

Suffolk Coast Acting for Resilience (SCAR) Resume following ISH6 – SZC Examination

SCAR is a strategic partnership of organisations and individuals of all political persuasions representing groups on the Suffolk coastline.

The aim of SCAR is to preserve and protect, for future generations, the Suffolk coastline, tidal rivers and surrounding land area.

SCAR takes no stand for or against the principle of nuclear power, or of the principle that the coast in general or the Sizewell site in particular can be an appropriate location.

Keith Martin, SCAR Chair, spoke at ISH6. His observations amounted to the following:

Agenda Items:

2a. Support for ESC position in the short to medium term. A view that the applicant and all the authorities take too short term a view and that none of them address the coastal impacts over the longer term, particularly beyond decommissioning.

2b. Additional information - longer time scales for monitoring

3. Support for ESC position.

4a&b. Support for ESC position.

4c&d. The spatial scale for baselining and monitoring is too narrow and should be broadened to include Benacre and Shingle St – support for Alde Ore Association position.

5b. Neither the applicant nor the authorities are assessing this issue over long enough time scales.

6e. The CPMMP is inadequate in scope, geographically and over time. It should cover the coastline from Benacre to Shingle St. It also needs to address the period beyond decommissioning for which there appears to be no allowance. At that time there needs to be an assessment of future mitigation needs and costs and proper financial and operational provision made to carry out mitigation works thereafter.

6f. An observation – this point was not made at the hearing. We found the discussion regarding removal of the SCDF somewhat bizarre as this discussion has hitherto taken place behind closed doors and not been open to public comment. We note that a revised CPMMP will be made available in due course; however, our initial view of this line of thought is that we understand exactly why ESC should require HCDF removal to be part of the DCO. Subject to nuclear safety issues, the conditions at the time and the future use of the site we believe it is likely for removal to be beneficial. Helpfully, the discussion that took place perfectly illustrates the point that we have been making that there needs to be proper provision for coastal process mitigation beyond the period under discussion, ie well beyond decommissioning. Whether the SCDF is removed or not, the platform itself will continue to adversely affect coastal processes for a very long time with potential adverse consequences for the coast, particularly to the south.