

Open Floor Hearing Input
Interested Party 20026505: David Henry Francis Robb

I am a resident of [REDACTED], Eastbridge, representing myself and the interests of my family who have been resident there since 1991. Thank you for the opportunity for me to give my inputs.

During a Sizewell C open day in Leiston during the summer of 2019 that I attended, I talked to a representative of EDF's public consultation team. I explained I came from Eastbridge and that with the proposals for spoil heaps, accommodation sites, 1500 lorries a day, etc – all on the doorstep of our peaceful village - we felt pretty well stuffed. He smiled, nodded and said "yes, you are, aren't you." Probably my most honest interaction with the applicant during this whole project.

I come to this meeting poorly prepared compared to the well-heeled applicant, who has the luxury of being able to focus solely on this project. I have a full time job, no recourse to resources to back me up and I have not been able to get time to participate fully in this planning inspection process due to the applicant's desire to rush this through in the pandemic, when we are unable to work with support groups such as Stop Sizewell C as much as I would have hoped. This failure on my part has greatly increased my anxiety over the project and the process.

The spectre of Sizewell C has been hanging over this village for more than 30 years.

I have a letter from my mother dated 1993 asking information on government policy on developing a 3rd reactor at Sizewell and objecting to it in principal – the Minister's representative replied that her objection was noted and detailing the expected process. Nearly 30 years later, we are still waiting, although my mother is now dead.

She was the liaison for Eastbridge and Theberton to Sizewell B and when she died, my father took on that role. As a lecturer in mechanical engineering at Imperial College for 35 years, he had a good grasp of the technical issues involved around the developing Sizewell C project. He focussed his energy into the local community and how best to represent their interests to Sizewell B&C. The book he wrote with John Rae Price on "The Draining of the Minsmere Levels – a saga of a community and a project" would be a great reference to you on how important the Minsmere and Sizewell marshes are to the community and the ecosystem. Impacting them through the currently proposed build is nothing short of wanton vandalism.

My father was deeply involved in responses to the various public consultations, growing more and more disillusioned with the process and the nuclear powerhouse driving it. They were not open, they did not communicate clearly or accurately and he could not understand what they were proposing to do or why. Nor would they listen to rational counter-proposals. If he were still alive today, he could tell you his exasperation.

I feel that the applicant's approach has not changed – why else are their proposals still so vague, so open to change and so poorly backed up with evidence? Looking at their application document, they were happy to show pages and pages of data from dysfunctional data loggers (so they could make no conclusions) rather than address the issue and provide a robust assessment of potential risk and mitigation for their proposals which can be rigorously inspected.

The language of "if" and "possibly", with mitigations "to be determined" used throughout every part of the application is more from a feasibility exercise than a completed project planning application. It is not like they have not had time to fill these gaps – remember the first public consultation was way back in 2012. As their TV advert says, "busy doing nothing".

Now they want to rush this half-baked application through as you know, starting this latest lap of the process in the midst of the COVID pandemic, discriminating the process against the local communities of working people who have to add this extreme stress to their daily lives.

I have been lucky enough to inherit my parent's house in Eastbridge – backing on to the marshes that become the globally recognised AONB, Ramsar site, etc, etc. You have heard of the outstanding beauty of the area, and its global importance to biodiversity – particularly in such a busy country as the UK, where there are fewer and fewer really wild places, especially in the south and east. You can sit at night in our garden, hearing only natural noises from the nature reserve, the only light from the stars and moon.

But this is dismissed by the applicant in their proposal. They talk only of our “perception of tranquillity”. When running their social and environmental risk assessments of Eastbridge and Theberton bundle us together with Saxmundham – a town, not a village, which will not be cut off by fast roads and excessive traffic, totally unsuitable for the situation. Not surprisingly, their conclusion on the impact on our villages is that it will be minimal – but they did not claim many benefits for us! I am going to be honest – even they do not claim an upside of 24hr light and noise – perhaps for the lifetime of the site, not just the build. My parents, in the Eastbridge cemetery, will be bathed in their light and covered in their dust. Perhaps miss the cemetery by night if this projects gets the green light!

The applicant has a history of changing their plans. The original road link was acceptable only to the applicant – it is cheap! Previously, the rail link was minimised, now you have heard how the applicant's proposal on rail will make a huge impact on residential areas. Also, the sea access had been dropped previously by the applicant, owing to its unacceptable impact on marine life – magically reinstated after a quiet word from our MP Therese Coffey (who, like me holds a PhD). Does it or does it not have an unacceptable impact on marine life? The reports are hidden from us – but the 2 conclusions put forward by the applicant appear mutually exclusive.

On this point of changing plans, we heard from residents near Hinkley C of how the temporary spoil heaps have grown higher and are becoming permanent. Roads remain and footpaths gone for ever. Lorry traffic increased massively – because what was in the application was not workable! Will we see the same with Sizewell C?

In a personal response to my Stage 3 public consultation, EDF's now Managing Director Humphrey Cadoux-Hudson CBE wrote to me to assure that they would behave in compliance with the law in terms of obligations to restore the land after whatever the build holds for us. During the hearings, you heard how Coronation Wood was cut down before the appropriate licences were issued. The Applicant challenged this and said that everything had been done with licences in hand. I was unable to ask you about this directly due to the virtual meetings and the rules that if you are not involved in those immediate discussions, you could not join the Teams meeting. I emailed urgently your colleagues to raise this matter during the last day of Open Floor Hearings, but this was not done and the panel showed no knowledge of my email during the public meeting (copy below of the email sent 21st May at 11:30 during the hearings and sadly never replied to). Again, highlighting how this virtual process has tipped the balance against the local community and in favour of the applicant.

