

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sizewell C](#)
Subject: Deadline 10 Submission EN010012 – The Sizewell C Project,, Interested Party Reference Number: 20026225
Date: 12 October 2021 15:25:19

EN010012 – The Sizewell C Project

Interested Party Reference Number: 20026225

Name: Arthur Stansfield

Following the completion of the examination hearings I would like to reiterate my opposition to the construction of Sizewell C. I have lived in East Suffolk for almost 40 years and frequently walk and cycle in the Orford to Southwold area. If the construction goes ahead like many others of my age the possible last decade of my active life will be blighted by the massive construction site.

During the examination Sizewell C Co have failed to show that the mitigation offered will compensate for the damage caused by construction.

- Speakers have highlighted how substantial parts of the Aldhurst Farm site have been badly managed which does not bode well.
- Groups such as Friends of the Earth and others have shown that the net habitat gain claimed by Sizewell C Co is achieved by manipulation.
- Sizewell C Co have made 19 changes, many addressing issues raised during pre-application consultation, since submitting the application. This has made it difficult, if not impossible for full assessment of the impact to be made and commented on.
- Friends of the Earth's experts have shown conclusively that Sizewell C Co have failed to fully understand the hydrology of Sizewell Marshes SSSI. This and the land take from the SSSI quite possibly will lead to loss of designation. Damage to an SSSI can result in this as seen at the Turnberry golf complex. Also the water quality required for the SSSI has mainly been ignored by Sizewell C Co.
- It is difficult to comprehend how creation of habitat (with a significant chance of failure) 3 or more miles away from the the site can compensate for habitat loss at the site. It is completely incomprehensible that attempts to create habitat 40 miles away has any compensatory effect.
- The ISH on the desalination plant has brought into question whether there is sufficient water in Suffolk for the construction of Sizewell C. This is under the current climate conditions and with climate change causing more unpredictable weather there are likely to be substantial periods when the River Waveney will not support the large persistent daily abstraction for Sizewell C. As part of the Southern Broads, putting the River Waveney under additional strain may have far reaching impacts on the many

nature valuable sites of the Broads.

- The benefits of Sizewell C are questionable. It will provide baseload electricity generation, but will require back-up power generation just like wind when it is down for maintenance. As recently demonstrated by Sizewell B this maintenance time is not always as predicted. Indeed events in China, where one of their EPR reactors has been unexpectedly shut down confirm this. The EPR design is far from proven - none are in production without problems.
- The site is badly located, requiring massive damaging sea defences which may not prove adequate with potential disastrous consequences.
- The site is not large enough for 2 reactors.
- The infrastructure is incapable of supporting the transport requirements without devastating impact on the local population.

I live in Wickham Market and have been a member of the Parish Council Sizewell Working Group (SWG) pushing Sizewell C Co for traffic mitigation. Initially Sizewell C Co were only interested in looking at the B1078, but eventually came round to considering other roads in the village. After almost a year of discussion Sizewell C Co appointed traffic consultants to design a scheme. In the early Summer the SWG decided that the scheme although flawed required input from the local population. The consultation is now in progress with an exhibition having taken place on 9 and 10 October. The lateness of the consultation means that it has made it impossible for residents to comment on the scheme during the inquiry.

Sizewell C Co produced the literature for the consultation and despite input from the SWG throughout reduced the profile of Sizewell C Co to such an extent that many of the public concluded that the scheme had been put forward by the Parish Council. In effect Sizewell C Co were misrepresenting their role and impact in the traffic scheme. The scheme is Sizewell C Co's with input from the SWG. Further I would say that input from SWG was frequently ignored.

Having worked with the scheme for almost a year I find some of the claims to be misplaced

- Little if any mitigation will be achieved along the B1078 through the village. In fact due to the loss of parking it could be regarded as having a negative impact.
- The claim that it will make cycling safer through the village is questionable
- The cycle path to the Park and ride site will have little legacy value unless it continues on into Marlesford.
- The impact of signage on the Conservation Area is a poor excuse for not introducing 20mph speed limits.
- I do not feel that East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council have offered us as much support as we required.
- The postal facility at the Southern Park and Ride will result in many additional LGVs using the B1078. Sizewell C Co indicate that they

will not have control of the route of these vehicles and so will be unable to prevent the use of roads through Wickham Market.

- Some of us in the SWG found the attitude and approach of T McGarry of Sizewell C Co to be aggressive

During the inquiry the Examining Authority asked Sizewell C Co why Wickham Market was chosen as the location for the park and ride

(EN010012-004679-Sizewell C Project - Responses to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) - questions Al.1.24 and Al.1.25)

The response of the applicant to the choice of Wickham Market for the park and ride location suggest the reduction of worker's journey times by a few minutes and the risk of collisions on the Woods Lane roundabout on the Woodbridge bypass is more important than the very real impact of over 1000 vehicles passing through the village of Wickham Market. I find this stance extraordinary. There is a bus stop on the High St (B1078) used by school buses, so the impact on pedestrians and children could be far worse than any likely minor road collision on a roundabout.

I have suggested methods that can monitor whether workers pass through Wickham Market, but Sizewell C Co have all but rejected any attempts at monitoring workers journeys. Without monitoring there it is impossible to enforce a journey policy although Sizewell C Co state that it is their desire for workers to use the A14/A12 when approaching from the West.

It is imperative that comprehensive monitoring of traffic is in place before and during construction to see how Sizewell C related traffic causes route change. I and others expect congestion at the Woodbridge Bypass to cause traffic to use other routes such as the B1078. Data is required to verify the predictions of the traffic modelling and to be able to take steps to mitigate for changes. If the modelling is wrong and the extra traffic amounted to 2500 vehicles would the current mitigation cope. Without the monitoring I suggest this information would not be available.

Sizewell C Co have not offered any compensation to the blight of 10 years of extra traffic to the residents whose houses are often within a metre of the road.

During the site visit to Wickham Market the SWG representatives were unable to demonstrate the impact of the extra traffic as all that occurred was a drive through on a coach. It is impossible to fully appreciate the impact from a coach seat. This was very disappointing.

Sizewell C Co claim that Sizewell C is required to combat climate change, this is not correct. When the policy to build more nuclear power stations was decided the electricity generation world was a very different place. Large scale battery storage did not exist. Offshore wind turbines were in their infancy, there have now been several generations

of offshore wind turbines and current models generate several megawatts each. It is doubtful if the policy to build large scale nuclear would be adopted now. It is very likely to be 2035 before Sizewell C can be completed. Electricity production almost certainly should be carbon neutral before that date. Given that and the massive carbon footprint of Sizewell C construction it is very doubtful that Sizewell C will have a positive impact on the UK's CO2 emissions that will impact our zero carbon target. When considering damage to SSSI and world renowned nature reserves the benefits of the project must clearly outweigh the negative impacts on these sites. This is not the case.

Arthur Stansfield