

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Written Submission following PM Part 1 prior to deadline B - 7th April
Date: 05 April 2021 16:00:17
Attachments: [Response to ExA - Part 1 - Sizewell C DCO - Pat Dowding Final.docx](#)

My Unique Reference Number - 20026233 - Patricia Dowding

Please see written submission attached to be reviewed by ExA prior to PM Part 2.

I hope this is the correct email address for this submission as I cannot find any specific email address for this in any of the documentation that mentions that written submissions should be sent in by 7th April 2021.

An acknowledgement would be appreciated.

Kind regards

Patricia Dowding - [REDACTED], a village close to and enroute to the proposed site for Sizewell C

Patricia Dowding's Response to EDF Sizewell C DCO Application Prelim ExA – Part One

My main concerns resulting from the Part 1 meeting are that until now there has been no real appreciation by the Examiners of the scale and complexity of the task required within the amount of time available for a thorough examination to take place. Do you have the resources? When the process for dealing with planning issues relating to National Infrastructure Projects was drawn up it patently never occurred to anyone that such a project as a new Nuclear Power Station would seriously be considered to be built on such a sensitive and fragile landscape. In addition, EDF frequently astound us by their blatant disregard for our communities, the fragility and importance of the landscape, our local economy and the impact on our lives for at least 10 years. So we are reliant on you to ensure no stone is unturned.

1. All the important **specific issues** that have been raised far outweigh the original list in the ExA's document, which looks as though it is a standard agenda for any piece of National Infrastructure. The latter completely fails to capture the enormity and complexity of the issues given the applicant is wanting to build a double nuclear power station on a coast that is eroding, on land that is 'protected' by being classified as AONB or SSSI.
2. Nor is there time for key authorities such as **The Environment Agency and the Office for Nuclear Regulation** to do the work required of them to provide the necessary information the Examiners need in order to even come close to making a thorough examination of the DCO within the time-scale. In addition there are time problems associated with local Government's ability to participate in the lead up to an election and then allocation of responsibilities to those elected.
3. Nor is there adequate time currently allowed for interested parties to consider decisions made about the **15-17 changes** that were submitted a short time after the DCO application was made, before the Examination commences.
4. This is compounded by the Applicant using the '**Rochdale Envelope**' as a convenient hiding place for issues it has been unable to resolve or even give serious consideration (some are merely suggestions) as to what would be involved and thus the level of impact on the environment and communities affected. The 'Rochdale Envelope' should only be used sparingly to identify the impact of 'worse case scenarios'. I'm hoping that the Examiners can see through this ploy and only allow it when it is an appropriate use. The Applicant is being allowed to get away with flagrant breaches.
5. The supposed **number of jobs** on this project bandied about by EDF, Government and Unions is farcical - many of the 10,000 people working on Hinkley will be able to come to this area if Sizewell C is given the go ahead. It will certainly do very little for the employment of our local population let alone the impact on social behaviour. Whilst Apprenticeship places are welcomed they will be at a low level; most of those employed on the build programme will be brought in and not offered to local people. There are better ways of creating apprenticeships on new technology than building an out of date nuclear power station. Please look at this data carefully. And think about the implications for residents and our economy (reliant on agriculture and tourism) if thousands of workers come in to this area. Boom and Bust, as it was back in the 80s/early 90s?
6. The short amount of time for the Examiners **to fully understand East Suffolk** and all the challenges of travelling to it (by road, rail and sea), the communities up and down the A12 and those also affected by the impact on local roads and particularly those who live within the area that will be affected by noise, loss of amenities and all types of pollution including light (this is a 'dark' area which is why it is so important to wildlife habitats as well as residents). Examiners participating in Part 1 could not remember where they had already visited unaccompanied – that is seriously

worrying – and no doubt most of the places you should be visiting are not yet on your radar. You cannot rely on Desk Research to judge the merits or otherwise of this DCO when it comes to its location. Also please do not just rely on EDF to tell you where to visit – take notice of us, the community. Someone judging the DCO has to be immersed in this area, really understand it so that every aspect of your examination will take a view on the impact on the people and locations affected.

7. Just as important is for Examiners **to visit Hinkley** (unaccompanied) and understand the impact on the community, the problems caused during the build programme, the back tracking on promises made. Talk to the community there.
8. When **EDF** started looking at Sizewell, it having been identified as a ‘potential’ site for a nuclear power station, one of their first statements was that ‘they would be good neighbours’. They have been anything but and their level of arrogance in dealings with communities, our thoughts and proposals is quite staggering, obviously amplified by their QC who participated in ExA Part 1. I just wonder what the outcry would be if Hyde Park had been identified as a potential site – yet Sizewell is probably a much more ecologically important site and it appears that no one taking decisions seems to understand and recognise that. **Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Kwasi Kwarteng** turned down an invitation to visit and said ‘He thinks EDF are nice people to deal with’. They might be nice to him; they show no respect for us even though the level of knowledge among people who live and visit here is vast and could help them resolve issues. The Secretary of State should not be allowed to make any decisions without being familiar with the site and all the issues that will be negatively impacted.
9. Following on from that is our mistrust of **EDF’s modelling** on many aspects of this DCO. It all needs to be thoroughly checked and further modelling carried out with full disclosure of the parameters and metrics.
10. I’m not sure that anyone has proved there is **a real need for Sizewell C** or another Nuclear Power Station anywhere in the UK, let alone one that costs a fortune, is technologically out of date and will undoubtedly take a long time to be Carbon Neutral. It certainly won’t achieve the latter within this Government’s timescale. The need has to be established by an independent enquiry.
11. Sizewell C is a **potential National Disaster** not only from the environment, ecological, and safety perspective (no proven record that the EPR model works, and is safe, within Europe) but also from a financial point of reference. EDF is essentially broke, it cannot afford to pay for what is likely to be a white elephant, it is relying on finance from other organisations and/or the State (i.e. the tax payer and consumer) to balance its books and survive. The legacy of significantly high prices for electricity plus paying for the build programme are burdens that we should not be leaving for our descendants.
12. There are very few impacts of the build programme that can be successfully mitigated. We are looking for **Resolutions**. And any mitigation that happens will be paid for by us – again, the tax payer and consumer.

I ask you to take all the above into account. How you can do this, and all that was highlighted at Part 1, within the time factors imposed to a satisfactory level is a mystery to me. I and the rest of those who will be impacted by this application need reassurance you can do a thorough examination that we can all understand and trust.

Patricia Dowding – representing myself, a resident [REDACTED] one of the affected local communities.
4th April 2021