

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Interested Party response for SZC planning application EDF
Date: 21 May 2022 15:31:03

>

>

> June Holmes

> [REDACTED]

> Interested party 2002 6809

> I reside on the B 1122 in Middleton, some 4 miles from the existing Sizewell nuclear power station I am an interested party to the planning application for the Sizewell C

> Nuclear power station and wish to express my concerns to the responses provided by EDF to the SOS request for additional information.

> Traffic and transport

> I have lived here on the B 1122 for many years and presented arguments through the whole of the consultation stages with EDF . I am still concerned to learn from their answers that the B 1122 proposals from EDF will carry 600 HGV a day and because the park and rides will not be complete for quite some time also many private vehicles, transporting workers at peak times of the day as well as the normal traffic levels.

> At the stage 2 consultation when this exact scenario was raised it was suggested that that much roadwork would need to be done to deal with public safety ,the hidden bends, dips ,hills and the congestion and getting about for normal residents.

> I now see that EDF propose no major changes to the B 1122 other than a few cosmetic ones and their answers will not alleviate any of these issues.

> This road will be used in the early years and in fact they appear quite forceful that you should grant them the road to be used pre-SLR as nuclear has suddenly become important. Well, they have sat on their backsides for over 11 years , not consulting with us residents as a community and pushing now the energy policy and the need for speed as a reason for doing nothing. This is exactly the situation we were in at consultation stage one when they wanted to use the B 1122 as it was in its current form. You cannot let them do this .

> They have put to you suggestions of how they will mitigate noise vibration and pollution but no one from EDF has contacted our community or our residents on the road to ask what we need to live safely with this extra traffic, noise pollution and vibrations. There apparently will be three months work of road surface dressing to the B 1122 which will cause more chaos for the surrounding villages and a negative impact on working schedules, journeys and ultimately ensure traffic delays.

> There has been no attempt by EDF to achieve an alternative to the B 1120 and the poor choice of Link Road means that EDF will use the B1122 for the major part of the build. If they had listened to the communities and chosen the cross country route W they would've been able to construct an alternative route much quicker and not caused all of these problems to residents and regular traffic . The proposed SLR is a dogs hind leg and not the correct route and as you can see EDF will only use it for the last part of the build anyway.

> My great fear is that the B 1122 is still one of the main retreat routes for Sizewell B and EDF in the event of a nuclear emergency.

> My submission to you is that the answers from EDF on the B 1122 are inadequate and the planning application if it is to be passed should not be allowed to go ahead before a more suitable alternative link road has been put in place. The need for speed is immaterial this is not a quick build and it will have little impact on energy supplies in the short-term . Because of other shortfalls in providing tests and information on other aspects to the planning Inspectorate there is time to ensure that EDF should be made to provide a proper alternative route.

>

> Water supply desalination and drainage

> I am deeply concerned at EDF responses to the fact there is still not a guaranteed potable water supply for the operational phase of the Sizewell C reactors. This needs further assessment with Ofwat and it is not a straightforward process .

> EDF does not ,repeat does not , have room or space for the desalination plant. They have still not come up with a solution and EDF do not appear to have any answer other than it will work out ok. To commence an

application for a new nuclear power plant and not have this sorted is an example of EDF's inept planning and how they work as a company.

> They appear to assume in the answers that all will be well and it will work outthat is not good enough without a clearly available guaranteed water supply this application should not be approved.

>

> Coastal considerations

> With regard to coastal considerations I would like you to note that I support the submission by Mr N Scarr to you and his comments on coastal protection.

> I still do not understand from The EDF answers where the coastal defence line actually is . Are you able to ascertain this ?

> I do not believe they have been transparent and seem to be over reliant on mitigating issues as they arrive.

EDF still do not appear to have answered whether our coast can actually stand up to the project without sliding or moving. Throughout The whole application information has not been forthcoming both to the EA, RSPB and also the water companies. Another example of EDF flying by the seat of its pants – no road planning..let's use the B1122 , no surveys , no potable water , no surveys, no testing for coastal defence strategyexactly the way that EDF work .

> The flood risk and defences from The EDF evaluation at a conservative estimate need to cope with sea rise and storm surge have only been projected to 2140 .

> after that we are in an unknown area of territory and I suspect EDF will be long gone and have sold the station off by then . You should not allow this to happen to our coast linebut hold them accountable for all the answers to the outstanding areas still to be replied to.

