



22nd May 2022

Response to Secretary of State's 25 April 2022 Questions

Dear PINS

My Interested Party Number is 20026506.

I am responding to the questions posed by the Secretary of State to EDF and Interested parties with the 23rd May deadline.

Throughout the long Consultation and DCO process certain things have become patently clear regarding EDF's approach to this project and the environment and communities which will be devastated if it goes ahead.

In the simplest of language **EDF do not care** about the impacts of their project on local communities and the unique habitat we have in East Suffolk. This is visible in the tone of their answers within the DCO and the disrespect of their staff to local communities (please refer to my submission dated 03 September 2021).

EDF's ongoing arrogance continues to be evident in their replies to the questions for this deadline and yet again we see the pattern of harking back to "*urgency*" being a priority over a thorough, holistic, transparent and accurate DCO process.

If EDF's consultation and preparatory process prior to submitting their DCO application had been thorough and completed with care many of the significant questions about this project would have been answered but instead they have cut corners in many areas and do not wish to be held accountable.

Many of the issues raised in the Secretary of State's questions connect to this fundamental issue and hence I believe it is important to express my concerns on this:

1. EDF's inaccurate and unsupported claims made with regards to biodiversity net gain and significant biodiversity damage post construction.

EDF's calculations for biodiversity net gain are based on flawed assumptions – this was made clear in the Issue Specific Hearings by Paul Collins of the Minsmere Levels Stakeholder Group/Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council.

This inaccuracy and EDF's inadequate environmental assessment processes were clear in even the initial DCO submission documents. It was clear in some sections this even impacted the basic planning and implementation of environmental survey work completed on EDF's behalf, where examples of inappropriate monitoring meters being issued by EDF to environmental consultants and hence a lack of collection of effective data was evident in places. Surely, if EDF cared about the impacts their project may have and wanted to effectively mitigate these they would plan and execute survey work properly. Unfortunately, it continues to be clear that they do not regard these issues as important and their obfuscation in response to the Secretary of State's questions further demonstrates it.

The RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust's have been very clear that Sizewell C will devastate the biodiversity in the local area. Their objection is based on their extensive experience of the unique habitats of this area. In the felling of coronation wood EDF have already demonstrated they have a complete lack of respect for/an understanding of biodiversity in this area and ultimately, EDF's development of the SSSI at Sizewell Marsh combined with the late and inadequate compensation do not meet the Environment Act 2021 requirements.

2. No transparency around decision making of the route of the Sizewell Link Relief road and reliance on the B1122 in early stages of construction.

Despite local communities preferring EDF's route W (known as the D2) to take traffic off the B1122 and provide a useful legacy road post construction EDF refuse to justify why they have discounted this and instead plan to build a road which will significantly increase the distance the 600 daily HGV's will have to take to reach the construction site (meeting the A12 North of Yoxford). EDF's chosen route will be of no legacy benefit, will split communities in two and will lead to significant increased emissions from HGV's and other vehicles. When pressed during the DCO hearings by PINS EDF's QC refused to explain this decision instead choosing to state that EDF had no requirement to justify their choices in this matter.

EDF refuse to put their proposed relief road in place until after the early years of the project, this will also be after any park and ride development. This will lead to over 600 HGV's per day and hundreds of cars relying on a narrow B road where houses are less than a metre from the edge of the road in the hamlet of Theberton. Due to weight of traffic, it will be impossible for local people to turn out of side roads to travel to access local facilities including health and social care and will cut children off from community amenity facilities.

The level of traffic and associated noise, fumes, vibration and disruption will make the lives of local people literally a living hell yet EDF refuse to putting a relief road in place prior to starting construction.

3. There is no water

Building and running a Nuclear Power Station requires massive volumes of potable water. EDF are now almost 10 years into their consultation and planning of this project and they did not think to evaluate if they could source potable water until the last 6 months. Northumbria Water (NW) will not guarantee the supply, EDF may say it is a statutory requirement that NW provides this water but the reality is the area is water scarce and there is no supply available.

EDF themselves stated during the DCO examination that "*desalination is not an appropriate solution for the supply of potable water for either the construction or operational phases of the project*". The Environment Agency are clear that the current plans for a temporary desalination plant on site would have to be re-evaluated if it was to be considered that this would be permanent, and the environmental impacts of ongoing desalination would be irreparable.

4. A lack of long-term planning

The Suffolk Coast is mobile and significant erosion has been seen historically and in the last year on the stretch of coast from the Minsmere Sluice South to Thorpeness and beyond. Processes are likely to be exacerbated when Sizewell B is retired. No modelling has taken place on the impact of the erosion of the salient of Sizewell B after that point and how this could change local coastal processes.

We live in a climate emergency, coastal inundation and associated increased storm and wave action will significantly impact the coast. Sizewell C and the spent fuel it will contain will be a significant risk in this context. EDF themselves note there is a significant site flood risk beyond 2140. In the context of EDF's unrealistic end date of 2140 for spent fuel removal and decommissioning completion - statutory authorities and EN-6 legislation point to dates closer to or beyond 2190. This is very worrying.

5. Lack of impartiality of the Secretary of State and Prime Minister

Despite the requirement for ministers involved in the final stages of DCO decision making to remain impartial, Kwasi Kwarteng and Boris Johnson have repeatedly publicly expressed that they support and are committed to the Sizewell C project (examples of 3 tweets by Kwasi Kwarteng below):



As a member of the Eastbridge community which will be most heavily impacted by this project I find it honestly disgusting that even before the Secretary of State's deadline to publish his decision was delayed for 6 weeks he was already publicly commenting about how committed to the project he and the government are. It is even more offensive that he will happily come and visit EDF, tour the Sizewell C site and conduct interviews but he refuses to meet community representatives. Repeatedly Parish and town councils in the local area and

across Suffolk have spoken with one clear voice and stated that we do not want Sizewell C. It is a shame the Secretary of State seems to have his fingers firmly stuck in his ears and refuses to hear this message.

This development and the 10 years of consultation (or lack of it) and DCO process are a spectre which continues to haunt my community. We have witnessed the developments at Hinkley C and the impact it has on communities in the area.

We have a sick sinking feeling that we have no voice and no power to get anyone to realise the devastation which Sizewell C will cause. This is even before:

- the 24/7 building site is less than a kilometre from the edge of our hamlet,
- we have thousands of vehicles on our tiny roads every day
- our houses, gardens, cars are covered in dust from the site,
- we have constant noise pollution
- we cannot quickly access emergency services due to the horrific weight of traffic
- we have constant vibration and homes and community assets are damaged
- we have a four story campus to house thousands of workers built on the doorstep of a hamlet of 75 people.
- we have 24/7 light pollution
- we have to put up with antisocial behaviour from EDF workers and the subculture (drugs, prostitution) that it will bring to an area still reeling from the build of Sizewell B.
- the unique habitat we are surrounded by is destroyed

I have said this at every round of consultation but I think I need to say again that I wholeheartedly object to the Sizewell C project and it should not be given consent.

Regards

Mrs Anne-Marie Robb