

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C DCO Preliminary Meetings My ref 20026173  
**Date:** 06 April 2021 01:17:58

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I requested to speak at the first Sizewell C DCO preliminary meeting where it soon became apparent that it would be very difficult to follow the agenda items as the Applicant's changes had caused great confusion to many. Therefore I would be grateful if you will accept what I had hoped to say as a written submission. Personally, whilst I appreciate the Planning Inspectorate's point about repetition of comments, how were individuals like myself expected to know what points would be made at the preliminary meeting? I think this highlights the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to people who, like me, have not been able to meet up with or even speak to, for best part of a year, others who might share views or know points that might cause concern or alleviate worry about the Applicant's proposals. I have been negotiating the Sizewell C DCO process on an iPad, not an easy task with the appalling maps and the fact that when you go in and out of a file it takes you back to the start of the file. I am now left feeling bitterly disappointed with myself that I felt too intimidated to speak at the Sizewell C preliminary meeting part 1 for fear of repeating others, and only managed to utter a few words expressing my support of those who shared my concerns. Having to listen to the applicant's QC H Phillpot telling us all that this is predominantly a written examination and referring to "important interested parties" I came to the conclusion that I was not important enough to speak.

I would also like it noted that I feel I had to take the decision to drop out of any active involvement with the Scottish Power Renewables EA1 and EA2 DCO, something I bitterly regret having to do, because of the burden of trying to deal with that and the Sizewell C DCO planning process together during the covid restrictions when I also had to provide home schooling.

Here are the points and a few additions that I wanted to make at the first Sizewell C DCO preliminary meeting. Item 4

I would like Pins to examine the following issues:-

My house is in floodzones close to the river Hundred, approximately 2 miles from the Sizewell C main development site and was impacted in the 1953 floods. Coastal erosion has been evident on the Suffolk Coast even before climate change impacts are taken into account - the flood risk assessment must take into account the impact of the applicant's hard coastal sea defences and other associated developments on all property owners who could be potential victims of the Applicant's endeavours to protect their own site, for the period from construction through to when the last spent fuel is removed from the Sizewell C site. In the event that damage is caused by Sizewell C, I would like the Examination to determine who will be held liable for that damage: the owners, developers, operators or Government. Especially as the Applicant admits they cannot fund the project themselves.

It became apparent at the preliminary meeting that the Applicant has no intention of sharing full details regarding the hard and soft coastal sea defences. Baring in mind the proposed height of the sea wall has increased by nearly 40% between the Applicant's submission of their DCO in May 2020 and their change request in Nov 2020 I was astounded to hear their QC H. Phillpot explain that the lack of detail on the sea defences is acceptable under the Rochdale Envelope, creating the impression that the Applicant dictates the rules. Surely this important element must not be left out of the DCO planning process and I question why the Applicant prefers that this issue only comes under scrutiny at the site licensing stage which I believe is more than a year away.

The examination should assess the full lifetime carbon footprint of the project (including all associated works and developments) ie cradle to grave as well as its contributions (if any) to meeting the government's net zero targets.

Given the recent publicity to the impact of the cooling intake pipes on the Marine ecology at the Applicant's Hinkley C site, Marine ecology should be a principal issue for the Sizewell C DCO and include all species of fish and other marine life.

Under Health and wellbeing- the impact of having five consultations over eight years plus numerous consultation over the Sizewell B relocation facilities and accepting the Applicant's DCO submission during Covid restrictions whilst the Scottish Power renewables DCO application is still in progress.

Funding should be a principal issue- Given that the Applicant has admitted that funds are not in place for the project and French public auditors have said that Flamanville (the same EPR design as proposed for Sizewell C)

is a failure with huge financial consequences for the French nuclear industry, I think the examination should assess the risk of the project never being completed, even if it is approved.

Alternatives- to include cheaper, safer ways to provide 3.2GW of electricity. Less environmentally damaging site. Accessing the site without damaging the Sizewell Marshes SSSI

Climate change and resilience- to include the period of decommissioning, spent fuel storage and the likelihood of a geological disposal facility never being available.

Potable water- this should be a principal issues and include the period of operation and decommissioning not just during construction. Given the fact that the Applicant has still not disclosed the source, and that the project requires vast quantities of water during construction and operation, consideration needs to be given to whether this project is sustainable given predictions of more extreme droughts due to climate change.

Storage of spent fuel on site- I suggest this should be a principal issue as the wider Suffolk community should have been consulted on whether the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB is an appropriate place to store radioactive waste for the next 150 to 200 years or maybe indefinitely as, despite government rhetoric, a geological disposal facility may never be built.

Having heard I believe a Mr Lovelock speak at the preliminary meeting I would like the examining authority to make the Rail Strategy a principal issue.

I also agree with other speakers at the preliminary meeting that the government's 25 year environment plan should be a principal issue.

#### Item 5

I hope PINS will consider the Applicant's changes as material as, while the end product might be similar, the method to get there will be significantly different and will likely have significant effects on designated sites including Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB as well as the marine environment. If the proposed changes to the transport strategy take place, examination is needed to assess whether all the environmentally damaging road schemes are still required. Surely if many aspects of my written representations are no longer relevant as a result of the proposed changes, then the overall project is fundamentally different.

The Applicant has acknowledged that the changes are material but at the preliminary meeting their QC H Phillpot suggested that, whilst the Applicant accepts the changes to be material, the fact that the Applicant perceives the changes to be enhancements means they should not be treated as material. Personally, I do not agree that the changes are beneficial as they will bring more environmental damage to the AONB. As the changes have not been integrated into the original DCO submission it is not clear how they will effect the early years especially regarding the number of extra HGV's required to carry materials to build the proposed temporary beach landing facility. Should the proposed changes be accepted for examination, then to enable interested parties to fully appreciate the Applicant's final proposals, there should be a new fully detailed DCO submission, incorporating all the changes. At the moment, the Applicant's plans are more of an outline concept so I would expect a new DCO application to include all the relevant supporting information.

#### Item 6

I feel it is unfair that examination dates have been set when we are still in the dark as to whether PINS will accept the Applicant's proposed changes. If the changes are accepted, then interested parties should have the same length of time that PINS have had to assess the changes before having to submit their written representations. I think PINS should be aware of the mental stress that has been placed on Suffolk residents with numerous large projects running concurrently, especially during the covid restrictions. Therefore, the plan for the Sizewell C examination to run through the summer, is a totally unreasonable burden to place on Suffolk residents and quite frankly feels me with trepidation.

With regard to part 2 of the preliminary meeting:

PINS are no doubt aware that the Scottish Power Renewables DCO examination has just been extended by 3 months because of the impact that the pandemic has had on statutory bodies' ability to deal with all that needs to be done within the six month time frame. However this does not acknowledge the struggles other interested parties ie residents and community groups had to make in order to stick to the examination timetable during the Covid restrictions. The Sizewell C PINS DCO team have been made aware in writing and at the first preliminary meeting that statutory bodies and many other interested parties will struggle to meet deadlines and maybe give inferior responses because of the Covid restrictions and the uncertainty around the Applicant's late

changes. Therefore, it would seem sensible to delay the start of the examination process to take account of these difficulties. A delay in the examination timetable also makes sense as there is no urgency in completing the DCO application as we know a decision on the licences and permits for the operation of Sizewell C and a funding decision are more than a year away.

Yours faithfully,

Jennifer Wilson

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of Jennifer Wilson.A single horizontal black rectangular redaction bar.