

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak at the virtual Preliminary Meeting Part 1 23/03/2021. As some of the points made by Others were similar to those I wished to make, I have deferred further observations until this e-mail to save valuable Inspectorate time and public money.

1.0 Background

As background, I am a Registered Architect with background supporting local Authorities (eg Essex CC; Kent CC; Babergh DC etc in assessing Development Project merit. My Clients for 'my' built projects have included UK FCO; British Council; Royal Parks Agency; SEEDA; University of Southampton etc as well as the Chinese Government.

2.0 Familiarity

I have inhabited Westleton (around 2miles from the proposed Campus and 3miles from proposed Sizewell C) for over 15 years and my contribution to our community includes obtaining funding and organising the £700,000 Award-Winning refurbishment of our Grade2 Listed Village Hall. Part of its purpose is to restore resilience in an aging, heavily deprived demographic in an extensive and disparate Parish. As a result, I am more than familiar with the characteristics of our Community and our unique and truly exceptional Countryside.

3.0 EDF Consultation

As outlined when I spoke, there has been complete failure of the Applicant to Engage with our the community with disregard of local residents and stakeholders.

For example:

-despite its proximity to Sizewell, Westleton only received an initial presentation and was then excluded

-subsequently EDF held the nearest Presentation four miles away at a remote Golf Club at Hinton, inaccessible to public transport, and out-of-reach to those without a car.

-in much EDF documentation Westleton was renamed by EDF as *Wenhaston* a different settlement eight miles from Sizewell resulting in much confusion about EDF intentions.

- despite many taking time to provide Comments constructively back to EDF, there was zero acknowledgement, let alone any Issue of collated Comments. **Has PINS received from the Applicant collated Public Responses to its past Consultation? Where is this published? Has PINS received from the Applicant how it has addressed these in the Application?**

Are Responders aware they need to reiterate those Responses afresh to PINS?

- Zero Consultation with registered affected community parties on Proposed Changes despite EDF Undertaking and Obligation to do this (refer EDF 4.3 Notification of Proposed Project Changes. **Will PINS now confirm that the Application Process will now be deferred until Proper Due Consultation takes place?**

The Applicant has disregarded the demographics and characteristics of East Suffolk, denying due explanation, consultation and engagement in a vulnerable, largely aging pensioner and vulnerable population with limited digital access. **It is crucial that the lack of due engagement is now properly addressed by PINS.**

As a result of all this and many more issues there is now a deep mistrust of the Applicant and fear of the future here compounded by news from Somerset and filtering information about past accidents at Sizewell (eg 07/01/2007). **We therefore now rely upon PINS to ensure the future well-being of our Community.**

3.0 Preliminary Hearing: Technical and Engagement Issues

There are serious concerns about the Quality of the Preliminary Hearings held last week. Although by no means the sole issue, connectivity and audio issues with the Lead Inspector were particularly problematic leading to significant confusion over Agenda; order and sequencing. Many official participants were inaudible for lengthy periods.

I have participated in a number of Inquiries and this is the first to exhibit such poor standards, and if continued will undermine public trust in the process.

Indeed this, and the frustration amongst Participants and Inspectorate that ensued is sadly reflected in the highly erroneous transcripts published by PINS ([The Sizewell C Project | National Infrastructure Planning \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/the-sizewell-c-project/) which even gives wrongful interpretations of simple local place-names. For example amongst a myriad of significant and damaging mistakes) the Transcript refers (Day One Session One 1:06:28 etc) to our settlement Westleton as 'Wesselton' (there is no such place!) and to Wenhaston as 'Winston'!!

The 'Transcripts' are an embarrassment and undermine not only Sizewell Hearings but UK Government itself, and the Press is already well aware of this.

Future Hearings must be postponed until a proper inclusive Hearing process and functioning technical systems are properly established

4.0 Concerns about the Applicant

The Applicant and developer is NNB Generation Company (SZC) which is a newly Registered UK Company of limited liability and scant track record. If granted Consent, it will embark upon over £20bn of Construction with limited Commitment or Financial Capability from EDF. The appalling track record of all similar and unproven EDF Projects is well-documented. The Project is increasingly nationally insecure as a result of inevitable escalating Chinese financial and military influence worldwide in conflict with UK concerns and interests eg Hong Kong, Uyghurs, South China Sea, exploitation in Australia and New Zealand. In this context long-term safety, reparations and reinstatement commitments conditional to Consent are to be considered with the greatest scepticism.

The Applicant has failed to provide the appropriate due level of information EG-

- Sizewell C's life cycle assessment of CO2 emissions/contribution to net zero
- Financing, not just for compulsory acquisition

- Under Policy & Need the Applicant's consideration of alternative sites
- Under Policy & Need the review of the National Policy Statements
- Under Marine Ecology the removal of the Acoustic Fish Deterrent

and it should be a pre-requisite of the Applicant to provide this before the Hearings proceed any further to ensure all interested parties receive due time to assess the implications to enable representations.

