From:
To: SizewellC

Subject: Rule 8 submission re. SZC planning application

Date: 06 April 2021 15:10:48

Mr & Mrs C. Whitbread



Planning request for NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for The Sizewell C

Project registration identification number is 20025424.

Rule 8 submission re. SZC planning application ~ Objections Draft Response to the ExA Preliminary Meeting Part 1, for submission by/on Wednesday 7th April, 2021.

1. Technical issues.

The proposed development of Sizewell C is a huge, complex multi layered issue and all future meetings should be held face to face. Many participants during the preliminary meetings held on 23rd/24th March 2021 had to cope with flickering screens, loss of reception and Internet connections or issues with quality of the sound. Making meetings more complex for local people to contribute is not acceptable. This planning process has caused local people enough stress and anxiety.

It was difficult to follow which agenda item we were on during the meeting. There were so many people wishing to speak on items of huge concern, a floor to floor meeting is essential. Quality time needs to be given so everyone can make their points known without needing to feel rushed or left with their views being undermined or not explained in detail.

2. Timing of the examination.

All interested parties must have time to consider the implications to the changes to the planning application. The documents are complex, time should be allowed for the information to be processed and informative responses to be made.

Suffolk Council elections are at the beginning of May and this will mean there will be no cabinet appointments till the end of May.

Scottish Power renewables DCO examination have been given a delay of 3 months in recognition of the pandemic and the complexities of the planning application, to give people more time to respond. There is a strong argument for saying this should also happen with the SZC planning process.

3. Principle issues.

The principle issues around this planning application remain the same as they have done since the process began, with more issues being raised with changes to the planning application.

Coastal Defences - EDF's coastal defence plans are incomplete, and late submission of applications for site licenses means that complete plans may not be available in the examination, potentially subverting the process.

We will also reiterate the following issues for specific inclusion:

- 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
- Under Air Quality, impacts of borrow pits (quarries) and spoil heaps on local communities.

The route selected by EDF for a relief road is not the best option. The route known as D2 is by far the best route and the inspectorate should listen to local residents and review the evidence. D2 will be a shorter route for HGVs, reducing pollution and it will not leave so many landowners with pockets of land that will become useless agriculturally. The relief route EDF have proposed will cut off three lanes that connect B1122 with Saxmundham. These routes are used for local residents to access health amenities (doctors, dentists, vets), shops and schools. Should planning permission be granted local residents should not have to wait 2 years for the construction of a relief road. It should be the first thing to be constructed. The relief road should be left in place after construction of SZC as the B1122 is not fit for purpose for the volume of traffic it will be carrying in 20 years time. Should this planning application be granted the B1122 will have to cope with decommissioning traffic for Sizewell A & B, outage traffic every 18 months for Sizewell C & D, farm traffic, local traffic, work force traffic required at for the two power stations, Friston traffic for the Scottish Power development, apart form an increase in traffic for the number of homes that will be constructed in the area and tourists, should they ever return after the huge construction period.

The inspectorate should visit the Hinkley construction site and speak to local people there. They should then visit the Sizewell area independently from anyone connected with SZC.

At the preliminary meeting in March, the Deputy Chief Constable of Suffolk police spoke about 'significant issues for community safety,' as did a representative from the ambulance service. These issues have to be taken into consideration. If residents had to evacuate this area for any reason, the roads would not cope with traffic heading away from this area to emergency vehicles trying to come into the area.

The challenge to provide realistic purposeful mitigation across all aspects of this development by a company such as EDF, which has not a proven trustworthy record, is beyond possibility.