

I am opposed to the building of Sizewell C and I urge the inspectors not to approve the application.

Sizewell A is, and always has been, a blot on the landscape. Sizewell B has some redeeming qualities and even has some fans who appreciate its iconic design. In certain lights it actually 'disappears' into the landscape! Sizewell C has no such redeeming qualities and offers us lumps of concrete. **The applicant claims in their Design & Access Statement\* that, "the proposed turbine halls have been through significant design evolution in response to the AONB and extensive stakeholder feedback and discussions in response to the need for the project to deliver a place specific design response."** I would challenge the accuracy of this statement on the grounds that the proposed twin reactor is pretty much a carbon copy of the projects at Hinkley Point and Flamanville. This claim is therefore meaningless and patently untrue. Please could the Planning Inspectorate challenge the applicant on this. The design and scale of Sizewell C is totally unsuitable for the proposed area as evidenced by EDF's need for additional land-take to facilitate the build, an example of which is the destruction of Coronation Wood.

Our Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB is one of the most important wildlife areas in Britain, encompassing three National Nature Reserves, many Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the RSPB's internationally important Minsmere Reserve. Among the key objectives for an AONB (defined as *a designated exceptional landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are precious enough to be safeguarded in the national interest*) is the requirement to value, sustain and promote the benefits that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty provide for society, including clean air and water, carbon storage and other services vital to the nation's health and well-being.

Sizewell C claims to be carbon neutral but, in making this claim, omits to consider the amount of carbon that will be created during the long construction process. Flamanville is already 4 years behind schedule. Construction would inevitably cause light, noise and traffic pollution over many years which could not fail to negatively impact the fragile and precious environment of the local area and the species which live there. While it may be argued that the wildlife would return afterwards, this cannot be guaranteed and we owe it to future generations, as custodians of the AONB, to preserve what we have. Marsh Harriers, a protected species, rarer than Golden Eagles, are threatened by this project. Proposed compensatory habitats are neither ready nor geographically close enough. The loss of the Marsh Harriers would be no less than a catastrophe. Please don't let it be on

our watch that this site was destroyed for future generations when we had the opportunity to choose otherwise. To quote David Attenborough: "Self-interest is for the past; common interest is for the future."<sup>\*</sup>

I would urge the Planning inspectors to consider the Wylfa precedent and reject this application on the grounds that the environmental impacts would be at least as severe here in Suffolk.

The applicant has continually changed their plans for delivering the project and their proposals continue to be full of ifs and buts. There **may** be a beach landing facility – which could be this long or possibly that long. Some of the materials **may** be brought in by train. If any of these proposals happen it **may** impact the number of HGVs on the roads. Essentially, the applicant is unable to give definitive answers as to how the project will be delivered. The DCO cannot therefore claim to have been fully consulted and surely cannot be granted on this basis.

On transport, the applicant has turned a deaf ear to repeated requests to abandon their proposed relief road in favour of the originally mooted Route W/D2 south of Saxmundham which could remain and provide legacy benefits. No reasons have been given for their refusal to acknowledge repeated requests to look at this route. In response to anxieties expressed about the effect of increased traffic on Emergency Services, the applicant claims that their assessment shows the impact on journey times is "considered to be imperceptible". This simply is not believable and shows a disregard for the concerns of local people.

The position of the proposed Sizewell C is on the edge of a notoriously unstable coastline. As yet, there is no plan for adequate long-term storage of radioactive waste. It is not fair or responsible to overlook this and leave the problem for future generations. The area is at risk of flooding and that risk will only increase with the passage of time. In view of the unpredictability of coastal erosion and major flooding incidents there is a serious risk to the safety of the area.

The project is not financially viable. It will put an unnecessary and unjustified burden on the taxpayer especially in the context of the need to recover from the Covid crisis and given that the end cost in any event is much greater than that of other methods of electricity generation. Chinese involvement is unacceptable on humanitarian grounds and on grounds of national security. Other sources of funding are drying up as large institutions such as Legal & General say that they will not be investing.

To end on a very personal level, I am one of hundreds of people who regularly visit Sizewell Beach for exercise and recreation. Upwards of a hundred people meet regularly on Saturday mornings to walk, run, jog or shuffle the 5K course that is Sizewell Parkrun, starting from the car park, going along the beach to the tank traps, onwards in a loop and back along the beach. It's a beautiful route once you get out of range of the hum emanating from the existing reactor buildings. This would be ruined by the building project and access may even be restricted. The effect on people's mental and physical health from losing this is simply unacceptable.

In closing, it also bears mentioning that EDF recently threatened to cut off the electricity supply to Jersey as part of coastal waters fishing disputes between the UK and French governments.

I would also like to add that I was very disappointed by EDF's lack of engagement at the Open Floor Hearings. Despite numerous opportunities, they failed to respond to any of the comments – always giving the stock answer that they would respond at a later date. An opportunity ducked.

I endorse the written representations of Stop Sizewell C, TASC, RSPB/SWT, and Suffolk Coastal FoE.

Referenced quotes:

\*Applicant's Design & Access statement 4.7.9. Building location and design

\*David Attenborough speaking to Greta Thunberg in Greta – A Year to Change the World