EDF and CGN are taking steps to discharge responsibility by creating a token Limited Company NNB Generation Company (SZC) to provide themselves with legal and financial protection against regress following future nuclear accident or obligation. And yet both EDF and CGN wrongfully masquerade as providing security of legacy, including the use of EDF and CGN logos in public presentations where they have no involvement in this process. **In reviewing this and related Applications we as neighbours rely upon HM Government and therefore PINS to ensure the enduring safety and security of our Country, Community and our indeed property for future generations.**

For an example of poor legacy, one need look no further than the huge adjacent, decaying, still-toxic, Sizewell A planned not to be fully cleared for another 75 years, increasingly an enormous awe-full deteriorating blot in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. **Why is proper removal of Sizewell A then not a prerequisite to any further Construction?**

5.0 Future Consultation/ Procedures.

You have asked for views.

With its aging, deprived demographic many here do not have the luxury of computers or access to Internet, or indeed the skills to access or understand these complex proposals and are therefore not familiar to the Application implications upon them. Changes of any substance such as recently put forward by the Applicant should not be accepted without prior Consultation and explanation. **We therefore request that Procedures all be in Person or at the least a Hybrid Procedure be adopted biased towards Meetings in Person.** To do otherwise is to wrongfully exclude a significant proportion of the population here.

6.0 Site/ Context/ Familiarity: Site Visits

PINS has requested further proposals for site visits.

In my (charitable) work as an Architect supporting our local Community, I am familiar with the predominance of pension age groups as well as the challenging implications of poor, unreliable or non-existent local public transport, disparate settlements and rural isolation from essential services. Not only has the Applicant failed to understand or address the social implications or properly engage with these fragile Communities, PINS is now at risk of also failing to do so. **PINS must duly engage with the local Communities by visiting the potentially affected towns and settlements and meeting and engaging and supporting the people to properly understand the implications of the proposals prior to reaching a decision.**

This includes the inhabitants and visitors to *at least* Aldeburgh, Blythburgh, Darsham, Dunwich, Eastbridge, Hinton, Leiston, Saxmundham, Sizewell, Southwold, St Helena, Theberton, Thorpeness, Walberswick, Wenhaston. Westleton, and Yoxford, and farmsteads

all of whom will be affected and many of whom have voiced concern to EDF without reply. In particular Traffic and rat-runs at Shift Changes much of which are self-evident even now.

PINS must make due allocation of time and resources to properly understand and seek ways to redress the negative impact of Sizewell upon its hinterland, neighbours, nearby population, and visitors.

This site is not Hinkley Point, which is not located in an Area of Outstanding National Beauty nor located immediately adjacent to SSSI, and so despite its replication does not form a precedent for Sizewell. In fact the Sizewell C Proposals demonstrate little understanding of either the unique setting or the true impact of the Proposals taken collectively and cumulatively with Sizewell A and Sizewell B.

Sole Bay provides an exceptional 20-mile inflecting bay of unique character and wildlife in the broadly convex characteristic of East Anglia. Thus Sizewell because of its mass already serves as a uncomfortable focus over an extensive area. The Proposals would double the frontage to approaching one mile and hence the impact over this broad tract. There is no evidence of any proposed or intended material natural buffer or screening nor attention to design to minimise impact upon Sole Bay. **PINS will only understand the impact by ensuring that Visits are truly comprehensive and enable the Inspectors to become cognisant of the area in full detail. In particular the unique diversity of species to be found.**

There are also many locations inland within or outwith the AONB away from the coast which will be temporarily and/or permanently impacted visually by the Proposals. Inspector Visits should include all TM 4666; 4767, 4759-4772; 4870-4874; 4973 & 4974; 4977; 5074- 5076; 5176 - 5178 (all inclusive four-digit OS References) and in particular the ancient Dunwich Road TM458674 (six-digit OS Grid Reference).

'Flagship' RSPB Minsmere is but one very special small reserve across many square miles of AONB hinterland to Sizewell featuring a wonderful and unique variety of wildlife across the seasons. Biodiversity is proven to be essential to sustaining human species.

Without gaining full understanding of habitats, species and ecologies, can PINS justify approval to the impact upon probably the most biodiverse area in England?

But this is not limited to just within Minsmere boundaries but across Sole Bay and well inland. In fact the Applicant intends essentially to sever the AONB impacting migration and movement of wildlife and public experience. Nighttime Dark Skies here are phenomenal and experiences with wildlife and fragile ecosystems serendipitous, unpredictable and adhoc but incredible. **PINS must therefore properly resource and participate to gain a full and empirical understanding of the unique and affected habitats and insight and experience wildlife across diurnal and seasonal changes.**

Yours

Anne and Anthony Ingram