From: To: Subject: Sizewell C&D 23 May 2022 23:46:57 Date:

Gareth Leigh Head of Energy Infrastructure Planning Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy 1 Victoria Street London SW1H 0ET

sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk Proposals for Sizewell C and D: EN010012

I remain very unhappy about the application by EDF and am responding to your letter.

Inadequate consideration of the risks of coastal erosion means that the proposed power plant is likely to become an island in the next 50 years and that the coastal defences proposed have not taken this into consideration, nor have the proposed mitigations for the removal of the beach flora for more than 10 years properly been addressed. We have seen considerable coastal erosion in the last 6 months particularly at Thorpeness which is close to Sizewell.

The proposals already put under concrete between 9 and 12 hectares of SSSI on Sizewell Marshes and westward protection would take up far more of the SSSI. A presumption of the Sizewell and Dunwich banks continuing to protect Sizewell is unwise because of the considerable coastal movement in the area and includes exposure of the Hard Coastal Defence at its southern extremity – see REP8-280.

It is unrealistic that the decommissioning completion will be by 2140 and may be as much as 90 years longer. This may be too long and too risky bearing in mind climate change, North Sea surges, storms and coastal erosion. There is significant site flood risk beyond 2140 according to the Applicant's own assessments. It cannot be deemed to be safe to build any more nuclear power stations at this site. This is also worsened by the fact that the land where the new reactor is to be placed is unstable marsh and not like the land that Sizewell A and B were built on.

The claimed wildlife mitigations and net gain are a lie post construction both at the construction site and shingle/due foreshore (REP6-075) is unproven and unevidenced. The development of Sizewell Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest with late and inadequate compensation plans do not meet Environment Act 2021 requirements (REP6-075).

EDF has failed to obtain any permits from the Environment Agency, or to plan for the requirement of potable water for 6000 workers at the site during construction and thereafter the workforce maintaining the reactor. There is already water shortage in East Anglia and it is not safe for the population to deplete what are already in jeopardy, water

sources. There is no permissions or adequate plans agreed for a potable water supply for the operational phase of the Sizewell C reactors or for a desalination plant either short term as currently proposed (belatedly), or for long term and the environmental consequences to the local Ramsar and SSSI sites will be devastating in additiont to damaging effects on marine life both from the desalination plant and inflow and outflow water cooling.

The inadequate plans for preparation in advance of starting work on the main site will lead to very heavy use of B1122 from Yoxford through Middleton Moor and Theberton will cause serious issues for the local people. The inappropriate selection of the Sizewell Link Road route over Route W (D2) favoured by Suffolk County Council and others, is a terrible mistake.

EDF has failed to adequately plan, and has continued to ignore suggested mitigations by the local people.

I support all the representations and submissions by RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust and Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth.

Surely the current proposals, the incredible costs both financial and environmental, and the dangers are totally unacceptable and are not justified and the massive investment proposed would be better invested in non nuclear renewable technologies which are far more cost effective especially when there is no resolution for nuclear waste storage and the costs are enormous and do not take into consideration the massive decommissioning costs in the future. We cannot be continuing to rob the future for the present.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Annette Abbott
Interested Party 20026263