this is indicative of the way that EDF have acted throughout their consultation - and makes it difficult to be reassured about any of their claims and projected figures.

On the subject of plant siting - we strongly oppose any additional infrastructure being sited adjacent to any of the Heaths or Marshes of SSSI sites which will cause yet further environmental damage.

EDF's second suggestion of siting near Sizewell A is another example of EDF proposing to renege on an already agreed mitigation area (for the felling of Coronation Wood & other natural capital damage)

3. Traffic and Transport

As a resident of Middleton whose residence is on the B1125 (which adjoins the B1122 near the proposed new junction for the SLR), we have grave concerns about the early years traffic on both roads now that EDF are saying they want to build the SLR in parallel to the construction work starting on Sizewell C - and in their estimation will take approx 2 years - of total mayhem! This is completely unacceptable and throws contempt at all local residents who have tried to work with EDF with suggestions and proposals to make the influx of traffic more manageable. The D2/W route has been repeatedly dismissed by EDF for no valid reason and we now learn the real motivation for their insistence on their proposed SLR route is for the convenience of 'mass balance' transfer to site, regardless of the issues it causes to the local communities and the environment - and no positive legacy into the future (which the D2/W could provide, being a direct route from the A12 to Sizewell).

It is difficult not to simply sound exasperated when looking at EDF's completely unrealistic timelines given the examples of Flamanville3 and HinkleyC which

are both delayed well beyond their predicted operational dates so we know the reality is that huge traffic problems on our local country roads will last way beyond the years already predicted by EDF.

In this beautiful and tranquil area it is only too obvious to locals that with all the adjoining farm access along the B1122 there will be an inevitable clash of agricultural vehicles with construction traffic - the roads simply cannot take the increase proposed by EDF in the 'early years'.

It is all very well EDF stating that their traffic will only use the A12/B1122 (& SLR if ever built/finished!), but what EDF insist on gaslighting anyone who raises concerns about white van traffic volume on all these little windy country roads in-between the A12 and B1122 - in particular the B1125 so beloved by Sizewell workers at present - this will obviously increase directly in relation to the extra traffic on the main roads both daytime and nighttime by all those trying to avoid the HGVs.

The proposed SLR will also close numerous footpaths which is a huge disappointment to us as walkers in this area - footpaths which have existed for hundreds of years in some cases. Again, like the AONB and SSSI we had believed these footpaths were protected, as much for the benefit of wildlife as for us - and as they can't be trained to 'stop, look & listen' before crossing, there will be a huge number of unnecessary deaths - we have seen no mitigation for fencing or wildlife barriers running parallel to these new roads.

4. Coastal Considerations

We fully support the RSPB's and the SWT's responses to you about coastal processes and the impacts of attempting to block the natural tidal effects.

6. Habitats Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity and Ecology

As local residents - this is an area of huge concern to us. The Suffolk Wildlife Trust have said - EDF's plans are "not even close" to mitigating the impact on the environment.

The premature destruction of Coronation Wood demonstrates that EDF have a complete disregard for the environment. The Woodland Trust recently reported on the fact that ancient woodlands (such as Coronation Wood) lock up far more CO2 than they release (as measured by DEFRA's science arm Forest Research) - so planting sapling trees elsewhere cannot begin to mitigate this - let alone the complete destruction of wildlife habitat; both at canopy and ground level.

The negative impacts of the proposed development of Sizewell C are so severe that adequate mitigation is simply not possible. All this at a time of intense awareness of the current climate emergency - it beggars belief ... and is completely at odds with the Government's Environment Bill to protect UK land in order to address the loss of biodiversity and wildlife populations. EDF

appears to be trying to reverse these aims single-handedly!

This does not make us feel at all confident about future proposals when such wanton disregard for the natural environment has already been demonstrated. EDF appear to forget that many people living in this area do so precisely because it is an AONB & SSSI and to stop any unnecessary destruction of, or damage to, this precious area is something we will always fight for.

In conclusion, it feels to us as if EDF's unprofessional, slow, inadequate and lurching approach is a deliberate attempt to 'wear down' the energy of interested parties. They obviously didn't expect to have their plans questioned nor fact-checked and expected to get the go ahead for this profit-making business venture without having to take all factors into account.

Receipt of examination submission ID : 2204 (M)

Unique Reference: 20026447 (M)

Receipt of examination submission ID : 2214 (S)

Unique Reference: 20026448. (S)