

Jennifer Wilson Aldringham cum Thorpe. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

After 5 consultations over 9 years, I believe the applicant's 56,000 page DCO application exposes that the Sizewell C project is still little more than a concept. Evidenced by the lack of detail, repetition with conflicting information, appalling maps with no grid lines and impossible to read keys, many of the major concerns ie the sea defences, water supply, transport strategy, presented at this late stage still as possibilities or options with the applicant's hopes of using the Rochdale envelope, to avoid proper scrutiny. I have wasted months of my life pouring through this documentation trying to fully understand the impact on East Suffolk and the AONB and can honestly say it has brought me to tears on many occasions. I am at a loss to understand why it is left to the little people to defend such a precious area with its many national and international designations.

Only a quick google search is required to find that French govt owned EDF has huge financial debt with the French public auditors saying, in October 2020, the EPR at Flamanville, the same design as proposed for Sizewell, is a "failure" with "huge financial consequences and implications for the French nuclear industry and beyond". So, no surprise EDF are demanding UK taxpayers and bill payers pay upfront and take the risk for the Sizewell C build. If you are a person that believes such destruction can be mitigated or compensated, which I am not, what is often overlooked, especially by our elected representatives, is all the compensation and mitigation on offer by EDF, will be paid by us too, as EDF have no funds. With regard to 'mitigation' such as new roads and roundabouts, I think it is time we all recognised this is, in fact, more environmental damage spreading the Sizewell C project throughout East Anglia.

My main concern is the applicant's cavalier attitude to the environment and the climate crisis. Last December we witnessed EDF's destruction of 100 year old Coronation Wood ie during the hibernation period and before obtaining the necessary bat mitigation licence. Ignoring the many consultation responses that reasonably requested this decision should be part of the DCO planning process as the Sizewell C project might not gain approval and the wood would be destroyed unnecessarily. Many local residents sensibly suggested that there are alternatives to site some of the facilities outside the AONB eg the visitors centre, training centre and car parks avoiding the destruction of Coronation Wood which provided screening and a noise barrier for the nuclear complex and was home to much flora and fauna. EDF ignored these requests.

My Cottage is 2 miles from the Sizewell site, close to the River Hundred and, like part of the Sizewell C site, is in flood zone 3. It was impacted in the 1953 floods so I have grave concerns as to whether the Sizewell site can be protected for its lifetime ie until all the radioactive waste is removed, possibly indefinitely as a GDF is still a government unicorn. Climate change predictions are unknown for this period yet the applicant wishes to proceed with a programme of managed adaptation. With a sea wall that has increased in height during the DCO planning process. I have also found that the 1953 floods have not been included in one of the applicant's surveys in DCO document '6.12, pages 68-86 Reports

Referenced in the Environment Statement' [AS-020] re Kenneth Pye BEEMS report TR322 conclusion on page 12, in which there is an assessment of extreme flood risk, and I quote part of the conclusion:-

“For the period extending beyond 2100 to 2185 a level of protection equivalent to a platform level of 7.5 m would be required to safeguard residual and more localised hazards such as those that might be associated with a spent fuel

store. The additional effect of waves also needs to be considered in the specification of the sea defences. It should be noted that these statistical assessments are based only on data for the period 1964 – 2014 and do not include the high magnitude 1953 event. Modelling has shown that the inclusion of this and other high magnitude events earlier in the 20th century leads to even higher estimates for the 1 in 10,000 year water level.”

From reading other DCO documents, it is my understanding that the platform height, and the SSSI crossing, will be 7.3 metres. With my limited knowledge, I question whether this will be high enough.

I am also yet to find anything in the DCO documentation that reassures me that my Cottage will not be put at risk by the endeavours of the applicant to protect its own site. I fear for future generations of East Anglia and the legacy EDF will leave them to deal with.

I am hoping the Ex Authority will heed the May 2019 wise words of Environment Agency Chair Emma Howard Boyd “We need to move away from talking about flood defence. We cannot win a war against water. We cannot expect to build our way out of future climate risks with infinitely high walls and barriers”.

For these reasons, and the many others I have already heard in the open floor hearings, I believe the applicant’s proposed Sizewell C project, if it is allowed to go ahead, will be an environmental and financial disaster for the U.K. and future generations. **I feel we all have a moral duty to ensure Sizewell C never happens and I hope this will be the conclusion of the examining authority at the end of the DCO planning process.**