I do hope that you will follow up with the applicant to find out whether:

- a) They destroyed Coronation Wood before the appropriate licences were issued
- b) They lied to you in the hearings when correcting the evidence of one of the local community on this matter

I view misleading a public body very seriously. If no action comes from this, this will further taint my view of this whole process as being a whitewash.

This is a story of 10 years of exasperating attempts to work with the applicant to make their proposals better – for the community and the environment. But they do not heed – I firmly believe that they do not care! What is worse is their propaganda – talking about all the green jobs, which our MP then trots out. Let's face it, there is no dressing up that driving trucks and pouring concrete over an internationally important site for biodiversity is not green! Therese Coffey clearly has a conflict of interest with the local community, does not represent their views on this and is only chasing the money. Her contempt for this process by only showing up for 5 minutes of her allocated 15 minutes during which she lied about getting local community backing for Sizewell (as you heard from the residents of Eastbridge and Theberton) and just talked about the wonderful project EDF has proposed, which would have prevented others talking with more information underlines her stance.

If you approve this application as is, I believe that the applicant will take every opportunity to change, reduce cost (and by necessity increase impact) and move as far from this application document as possible. They will take the Rochdale envelope and rip it to pieces – because their proposal is so vague. The damage to local environment and communities will be immense. The sole beneficiaries will be the applicant.

In conclusion to my disposition, how can any reasonable person make an informed decision to support this project, given the lack of evidence presented and the failure to present a complete and coherent plan through the entire process? Making the wrong decision will leave a life-long legacy of environmental and social destruction in the local communities around.

I will be reserving my right to give input to all topic specific hearings coming up, when you release the information. I encourage you to give us as much notice as possible. The non-applicants all have jobs and lives which do not revolve around this process. We are not funded by public money and unlike the propaganda from EDF, we are not well-heeled and have to work for a living.

Dr David Henry Francis Robb

[REDACTED]
Eastbridge
Suffolk

Copy of email sent to PINS regarding the applicant misleading the inspectorate:

From: **Dave Robb** [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, 21 May 2021 at 11:29
Subject: IP 20026505 - Urgent procedural question on the OFC proceedings
To: <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: <info@stopsizewellc.org>

Dear Mr Brock and Ms McKay

As well as giving my own personal disposition, I have been listening as much as possible to the proceedings. I want to raise a query about the need to give accurate and honest inputs to the inspectorate.

Yesterday, you heard from Ms Jennifer Kirtley an accusation that the applicant cut down a significant part of Coronation Wood before appropriate licences were issued.

The applicant's representative stepped in afterwards, stating clearly that all licences were in place at the time of felling and that everything should be seen as fully legal.

Today you heard from Mr Christopher Wilson that under a Freedom of Information Act request, he eventually found from Natural England that the licences were not issued until the bulk of the wood was destroyed.

It is a matter of public record that the wood was being cut on 9th December: <https://www.eadt.co.uk/news/protestors-gather-at-coronation-wood-sizewell-c-6658662>

I would ask that you request the applicant to submit unredacted copies of the licences issued for the destruction of the wood and subsequent disturbance of wildlife. This will resolve clearly the issue of whether the applicant is seeking to mislead this inspection on that issue.

If this is proved, I would also request that you in future act with extreme prejudice against all evidence provided by the applicant as also likely to be at best misleading?

If it is false, then I withdraw.

Due to the non-physical nature of this hearing, I am sorry I cannot raise my query live, but hope that the team are able to relay this to you in time for discussion today.

Yours sincerely

Dr David HF Robb

Dr Dave Robb
Aquaculture Specialist

Email: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]



DEPARTMENT OF TRADE &
INDUSTRY

1 Palace Street
London SW1E 5HE

Fax No. 071 834 3771
Telex 918777 ENERGY G
Switchboard 071 238 3000
Direct Line 071 238 3763

Miss G Robb

[REDACTED]
Eastbridge
Leiston
Suffolk
[REDACTED]

8 December 1993

Dear Miss Robb

PROPOSED SIZEWELL C PWR POWER STATION

Thank you for your letter of 25 November objecting to Nuclear Electric plc's application for the Secretary of State's consent under section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate the above mentioned power station. I can confirm that you have been registered as an objector to the application pursuant to paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 8 to the Electricity Act 1989.

Should a relevant planning authority (RPA) object, the Secretary of State will be obliged to call for a public inquiry to be held into the application. Even if an RPA does not object the Secretary of State has the discretionary power to call for a public inquiry to be held in light of other objections received.

If the Secretary of State does call for a public inquiry to be held, he will issue in advance a statement of the matters which seem to him relevant to his consideration of the application. The views of those objecting will be taken into account, together with all relevant factors, in identifying these matters.

Even if a public inquiry is not held the Secretary of State will similarly take objectors' views into account in reaching his decision on the application.

I am copying your letter and this reply to the Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council and Nuclear Electric.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]