

To Planning Inspectorate

From Mike Taylor and Joan Girling

Sizewell C project by e mail.

1st February 2021

Dear Case team.

We note in the latest documents sent out from PINS that there is an explanation why the geological information on the Sizewell C is replaced or deemed confidential :-.

“• 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Ground Investigation on Sizewell C Construction Site Area and Associated Development Part 2 of 2 CONFIDENTIAL [APP-294] • 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix L of Appendix 18A - Pre-existing Geotechnical Data Synthesis and Interpretative Report CONFIDENTIAL [APP-295] • 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Summary of Terrestrial Surface Water Quality Monitoring CONFIDENTIAL [APP-292] • 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Ground Investigation on Sizewell C Construction Site Area and Associated Development Part 1 of 2 CONFIDENTIAL [APP-293] The ExA requested a further explanation of the commercially sensitive aspect of the documents and justification for them not being required in its letter dated 22 December 2020 [PD-009]. The Applicant subsequently responded in its Cover Letter dated 8 January 2021 [AS-049] and stated that: “With regard to query (i), the documents that SZC Co. seeks to withdraw are historical reports. These reports were redacted because they contain commercially sensitive information that was not deemed suitable for public circulation. Due to the reports being of a historic nature, SZC Co. has been unable to make contact with either the Project Manager or consultancies who produced the reports. Therefore, SZC Co. is unable to amend the protective marking on documents and ultimately requests their withdrawal from the Application. With regard to query (ii), the information provided in each of these historical reports has been used to interpret the ground conditions at the main development site and is summarised in the Phase 2 report provided in Appendix 18A which is an appendix to Volume 2, Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality of the ES [APP-281 to APP-291]. Furthermore, the historical reports that are requested to be withdrawn from the Application contain information that has since been surpassed by more recent ground investigation data that has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 18, Appendix 18A [APP-281 to APP-291].”

In order to throw some light on the matter we refer you to an approved plan from Suffolk Coastal District council (Predecessor council to East Suffolk Council) **C09/0476** consented 10th June 2009 presented by British Energy Generation, Barnwood. British Energy then were the predecessor to EDF and operated from the same address as EDF does now. The plans relate to peat clay excavation from the Sizewell C site. Material would be extracted and used for a trial of heathland creation. We are not aware that these trials ever took place but nonetheless this approved plan demonstrates an intent that this work be carried out to further enable understanding of the principle of heathland creation. (These plans can be found on the East Suffolk Council public access planning portal by entering the plan number in the search box.)

The plan C09/0476 was prepared by Royal Haskoning for British Energy (then owned by EDF) and show quite clearly the indicative future development site (SZC), full contour mapping, a description of the geology, the presence of landscaping on sites G1, G2 and G3 and a description of planted trees. All planting was performed under Sizewell B landscape plan referred to as SXB-WH-307383/A New planting April 1997. The tree report prepared to BS5837 (2005) by Cedar Land Management Ltd. describes the type and number of trees. We believe that East Suffolk Council are responsible for

the adherence by EDF NNB Genco, operator of Sizewell B, to those planning conditions set by the Secretary of State. We have not been able to get ESC to acknowledge this responsibility as requested in a mail copied also to PINS SZC case team (for information) dated 18th December 2020. We assume PINS may wish to ensure that those planning conditions are incorporated into the DCO process.

The Secretary of State's SZB consent document dated 12th March 1987 may be found at <https://community.magnoxsocioeconomic.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/EDF-Energy-SSG-Actions-Nov-2014-Attachment-No.-1-2014.pdf> <https://community.magnoxsocioeconomic.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/EDF-Energy-SSG-Actions-Nov-2014-Attachment-No.-2-2014.pdf>

To conclude we believe it is in the public interest to draw to your attention the presence of these earlier plans, which may have implications for a wide number of concerns, including the final depth and size of site, the types of material to be deposited and or shipped off site, and the amounts of material to be transported to site to build up from the foundation. We are dismayed that despite EDF's extremely lengthy documents they do not to our knowledge allow an understanding of their intentions for the development.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Girling and Mike Taylor