

I am writing as the delegated representative of Walberswick Parish Council in response to your latest consultation closing on 27 August 2021. We are also participants in the Planning Inspectorate process.

1. *Before getting into the specifics of your proposals, we would like to record our objection to your consultation approach. We were given only 3 weeks, at the height of summer holidays and with little attempt to bring this major alteration to the attention of Interested Parties and the community. We have joined with other local councils in objecting to EDF's approach on such an important and major change to the DCO.*

2. *Your brochure, in which you mentioned the consultation, was highly misleading. First, we note that you did not mention the consultation until after pages of claims about how Sizewell C will improve the natural environment. Like other interested parties, we contest the claims EDF is making about its impact on biodiversity in the area. It was particularly shocking to see your claims of helping the Marsh Harriers. In fact, I wrote about and had an exchange with your representatives at the ISH on biodiversity and the environment specifically on this topic. EDF itself admits that you will be displacing the Marsh Harriers from the Sizewell Marshes. And yet you put pictures of Harriers on your brochure and made claims that you were improving the environment for these birds. Given that this species was saved from extinction in the UK in these marshes and that it is your proposed construction that is causing the threat to their habitat and continued existence here, your communications appear highly misleading.*

3. *In terms of your proposal for using water tankers and then constructing a desalination plant, again your brochure is misleading. You say that you are proposing desalination as a result of "listening to the local community". That is hardly the case. The local community for years has been pointing out that Sizewell is an inappropriate site because of the lack of potable and non-potable water. Instead of admitting that you have been caught out by your failure to take this constraint into account, you appear to want to make the local community believe you are doing us a favour by building a desalination plant. This is clearly inaccurate.*

4. *We object to the proposals by EDF to bring water to the site. This includes the proposals in 'early years' and thereafter:*

- There have already been lengthy objections and discussions with EDF about your failure to put in place transportation mitigation measures in the "early years". You are now proposing to put 40 additional tankers on the local roads, per day, when no transport mitigation will be in place. At the same time, you will be trucking in materials to build the plant and presumably trucking in diesel fuel to run it. Yet you claim that this will not impact your overall number of HGVs. This cannot be correct. Either your current caps have been set excessively high or you are already planning on over-running your HGV movement numbers and have simply factored in these additional tanker movements into your calculations. Your consultation says nothing of the cost overruns that will come with providing potable water by tanker and desalination which will have to be passed on through financing mechanisms and higher electric costs to the public.*
- In terms of the desalination plant, your consultation document lacks sufficient detail, but it appears that there will be a minimum of 4 years using diesel and possibly much longer than that. In fact, if the water pipeline isn't built, then the desalination will be running for the lifetime of the nuclear reactors. Desalination is one of the most environmentally harmful, carbon intensive processes and will produce many tons of CO2 everyday of its*

operation. Because of these excessive costs and carbon intensive processes, desalination is only a rational choice in the most extreme water-deprived, drought-stricken areas. Building desalination in Suffolk cannot be justified.

- You claim that there will be no change in baseline assessment for noise and vibration and air pollution. How can that possibly be correct when diesel generators create a tremendous amount of noise, vibration, CO2 and other greenhouse gases? Whether people living near the site hear it or not is unknown given your lack of detail and analysis, but surely the wildlife in the area will be disturbed by it and you have made no meaningful analysis of this impact.*
- EDF is already being challenged on its claims related to marine life impact. You are now arguing that you will be able to run a desalination plant without creating any additional impact, despite the fact that desalination plants are known to have significant negative impacts on marine life in terms of fish larvae and other marine animals being sucked into the intake and in terms of pumping back brine into the sea. Desalination has also been linked to algae blooms. We note too that you will be using daily additional HGV movements to take some slurry out of the site by truck. What is that impact on transport? And what potential impact might any run-off of this slurry and brine have on the surrounding AONB. There is absolutely no guarantee that you will ever receive piped water to the site and therefore the impact of desalination and its costs could be a permanent feature of the site. It is up to EDF to provide a full and accurate assessment of impact, of risk and cost and prove that its desalination plant will have NO additional impact on marine life, the sea or the AONB.*

5. What is very clear from your latest proposal is that this desalination and tanker solution would be a major change to the DCO. Moreover it is further evidence that Sizewell C is the wrong project in the wrong place. If EDF insists on building two EPR reactors, then you need to find a suitable site. As the absence of water demonstrates, the Suffolk coast is clearly not it.

Councillor Josie Bassinette
Walberswick Parish Council

27th August 2021