

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Sea Defence height - Sizewell B and Sizewell C.  
**Date:** 31 August 2021 10:44:31

---

Apologies - there was a typographical error in my earlier email. Corrected below.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Nick Scarr [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, 31 Aug 2021 at 10:27  
**Subject:** Sea Defence height - Sizewell B and Sizewell C.  
**To:** SizewellC <[sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

Dear Sizewell C Team,

Ref: Nick Scarr Interested party: 20025524

Sizewell B and C are adjoining sites and, in the flood risk assessment addendum issued by the Applicant (*Main Dev Site FRA Addendum (AS-157). Page 1*) the Applicant states that it raised the sea defences for the proposed Sizewell C because it was aware that a 14.2m crest height '*would need to be established*' for Sizewell C by 2046.

However, the adjoining Sizewell **B** has a 10m AOD sea defence crest height.

The new proposed sea defence designed for Sizewell **C** (14.6m - 16.4m AOD) does not appear to cover the frontage of Sizewell B.

I have not seen an explanation for this, and Sizewell B is not responding to correspondence asking whether its sea defence height will be raised.

The following paragraph 3.2.21 in the Applicant's '*Sustainability Statement (APP-617)*' states that, "*As Sizewell C has a boundary with Sizewell B to the south and both platforms are at differing ground levels, a retaining wall would be constructed to prevent surface water discharging from Sizewell C to Sizewell B.*"

This does not appear to address the apparent discrepancy and it appears then, that Sizewell B's defences could represent a danger to itself and Sizewell C by 2046.

Would you please ask the Applicant to explain what appears to be an anomaly.

Regards  
Nick Scarr