

Outstanding Principal Issues:

- a. The Planning Inspectorate has identified a list of Principal Issues and recently added Coastal Processes and Community Impacts. Whilst this is welcomed the definition of what is categorised as a Principal Issue is not clear. More comprehensive detail on the definition is required to help determine if there are further gaps in the current list.
- b. The significant and fundamental issue of the coast defence design, the consequences arising from them and the sites vulnerability to flooding are all being excluded from the examination process. EDF's position utilising the Rochdale envelope for these matters is entirely inappropriate for such a vulnerable and sensitive location. The desire for EDF to have this examined only within the Office of Nuclear Regulation process should not be accepted. The consequences for; access, adjacent coastal erosion, long term funding, and many other issues need to be examined. EDF should not be allowed to subvert the process from detailed and proper examination. This approach is not one they adopted at Hinkley Point C application where full details were available in detail for the examination. EDF appear to be trying to disguise issues from the Examining Authority and this must not be allowed to happen.
- c. Whilst I welcome coastal processes being identified as a Principal Issue I am unclear as to how the Examining Authority will integrate the closely related issues of; coastal processes, coast and flood defence, source, frequency and vulnerability to flooding and the consequential impacts to adjacent sites. This raises some fundamental issues which including the need to for an examination of the siting of the proposed development. Has the short-term expediency of locating the station as close to the sea as possible to reduce the impact and take of the SSSI been calculated against the potentially more serious long-term risks of earlier exposure of the sea defences and consequential impact on coastal processes and erosion. The suitability of the Hinkley Point C design / layout on this site need to be examined in detail.
- d. The widespread and selective claims made by EDF on the CO2 credentials of this development need to be examined. In order for the UK to achieve net zero by 2050 an open and peer reviewed verification of EDF claims must be undertaken. In particular the creation of CO2 in construction needs to be closely examined and recognition of its additional significant challenge to interim UK CO2 targets made and therefore how will they be mitigated for.
- e. Clarity needs to be established regarding whether financing is part of the process or excluded. If included then this needs its own section.
- f. The Examining Authority will need to examine whether the proposal meets in detail the requirements of the national policy statements and EDF's consideration of alternative sites. There have been recent reports identifying the

Planning Inspectorate Sizewell C.

Deadline B response to Preliminary Meeting: Outstanding Principal Issues - Bill Parker

Sizewell is one of the least suitable sites in the country, in particular for its location on a vulnerable coastline and in an area of high environmental quality.

- g. Concern has been expressed by many on the weakness of the proposal with regard to the impact on local fish populations and in particular with regard to local and adjacent protected marine sites and designated species. The lack of Acoustic Fish Deterrent is just one issue. EDF could help mitigation with one, however no acceptable justification has been made for it being removed from earlier proposals.
- h. In the recent dry weather this year there are already examples of wind-blown soil from fallow fields, the impact on air quality of the extensive spoil heaps on the local community and tourism industry needs to be examined in detail. The soil type in the area is extremely friable and this is a significant risk that needs an extensive, comprehensive and a deliverable mitigation plan in place.

Bill Parker

6/4/21