

Deadline 8 response to the applicant's and East Suffolk council's post-hearing submissions relating to ISH-8 on air pollution from Frances Crowe (IP 20026749)

I wish to respond to the post-hearing comments made by the applicant (REP7-071 and REP7-063) and by East Suffolk Council (REP7-112).

Neither response addresses the concerns that I raised at the ISH or in my subsequent submission (REP7-187), although I note that the applicant has withdrawn their mistaken assertion that most ozone pollution precursors affecting this part of England emanate from France. As this was the main (only) comment on ozone in their earlier submissions this is indicative of how little weight and expertise the applicant has given to proper consideration of this pollutant, which, as they now acknowledge, is highly significant in the East Suffolk area. Moreover, their continued propagation of the idea that pollution from their activities will lead to a significant reduction in ozone in this region lacks credibility. I urge the inspectors to press the applicant on the issues I raise in REP7-187 to ensure that the health of local people will not be jeopardised.

The funding of some monitoring of PM2.5 particulate levels is a token gesture. Monitoring needs to be in real time and to be public. The very least we should expect given the size and impact of this infrastructure project is that all pollutants including PM 2.5 and PM10 are in future monitored at our local DEFRA monitoring site, Sibton. Currently only ozone is monitored there.

I draw to the examiners' attention the recent very large reductions in the World Health Organization's recommended limits for air pollution with nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), mainly produced by diesel engines, being 75% lower and PM2.5 being halved (<https://www.who.int/news/item/22-09-2021-new-who-global-air-quality-guidelines-aim-to-save-millions-of-lives-from-air-pollution>). Notably, the environmental lawyers ClientEarth have said this week that legal pollution limits for PM2.5 and NO₂ in the UK were now four times the WHO guidelines, meaning people are exposed to levels far above that known to be acceptable. It is critical that levels of pollutants resulting from Sizewell C construction and operation are kept below the new WHO limits. Moreover, these pollutants must be monitored and publicly reported twice daily (as ozone currently is) at local monitoring stations (Sibton and others), with an effective and immediate plan in place to tackle any exceedances.

Finally, I am dismayed that the proposed desalination plant was introduced to the planning process at such a late stage it could not be considered as part of the ISH on air quality. I am highly concerned about the impact of emissions from this proposal - for humans and precious ecosystems.