

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response re Sizewell C re EDF responses to questions
Date: 23 May 2022 22:49:33

RESPONSE TO BEIS

Dear Secretary of State,

Thank you for your request for reactions from Interested Parties to EDF's latest response to your questions. I would like to comment on the following:

Water

EDF's assumption that Northumbrian Water would supply the potable water needed by local residents as well as the workers building Sizewell C has proved false. As a result, they are now talking of constructing a "temporary" desalination plant. However, neither of their suggestions for the siting of this is viable.

1. The "*temporary underground site North West of the SSSI crossing*" cannot be used. There is already a 25% loss of biodiversity in that area, which is close to the Minsmere to Walberswick SSSI, where development is prohibited. The SSSI crossing is vital for wildlife, as if species on one side of the crossing became depleted, the crossing would act as a wildlife corridor, enabling species from the undamaged side to repopulate the damaged side.
2. EDF's second suggestion is to use the outage car park of Sizewell B, and moving the car park to Pillbox Field. Pillbox Field is unacceptable because this site is being used to compensate for Coronation Wood, which EDF destroyed. (Coronation Wood was home to Badgers, Bats and Dragonflies, and was declared unusable for Bats after EDF destroyed all but one tree, prior to calling in the Bat Authority, who then confirmed that it was no longer viable for Bats!)

In both of these situations EDF is trying to build on protected wildlife sites in order to make up for its neglect of a proper plan for a water supply.

Traffic

As I have mentioned in previous submissions, the B1122 in will be severely congested throughout the construction period. As a result, apart from the blight to local peoples' lives, blue-light services will be seriously affected. This will put lives at real risk from delayed journeys to hospital, delayed fire call-outs and delayed police responses to crime. And no doubt there will be more traffic accidents, which will put even more strain on the system. The hugely increased traffic load on inadequate roads will also put off tourists and harm the local economy, which depends on tourism.

Although the Sizewell Link Road (SLR) was not my first choice, I welcome the recognition that it gives to my long held concerns for the B1122. For the reasons that I have already given I think the project should be delayed until the SLR is completed.

I would also like to make some more general points.

Firstly, I think it is outrageous that government ministers are talking about the development of Sizewell C as a done deal, before due process has been followed.

In particular, the attempt by the Government to steamroller the development through has led to the RSPB (who are over 1,000,000 members strong) to behave in what they call a "once in a generation" manner - demonstrating against Sizewell C in Westminster. As their Regional Leader Jeff Knott said about Minsmere, the British flagship reserve, "*We're not naturally an organisation that paints avocets on the pavement and holds*

banners up in front of Government departments. But Minsmere has every protection under the sun, and if Minsmere can be put at risk, nowhere is safe and sooner or later a line in the sand has to be drawn. This is our line in the sand." To ride roughshod over all these protections would be to give the message that this government has no regard for the environment.

I would also like to point out the fact that EDF are not, as they claim, taking the "silent majority" of the local population with them. They took a poll which in their view indicated that 2/3 of the population was for Sizewell C. But this poll was flawed, giving many nuances for shades of opinion agreeing with the development, but only one option for those who oppose it. The fact that Leiston has elected a Green councillor for the first time is evidence that local people, along with the Greens, do not a) believe that Sizewell C would be a green option or b) feel that the position of the two major parties on Nuclear represents their views.

I have many concerns, and space does not permit me to air them all. However, I am extremely worried that no one appears to be concerned that the Taishan 1 EPR nuclear reactor is still out of action, with no explanation from the Chinese. You will no doubt be aware of the *Diplomat* online article which quotes an unnamed whistleblower. This person says that contrary to the Chinese assertion that only 5 fuel rod casings are cracked, the actual number is over 70! Furthermore the same whistleblower suspects that this may be due to a flaw in EPR reactor design. The fact that the ONR are not briefing you about the dangers of the EPR design does not mean that it is safe; they simply that have no scientific information because of Chinese secretiveness.

Given the dismal history of delays and added costs in building this type of reactor, from Finland to France and even Hinkley, together with the unexplained and dangerous cracking of fuel rod casings due to vibration in Taishan, surely the idea of building one of these - and burying its waste - on a sinking and eroding coastline in one of Britain's most treasured wildlife habitats and beauty spots is completely mad!

If Britain is looking to secure her energy supply while using the energy infrastructure already in place from Sizewells A and B, it would be far better to put a few Rolls Royce SMR's there. They are at least a British company with a proven track record - as opposed to EDF and CGN, who have much more dubious credentials.

Mrs Marilyn Checkley
PINS Unique Reference **20026503**