

Response to the Applicant's Comments on Written Representations and Written Questions
(Frances Crowe - Interested person ref: 20026749)

I am not satisfied that the concerns raised in by my oral and written representations have been properly addressed by the Applicant in their responses. Depressingly, this applies moreorless across the board to the issues I have raised but I specifically want to draw the examiners' attention to the following points:

Air pollution:

Ozone pollutants: The applicant's response (REP3-046, HW.1.22, p.150) to the examiners' written question regarding ozone (my relevant representation RR-392) was cursory and inadequate, and does not in any way address the detail submitted in my written representation (REP2-275). It is clear that no proper consideration, let alone research, has informed the applicant's response on this issue.

PM2 Particulates: I am not satisfied that the dangers that even small increases can generate have been satisfactorily addressed.

These issues need to be addressed through further examination and I urge the Planning Inspectorate to ensure that an issue specific hearing is included when further hearings are announced.

Tourism impacts:

The applicant has failed to respond satisfactorily to the issues raised in my/Bill Parker's written response (EP2-427) to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) concerning our business, Sea Poppies holiday let (REP3-046, SE.1.9, p.24).

Moreover, I am very dissatisfied by the applicant and council's response to the ExA questions regarding tourism benefits (REP3-046, G.1.27, p21) A tourism fund, no matter how large or how well it is spent, will not mitigate for the destruction of the very attributes that draw visitors to this area. No amount of promotion or marketing - or new visitor attractions (what exactly are they?) - can make up for the loss of the very special qualities of this region. As all marketing professionals know, a high marketing spend on a defective product is a waste of money: all you can hope to generate is disappointment. The whole nature of this area will be irrevocably and adversely impacted if the type of tourism this area currently enjoys is threatened. This would badly affect local businesses and residents alike and destroy our vibrant tourism economy.

Marine environment for leisure users:

My concerns (REP2-428) regarding swimming and water quality, including the increased numbers of jellyfish, have not been addressed at all. Swimming at local beaches, especially Sizewell, Thorpeness and Aldeburgh, is a very important and frequent leisure activity for numerous visitors and residents alike, across the age spectrum. The impact of adverse changes in the swimming experience would have enormous impact on well-being and fitness, and would impact tourism significantly. This must be properly examined by the applicant.

Impact on future generations:

My concerns (PDB-062, REP2-276) do not seem to have been addressed. I would like to see an issue specific hearing on this topic.

I have also seen no reassurance on insurance risk (REP2-275: Transport health and other matters), protection from cyber attack and terrorism (PDB-062) and other points made in my WR (REP2-275: Transport health and other matters).

In my WR (REP2-275: Transport health and other matters), I referred to the poor quality of consultation (pt 7), the misleading information from the applicant (pt 8 and 9), and my concerns regarding measures for communication and complaints handling (pt 6). The applicant's response to written questions and written submissions has served to further undermine any remaining confidence that the applicant would do the right thing by the community here if granted planning permission.

I therefore urge the planning inspectors to pursue these issues with rigour to ensure that they are properly addressed by the applicant.

Frances Crowe
26/7/21

PDB-063

Frances Crowe and Bill Parker
Procedural Deadline B submission
Re online process, amendments etc etc.

PDB-062

Frances Crowe

Procedural Deadline B submission:

From: To: Sizewell C Subject: Principle issues Date: 06 April 2021 21:12:53 Dear Planning Inspectorate Further to the Preliminary Meeting Part 1 and my earlier submission prior to that meeting, I attach below 2 additional submissions for Principle Issues as presented on the day. Please note I have also written jointly with Bill Parker with comments on other issues raised during the Preliminary Meeting Part 1. Kind regards Frances Crowe

Impact on future generations I would like the examination to give particular consideration to evaluating the capacity of future generations to safely secure the site and all the waste that has been generated (wherever that will ultimately be located) for its entire lifetime. Although we don't yet benefit from a Well-being of Future Generations Act here, as has been introduced in Wales, it is nevertheless very important that the enquiry examines the impacts fully - in particular the costs (including who will pay) and carbon footprint (as highlighted by Alison Downes and Chris Wilson) - and indeed long-term practicality of defending a site that may in effect become an island. This evaluation needs to take into account the high level of uncertainty in predicting climate change impacts and therefore model the full range of scenarios - including the worst - as well as taking into account potential issues of resource scarcity and the possibility that future generations may be having to deal with multiple events at other sites at the same time. Significantly, we have had very recent experience of the partial destruction of sea defences at Thorpeness just 2 miles south of the Sizewell site. This has happened after only around 10 years of their life despite this being expected to be an estimated 25 years. Although the defences were known to have a limited lifespan I do not believe that any measures were put in place for its end of life management. It now represents a significant hazard to beach visitors as well as being partially ineffective. For the sake of future generations, we cannot afford to let such a situation arise with this project - even if it is decades - or even centuries - in the future. Given this project will give some relatively short-term gains but leave a massive long-term impact, the findings should guide whether in fact this development is viable from both a financial and a climate change point of view. I therefore ask that consideration is given to making this a principle issue in its own right.

Protection from cyber attack and terrorism Secondly, I ask that the examination also include evaluation of the cost and viability of protecting the development from cyber attack or other terrorist events, especially in the light of the Government's recent defence review which emphasised the heightened risk of this type of event. It should be borne in mind that local residents and businesses will have absolutely no insurance cover in the event of any kind of incident at a nuclear facility, whatever the cause, as this is excluded from all insurance policies [the radioactive contamination exclusion clause (RCE)]. In the event of any kind of incident, we could lose everything.