

Good morning Miss McKay. Thank you very much. Good morning ladies and gentlemen panel members, Councillor Marianne Fellowes representing Aldeburgh Town Council. To provide some context for you I was born in Aldeburgh in 1959. And have served as an elected member on the Council over many terms in excess of 10 years. Thank you for this opportunity to share with you our views. You've already heard earlier this week from Aldeburgh Society, the Alde & Ore Estuary Partnership, who have set the scene very effectively, with regard to Aldeburgh's setting - its unique culture, its diverse history, and its real dependence upon the tourism industry. And our love for this area, especially the AONB. In addition to our Open Floor Hearing submission today, we would want respectfully to give you a lot of evidence at the various Issue specific hearings. We will attempt to answer your written questions as well, as we do want to engage with you and assist your important Examination.

Looking at the fact that you've had in excess of 130 speakers so far during the Open Floor Hearings with another 20 to go today, including some 20 or so Parish council colleagues, and following our written representations – one might ask how much else there is to say? And, sadly I do wonder what impact we actually having on you genuinely, from our little screens, isolated in our own homes rather than standing in front of you in the magnanimous auditorium of Snape Maltings, which is so much part of our iconic culture and history. Although the context of what you've heard already so far over these days may be different, I can assure you the clear and passionate, and factual message is the same. The strong and robust evidence from Aldeburgh Town Council is the same as many others who have already spoken to you during these Open Floor Hearings, that the disbenefits hugely outweigh any benefit of this proposal at this site. And we respectfully request that you please pay careful regard to these contributions. To me, sadly, over COVID-19 many have lost loved ones, and it's like when we find out only following their death, how they've actually contributed across many areas of their lives, over the years. We get the pieces of the jigsaw of their personal story from the collective comments of friends, family and colleagues. But this week, what you're hearing is not the good news or positive contribution which has been made. It is sadly, the huge negative impact, which is being revealed to you - person, by person by person about this same harm that will come to us. And the significant harm has actually started already, from the blight on housing, to the health and well-being of people that have really been affected, as you've already heard. And also the lack of inward investment, people, organisations and companies are starting to question whether they should invest in this area. And this harm will go on not through just the construction phase. But beyond that, because recovery won't happen in the first 10 to 20 years. For trees and vegetation to grow and habitats to re-establish, for wildlife to return. And for structures to be fully removed as promised (there were delays following the construction of Sizewell B). Perhaps the lovely picture that EDF have used on cover of their publications at every stage of their consultation, and always features in the East Anglian Daily Times (our local newspaper) in every advert or article looks wonderful, everything's back to green again. But that's not going to happen with a click of a button. And so it's about 30 years damage we're actually looking at following construction and then 60 to 70 years for operation and then the long wait of 100+ years due to the high temperature burn of the new Mox fuel which the EPR reactors will use, before the spent fuel goes to a GDF if one is ever approved and build.

Ms Downs speaking just before me, perfectly detailed how the lack of real consultation means that we're in quite a difficult place today. It's not front loaded as an NSIP should be. And it's clear that

EDF are driven by two things; one, what's best for them and two, cost? A quick example of what's best for them is how the consultation stages went for us on every matter really?

“Stage one, would you like the accommodation block in location A, B or C? A is our preferred option.

Our response: Actually we'd like D for these reasons.

Stage two, we've dropped C, do you want B or A? A is our preferred option.

Our response: We'd still like D to be considered, why is it not possible, you have not answered our previous points.

Stage three, we're going with A.”

With regard to cost. As you know, this impacts the aspiration for 'local' jobs as people who are previously trained through the Hinkley Point C project already will transfer. And local includes all of Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, East & South Cambridgeshire as it is!

Cost also impacts on the amount of mitigation and compensation that EDF are willing to consider. For example: You've heard earlier this week with regard to noise prevention, that the double glazing that was offered when Sizewell B was constructed all along the roadways to local residents, will not be offered now with this project. And the truth is that the harm cannot be mitigated, and no amount of money can compensate for what this project will bring to our local communities, our residents and those who visit and work here. The only conclusion Aldeburgh Town Council can come to and we would ask you to accept therefore, is that it is just not viable financially, being completely in the AONB with RAMSAR and SSSI designations. Along with the £Millions that have been spent on conservation and encouraging a year-long Tourism offer to date since Sizewell B. Surely this has tipped the balance and the premise in EN-6 that the Government listed Sizewell C as a potential location. EN1 and EN6 as we all recognise are completely out of date, written evidence and calculations for those sites to generate by 2025 which will not happen. And on all the criteria for Sizewell C the language includes phrases which indicate that it is a very delicate balance, a 'can't do without harm' decision for the 'good of the UK'. 4.6.2 included that there's real potential for long term effects on the environment and landscape at Sizewell C given the highest protection that should be afforded to AONB.

