

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Deadline 7 Submission
Date: 03 September 2021 22:02:48

Dear Planning Inspectorate Team,

This is the text I had hoped to share at the open floor hearings on 24th August but was unable to do so due to work commitments. As I explained at the time, it is incredible difficult for people to engage with this process if they work full time.

I am a resident of [REDACTED] which as EDF so kindly put it has “*a perception of tranquility*” which is located closest to the development site.

Eastbridge will suffer throughout any proposed build of Sizewell C from near constant:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->vibration,
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->noise,
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->air pollution
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->light pollution
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->loss of biodiversity

In addition, there will be an influx of workers to live in an accommodation campus two fields away totalling more than 35 times the population of our hamlet.

In Eastbridge will just have to “put up” with the lengthy build life of the project on our doorstep and its ongoing impacts on our community’s health and wellbeing should you recommend to the secretary of state that it goes ahead. EDF’s lack of attempt at any realistic mitigation has made it very clear that they are not really concerned about how the project will impact us.

I’d like to use my time to highlight my ongoing concerns about the proposed Sizewell C project and my observations of challenging and ever-changing landscape of the DCO process so far.

“Urgency” and inconsistency

If we were to create a “word cloud” using the applicant’s QC Mr Philpot’s contributions to the DCO hearings I’m pretty sure the word “Urgency” would feature prominently.

However, his rhetoric is at odds with reality when:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->EDF have now been “consulting” on SZC for 9 years (and I would assume /hope they did some preparatory work on it for a few years before that)

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->They are now delaying the final investment decision until potentially 2023

This doesn’t seem very urgent to me.

Since the DCO was initially submitted, we are now about to get at least the 3rd set of significant, material changes to the plans. These changes almost comprehensively were issues EDF were aware of for quite some time and both could and should have sorted out prior to submitting the DCO.

The latest of these being the issue of water (or lack of it) & subsequent requirement for an onsite

desalination plant out for consultation now

It is almost inconceivable that a developer looking to locate the largest construction site in Europe in a water scarce region had not considered the source of this water prior to going into the DCO process.

You cannot build a nuclear power station without water to mix the huge volumes of concrete required and you cannot run a nuclear power station without around 3 million litres of water daily within the reactor and cooling ponds.

I, a mere Geography teacher, raised this issue in my January 2017 response to Consultation 2, yet EDF seem to only be addressing this in their DCO four and a half years later. This does raise the question - were consultation responses purely "one way traffic" not thoroughly digested or listened to by the applicant...

Perhaps we should remind the applicant of the old adage that "*proper planning prevents poor performance*" as they do seem to be struggling with this...

The applicant and their employee's approach

I am afraid the context detailed above is just one of many examples of a pattern of the applicant not engaging in an effective consultation process or truly listening to the concerns of local communities. This is also clearly reflected in the views and behaviour of its staff.

The tweet below belongs to Mr Tom McGarry, EDF's Head of Stakeholder Engagement and is quite demonstrative of this approach as he describes local green politicians who are members of the communities he is tasked to engage with as "*thick as mince and beyond contempt*".



This attitude of disrespect and lack of consideration for local communities by the applicant has been clear since the start of consultation and continues today through the DCO process through regular condescending comments from EDF's staff in Planning Inspectorate hearings.

As an example, EDF's QC for a series of early meetings seemed to feel the need to refer to some "Interested Parties" as "Important Interested Parties". It was very clear that he felt that local community members, Parish Councillors and organisations which represent the views of communities were not in his "Important Interested Parties" category.

EDF's approach, constantly making changes to the DCO and inflicting more incredibly short "consultations" on communities again exemplify both their poor planning and total disrespect for communities.

EDF staff responding in the DCO hearings seem surprised and even irked that members of communities whose way of life they will devastate for at least the 15-year build life of the plant are in opposition to their plans. Their tone is disrespectful and regularly condescending. Even when dealing with the Planning Inspectorate Examination Team in hearings, EDF's QC and senior staff seem to feel it is acceptable to avoid answering questions directly and to imply that team members approach is not correct.

“Poor track record and high cost...”

One would have thought that the Development Consent Order application and plans for the final of five proposed EPR reactors would be considered, thought out, well designed and would have the benefit of experience of successfully operating other EPR reactors...

This is not the case.

When the Sizewell C DCO process commenced there was 1 plant of this design of EPR working – Taishan in China.

There are now **no** fully operational EPR plants as Taishan has had to be taken offline for significant safety concerns and the other three are still not operational (Hinkley, Flamanville and Olkiluoto).

Two plants are very significantly behind and over budget

- **Flamanville, France**

First concrete poured Dec 2007,

Start of commercial operation originally planned for May 2012

Latest estimate for start of regular production 2023 – that is at least 15 years

- **Olkiluoto, Finland**

Started in 2005

Start of commercial operation originally planned for May 2009

latest estimate for start of regular production is February 2022 – that is at least 16 years.

If we look at Hinkley C, the build is in progress but already is behind with delivery delayed until “at least” 2026 and escalating costs with a current estimate at £22.9 billion.

“Price hike and Fuel poverty”

At the start of August, we saw significant rises in UK household energy bills, according to the BBC a “typical” customer's bill rising by £139.

It is worth noting that the National Audit Office estimates the additional cost to consumers of Hinkley C (above the estimated market price of electricity) under the negotiated “strike price” to be £50 billion. UK Consumers are already paying between £10 and 15 on their bills for Hinkley C.

In an economic environment where the costs of renewables is falling consistently it makes no sense to add on a potential Regulated Asset Base “Nuclear Tax” with every bill payer in the UK to foot the bill for this unwanted project at Sizewell.

UK consumers want cheap, clean energy. With at least a 6-year legacy of carbon to “payback” when operation would finally commence it cannot be considered truthful to say Sizewell C would be clean or cheap despite what is claimed by the applicant in promoted posts on twitter and facebook.

For those who like to use the “wind doesn't always blow” argument to try to justify this project, I'm

sure even half of the more than £20 billion SZC is proposed to cost could make a real dent in developing effective battery technology in a lot less than the around 15 year build life of SZC.

Wrong Location

The East Suffolk Coastline is unstable, mobile and vulnerable to the impact of Climate Change which will bring increased storms and subsequent increased wave action. An eroding coast is not the place to build a new Nuclear Power Station.

Since the open floor hearing there has been another cliff fall at the Sizewell end of the Thorpeness cliffs [Thorpeness cliff erosion: Warning to avoid part of beach](#).



Thorpeness cliff erosion: Warning to avoid part of beach

The erosion happened in an area a dog walker died in 2017 when a cliff collapsed onto him.

The lack of modelling of the effect that future impacts of climate change will have on this coast is reason enough to decline this application.

Summary

Ultimately, this continues to be the wrong project in the wrong place.

Some might also say “wrong company” due to the 0/5 record of success with EDF’s EPR.

This quote from the New Civil engineer sums up both EDF’s approach to this project so far and the perils RAB could bring

“unless carefully implemented the RAB model will likely encourage sloppy project planning and sub-par project risk management, under a pure RAB model there is little incentive for the developer to identify and mitigate risks in order to build on time and on budget, the developer has no skin in the game”

Regards

Mrs Anne-Marie Robb

