

Written Representations to D/L 10

From Stephen Beaumont Interested Parties AFP209 and 358

I understand this is the last opportunity to comment on the DCO Inquiry into the plan of EDF to build a nuclear power station at Sizewell with EPR technology that even after 12 years has yet to work.

We oppose SZC as the site is too small, it would cause massive traffic and disruption locally, it would destroy local tourism, the massive influx of workers will upset the local social balance, it will devastate this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Minsmere and local Nature generally and, despite the claims, it is not a green source of energy. It also appears the local geology, hydrology and the rising sea level are not suitable for such a large development.

How on earth can one trust an enterprise which proposes to build a multimillion pound facility without having, from the outset, a clear definition of where the water needed is coming from?

This only goes to illustrate the difficulties we have had over the last six years in trying to get valid, truthful answers to our many questions to EDF. Over this period we have all experienced being promised these answers, or been told they are coming, only to have to repeat the same questions or concerns at the next Consultation Stage since they have not been answered.

I know I am not alone in finding EDF and their advisers completely lacking any professional or moral standards.

For example we have queried EDF repeatedly on why they selected the Sizewell Relief Road as the principal vehicular access for all traffic while they ignored the County Council Highway Department proposal of Route D W which would shorten the journeys to site by literally millions of miles every year, would create less social, health and historic damage and would leave a legacy with a better route to and from Leiston and Sizewell.

Never has any clear or satisfactory answer been provided. The latest revelation that the SLR provides 90,000 tons of extra spoil for the site should not be allowed to overrule the benefits of Route D W.

From our own point of view EDF has consistently provided plans showing that the bridge proposed on Pretty Road will prevent access to our Listed Heritage Asset. These currently show a step of over 350mm at the end of our drive.

Their plans have also shown proposed Compulsory Purchase of a small area of our property but I can confirm – despite the promises made to ExA in ISH 13 – they have not made any contact with us.

Furthermore we have expressed our concern at the continuous noise levels to be produced close to our house which they have stated will be covered by their Noise Mitigation Measures. Despite many questions to explain these Measures there have been no replies. We thus had to commission an independent report.

Similarly we have been promised a Property Price Support Scheme but again despite many requests for the detail nothing has been provided.

The original offer of EDF to pay for reasonable professional fees incurred by those of us affected no longer appears to be mentioned by EDF. We do hope the ExA will condition this. Why should we pay for outside advice necessitated by EDF's proposals ?

Every step of the way it has been clear that EDF have always chosen the cheapest options with no consideration of the effects on others.

EDF still adhere to the original cost figure - £18-20 Billion – while even in the last year we are all aware of the significant increase in both wages and construction materials. Has any figure yet been given for the Desalination plant?

Presumably the total will not be updated until demanded, as it will frighten off even the most determined of investors.

In running this Inquiry we do hope the ExA has appreciated our six years of difficulty and frustration in dealing with both EDF and their advisers and find, like us, against SZC.

12 October 2021