

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: info@stopsizewellc.org
Subject: The Sizewell C Project - Issue Specific Hearing 6
Date: 23 July 2021 12:48:53

Dear Sirs

Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project - Issue Specific Hearing 6

I am retired architect. Most of my life has been spent in Suffolk. I have followed the Examination process to date, including most of the Issue Specific Hearings via the livestream. My representations to date have concentrated mainly on the vulnerability of the application site and the fragile nature of the entire East Anglian coast, particularly in relation to the climate emergency that faces all of humanity. For that reason, I was particularly concerned to follow ISH 6 on the subject of Coastal Geomorphology.

Of all the contributions to the Issue Specific Hearings, that of Professor Andy Blowers OBE to ISH 6 was the one which I urge the Examination team to reflect on. None of the thousands of pages of text, nor any of the predictions prepared on the applicant's behalf by their team of experts, can tell us with any degree of certainty, what the future holds in the face of rapidly developing climate change. All that we can be certain of is that it will be extremely challenging ... and that the decisions that we take now will have far reaching impacts for future generations.

I fear for the future of my 2 year old granddaughter. At the turn of the century, she will be 81. She may have grandchildren of her own (possibly, even great grandchildren). And yet by then, if Sizewell C has been built, it will still require protection as it enters its decommissioning phase. By 2165, three more generations will have been given the onerous responsibility for dealing with that poisoned legacy during a period for which the Applicant has made no convincing plan (and is incapable of making a plan). It is highly likely that the legacy will persist even beyond that point as the broader issue of radioactive waste disposal may well not have been resolved.

As Professor Blowers has pointed out:

"Proposals for defending the site against climate change and its effects will be at best short term. In the longer run, and especially during the indefinite period of decommissioning and clean-up, it is impossible to provide unequivocal technical assurance of safety and security in the management of radioactive waste, including spent fuel. There is the possibility of calamitous risks being passed on to generations in the far future. This may be acceptable to the developer and government, in which case they should say so. It is not acceptable to those who oppose the development. I believe it is technically improbable and ethically indefensible for the present generation, who enjoy the debatable benefits and consign the

cost to the future which have no voice and no interest in the present proposals."

Many of the Applicant's technical submissions suggest that a precautionary approach has been taken in their preparation. I suggest to the Examiners that the only ethically defensible way in which to apply a genuinely precautionary approach, is to refuse the DCO application. For the sake of all of us now, and of those who will follow us, I urge them to do so.

Yours faithfully

Neil Poole

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Neil Poole.

My Interested Party Ref: 20026566