An influx of workers would change the local population dynamics, alter the demand for services and impact negatively on the Tourism facilities, as well as negatively affect the social cohesion of the area – as we all saw during Sizewell B construction, and prior to that the building of Sizewell A, etc, etc, etc. So really the Government's only agenda, is it's aspiration for new nuclear, and claims by the applicant regarding contributions towards CO2 reduction, which you've heard Ms Downes very powerfully tell you - is not true for many years before the CO2 foot print is at neutral.

EN-6 and the Applicant state that job benefits are positive factors to the project. In terms of jobs, yes there is evidence that health and well-being is supported by employment. But it also comes from retirement and volunteering. And we would ask you to remember that if this project gets the go ahead, employment will be lost from the Tourism industry as numbers of visitors will fall off both in the pre-consent investigations, during the construction and may never return. This is evidenced already in the DMO report that PINS have. And whether it is actual or perceived barriers we have been told consistently that visitors will not choose to come to this area and face traffic chaos, noise, light and air pollution. The very reasons they choose to come here are gone, it is no longer tranquil. There is no accommodation left to stay for the Literary Festival etc etc. There will also be a negative

net amount of jobs. With staff from Sizewell A and B transferring or staff from other sites across the country as the aging AGR fleet is shut down. If Sizewell C does go ahead there will be the very limited 'boom and bust' which has already been experienced in the past following the construction of Sizewell B. For example, recently, taxpayers money had to be spent on refurbishing the Leiston Leisure Centre that was supposed to be legacy from the build of Sizewell B – yet it became a liability with a huge amount of money to make that into a viable proposition going forward. With respect to Leiston Town Council colleagues, any problems in Leiston or in the rest of our community could actually be solved by other investment and probably don't really need solving if we don't have Sizewell C. If you look at the measures in the draft section 106 with the exception perhaps of the four-village bypass, which EDF won't fund, there's nothing that actually needs to be solved at the moment by nuclear money.

With regard to the imperative reason for overriding public interest (IROPI) this is used extensively in EN-6 by the Government as a reason to list Sizewell as a potential location. I would ask you to listen to what was said by Ms Downes and to recognise that actually, that's not true anymore. And it was only based on the Government wanting the flexibility of having 10 sites, which we now know we don't need 10 sites delivering nuclear power. This question should be subject to new robust assessment, when you visit under the Issue Specific Hearings, the reason for including if this remains the conclusion. And I'd encourage you to consider this (IROPI) as a neutral factor not as a positive one. Because the overwhelming negative benefits here mean that they should project should not go ahead. The elephant in the room, of course, is the fact that EDF embarked on Hinkley Point C saying it would have to build a second to achieve back the initial investment. And now they're too far down the road to let this "juggernaut stop" and our real fear, they're going to sell it off very, very quickly after construction to someone else. And then where will we be (in terms of item 9 in our agenda) delivering the development consent order or protecting the environment from all the harms that it's going to have?

EN-1 1.7 13 says refusal is allowed by the PINS team. The town council is continuing to seek views from residents through its website, through a banner on our roundabout, and the replies are flooding in; loss of tranquillity not being able to breathe, pollution, sleep disturbance, not being able to exit their properties across the road, carry out their daily lives or access services, the loss of jobs in tourism, the loss of income from tourism, complete destruction of wildlife habitats, and coastal management nightmares, chaos on the roads, ambulances not able to get through to casualties, fire engines to emergencies! If energy is really needed elsewhere in the UK generated from nuclear, then it needs a different Brownfield solution. Now is the time for UK PLC to honestly thank this area for hosting Sizewell A and Sizewell B. Just because we have two nuclear power stations (3 x reactors) doesn't mean we should have three stations and five reactors on our coast line for three generations. It's time for us now to concentrate on managing the decommissioning of Sizewell A and managing for the next 30 years the generation of electricity from Sizewell B, and then its ultimate decommissioning. The deadly nuclear waste which will remain here for the many hundreds of years is a mammoth task for us to cope with. Without new nuclear at Sizewell C, we can attract other investment, and we can continue to provide for our children's children. And this area will flourish, flourish and thrive. We don't need it. It's the wrong time, the wrong place the wrong project. And it's the wrong generation. Now, we know what green energy is. And it's not Sizewell C to be sure.

Thank you.

Cllr Marianne Fellowes M.B.E