>

> Questions from the Austrian government

> With regards to the spent fuel questions asked by the Austrian government EDF say and still claim that all fuel will be cleared cleared and offsite by 2140.

>

> That to my local knowledge does not add up their own evidence shows that the earliest removal of the OLD {not the new} power station spent fuel will not be clear till 2135and even that's unlikely . To then start clearing SZC spent stuff will be more like 2200. Greg Hands minister for nuclear has been advised of this discrepancy and his department is supposed to be finding out who is right . Did you as an Inspectorate realise the fuel for all Sizewell from the start was of Russian origin and it will also be of Russian Origin for the next refuel?

> How can we be condoning EDF working for so long within a contract with Rostatom and Rosenergoatom. Will you ask please where they are going to get the new sources from ?

> We should be actively as a country moving away from any Russian dependency. This is unbelievable when our government is saying we are moving away to home grown energy and EDF uses Russian fuel and will do for the next refuelling which will be for some time yet.

> Confidence in the nuclear industry as well as being questioned by the Austrian government is waning and you should be aware that this new build is a very contentious local issue. This is because Sizewell B has a problem with spent fuel that they may not be able to deal with and the result will therefore mean that they will not be able to refuel in 2023 if it is not sorted out.

> EDF has put a new safety case to the ONR to cut the lid of one of the tech containers...it has never done this before, nor do they know the correct dose to use in order for this to be successful. If they do not get an agreement they will have to put a new safety case to the ONR to move the container to a dry fuel store which is currently against all UK regulations.

> All along EDF says "trust us we know what we're doing "and here we are with a high level safety issue that they have never met before and is new to the whole nuclear industry in practice . Why should we trust this company , working with this volatile technology in the new Sizewell C plant when they are still learning on the job with SZB.

> SZB was due to close in 2035now we are toldEDF will apply for a 20 year extension but Sizewell B does not meet the post Fukushima Dalichi rulescan you see why we are all so , so , worried.

>

> Biodiversity and ecology

> EDF in its answer still has not dealt with the issues of biodiversity. They are relying on the new land purchase to give 19% biodiversity which is an absolute falsehood.

> The environmental act of 2021 requires specific metric assessments for the DCO application and that their answers should meet these metric assessments .

> They are not using the correct version of the criteria and you should re-raise and recheck this. They have declined to publish any meaningful data and the environmental act 2021 on sites of SSI does not allow the applicant to claim biodiversity. This is a contentious project and RSPB, Suffolk wildlife trust ,and the environmental agency have a right to be worried please challenge this answer . The fact RSPB for the first time

in its history demonstrated outside Whitehall about their fears for Minsmere must back up that you re look at this area.

> Even the Marsh Harriers nesting where they shouldn'tshow how much EDF care about the environment when it affects their business plan . Coronation Wood will long live in our Suffolk memory

>

> Value for money

> Final point I feel very strongly about and wish to raise with you as it has been one of your queries at an earlier stage and is so still very relevant and that is value for money. It is evident that the project and the cost will be added to everyone's energy bill in the form of an RAB tax and approaches to the government have resulted in them saying that they will not disclose the costs.

> You need to raise this in the public interest with EDF and the government to help us protect our energy bills from rising further.

> Hinkley point C has announced yesterday that costs will now rise by a further £3 billion-to £26 billion and power will be delayed for a further 12 months now coming on stream in 2027. This is the fourth increase since 2016 and a nearly 50% increase on the original pre-predicted cost of Hinckley.

> We the public will pay for the Sizewell C in the form of RAB and if there are other projects running in parallel these additional RAB costs will also be added onto house holders bills. Sizewell C costs are being kept a total secret even when the nuclear energy finance bill went through parliament they would not say what the cost would be.

> Please , please. ... ask questions on costs on behalf of us public because we are getting nowhere.

>

>

> Finally SoS ,Kwasi Kwarteng said EDF must bring the community on board with this build but EDF has consistently failed to listen to the local villagers and their worries....they pursue their own agenda to build the project as cheaply and as easily as possible ...with little effort to help deal with the problems .

> YOU should be aware that as a community we have not been taken on board.

> Yours faithfully.

> June Holmes

>

[REDACTED]

> June Holmes

>