

I write to add the following to my representation made in September 2020. I remain wholeheartedly in disagreement with the application to build Sizewell C. I will focus on just two areas community engagement and the site selection.

Community engagement

I'm a three year Aldeburgh resident. A week before the interested party registration deadline, I received a brochure from EdF telling me what SZC will mean to me. This brochure was full of upbeat soundbites which sounded positive initially but contained items that were not true, eg it did not reflect the earlier announcement they had made regarding vastly increased co2 emissions during construction. Just this should have stopped that brochure. Statements like "we are not building on RSPB Minsmere land" misleads as although not untrue, this wasn't the issue. Another was "the project will be backed by UK investors" and is misleading because of CGNs involvement and that EdF had not yet started negotiations with the government. It was certainly unconnected to the possibility that we all pay for it through an energy tax. This would contradict the Prime Minister saying last year at the conservative party conference that where all infrastructure would be funded by the private sector and not from the UK tax payers' pockets. This brochure was a cynical one off piece of marketing designed to dissuade those who did not follow the issues so closely, from registering with the planning inspector and thereby losing the right to officially object. The fact the brochure had factual inaccuracies, all painting EdF in a better light, is unforgivable.

That brochure is the only correspondence I have had with EdF.

The whole application process is extremely difficult to wrap ones head around. The documents are voluminous and the planning process itself is not easy to follow. In addition the pandemic made things much more difficult for local people to engage as we were unable to meet in public or join together in supporting one another. Notwithstanding this, the Stop Sizewell C campaign have worked so hard to ensure that lone residents such as myself who have few close contacts in the area, are kept aware of deadlines and given advice on our submissions. They have therefore a very good understanding of the views of this region and do this despite having only the bare minimum of funding. Having seen the open floor hearings and watched our local MP, Dr Coffey, barely engage at all, with a presentation of probably one minute in total, much less than she was allotted saying that she considered EdFs consultation with the community to be good. It was evident she was rushing to get through it and that she obviously had better things to do that day than spend time protecting her constituency and the livelihoods of her constituents. This demonstrated to me unfortunately that our MP is very out of touch with the community, they are left to be represented by people like Alison Downes who clearly understands the people round here better. The volume of people electing to speak at the open floor hearings as well as those objecting in writing sends a message that is difficult to ignore. Our MP might have noticed that had she stayed, watched and listened. Something that I was very encouraged to see all the planning officers do.

The last consultation issued 6 days after the interested party registration deadline was unfair to those it affected. It seemed written to deal with our MP and Suffolk CC's biggest issues. But it means now EdF have a revised transport strategy that brings 8 freight trains overnight each night to Sizewell via the East Suffolk line and this has caused upset and fear to many people who live near the line or near the noisy level crossings this line has right across East Suffolk. The plans for the new beach landing facility even made you feel compelled to write to EdF for more information. EdF have had ten years to get this right and then it's a replica of Hinkley Point C you would think the plans were a little firmer and that EdF would not submit a DCO that the planning inspectorate can't understand. Without all the information it is impossible to conclude and should be rejected.

I wanted to know the potential impact and mitigation for my B&B business but found nothing. I have to conclude therefore that engagement with the community is something EdF does as a last resort unless you can be of benefit to them

This area has an ageing population that do not all have access to or ability to deal with documents electronically. Having these reviews during lockdown forced people online whether willingly or unwillingly and will have marginalised many from the local community who could not see the DCO in order to respond. EdFs solution, to bring a bus with hard copy information to local towns and villages was a shambles. It couldnt get to many of the sites it scheduled stops for, and many places including Aldeburgh did not even get on the schedule. EdF have as always seemed to time these things to avoid them reaching as many people as possible, and to marginalise many who have not been given the chance to have their say. I understand this was common historically as EdF tended to release consultations at times when people are busy, such as Xmas and the summer, giving people less time to respond.

Its worth noting here that my local councillor to East Suffolk Council has resigned recently suggesting that the council weren't listening to her when she tried to represent the dissenting voices of her constituents. East Suffolk Council say they are neutral, but having watched a number of meetings broadcast online I have seen that the attitude is about getting the right mitigation for people and excitement about inwards investment and jobs. However I've seen council officials shut debates down by declaring certain topics, like site selection, off the table. If this plan goes ahead we need the council to do this work, but I'd sooner they considered all angles and not just from the presumption it will be built and by not entering into debates as to why it shouldnt. I can understand my ex-councillor's frustration. The destruction of Coronation Wood for which ESC gave permission despite SZC not being approved threw into question the motives of the council. And showed up EdF as an organisation that doesn't really care about the environment. Lip service here was barely paid when they felled the wood without applying to Natural England for the necessary bat licences but went ahead anyway. The felled wood is now being turned into a car park.

Site selection

I won't repeat the detail about the impacts of SZC on the Aonb and immediate environment as many have already written about this however I will tell you that the thought of the areas between the complex and sea being dug up when this beach is one of only three of its type in the world is heartbreaking. Its a walk I enjoy regularly with my two year old Boston terrier who gets excited each time we go. Once construction begins, he's never going to be able to experience that walk again in his life time. Its a huge dog walking area and a stark reminder of the importance of design in these decisions and the loss to our community. Everything here is heartbreaking.

I'm aware you are not wanting to discuss policy statements however I feel compelled to mention the appalling contradictions in place to show Sizewell should continue to be included in the list of acceptable sites.

The factors in the decade since this was published in 2011 have changed and arguably, this proposal might not have even been an option if an assessment was done today. The document EN1 gives the Secretary of State the need to update the policy statement as material factors change. Ten years on and despite the much faster acceleration of sea level rises than thought and the increase in climate change related matters to what we understood in 2011, the fact that renewables have advanced so far and become so cheap to produce and our updated view on the importance of protecting our nature and habitats, it is baffling to see the government take the view that the only material factor needing to change is that the original deadline of generating power by 2025 should be extended to 2035. All of this looks like cherry picking criteria, outrageous especially if EdF have to seek overriding public interest calculations for the destruction of marsh harrier habitats. The above factors are all inputs into this calculation which allows the government to ignore any designations and protection on that land. All this horrifies me. It is clearly being done to suit EdF and may mean this whole process is merely part of the box ticking exercise.

Thank you for your attention

Regards

John Richmond

[REDACTED]
Aldeburgh

[REDACTED]