

Deadline 9 Response to ISH11 and ExQ3. Question to the Environment Agency reference the offshore wave-relief features—the Sizewell-Dunwich banks and the inner and outer longshore bars.

This paper is a response to the Applicant's replies to enquiries made by the Planning Inspectorate relating to my documents. Author: Nick Scarr, IP 20025524

#### Question 1 to the Environment Agency:

The Applicant has confirmed that it is using the Sizewell-Dunwich banks (and the inner and outer longshore bars) as immutable offshore wave relief features for all modelling scenarios and epochs and this represents worst-case modelling. This was confirmed at ISH11 and in ExQ2:

*"...the assessment concluded that the Baseline scenario, i.e. with the Sizewell - Dunwich bank in situ, resulted in more conservative (i.e. worst case) nearshore wave conditions than with their removal. As such, the scenario with the bank in place was adopted in the MDS FRA for all scenarios and epochs as a conservative approach." REP7-052 (EN010012-007054-Responses to ExQ2 epages 104-115.*

It was also confirmed at ISH11 according to the Applicant and confirmed in ExQ3 that the Environment Agency fully supports the Applicant's approach:

*"The Environment Agency confirmed in ISH11 (transcript for ISH11 Session 2 epage 3) that they were content with how it was modelled and how it was represented within the flood risk assessment." Responses to the ExA's Third Written Questions (ExQ3) Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses. Epage 67'*

Would the Environment Agency please explain why it fully supports the approach of the Applicant in treating the major offshore wave relief features—the Sizewell-Dunwich banks and the inner and outer longshore bars as immutable (unchanging) over the proposed Sizewell C lifetime and that this approach represents conservative (precautionary) modelling.

My view is that the Applicant's approach is clearly contrary to both academic research and its own research pre-DCO and could represent an underrated flood and erosion risk to the proposed development.

#### Question 2 to the Environment Agency:

The Applicant further states in ExQ3 the following:

*"...If Dunwich Bank were lost or substantially reduced (in extent or elevation) there is a greater potential for erosion of the shoreline around Dunwich and, importantly, the Minsmere – Dunwich Cliffs, resulting in a local increase in the supply of sand and pebbles (i.e., beach shingle) from the cliffs. This sediment would move south and could reduce erosion rates. Reduced erosion rates could tend to increase resistance to flooding over the Minsmere and Sizewell frontages." Responses to the ExA's Third Written Questions (ExQ3) Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses epage 68.*

Does the Environment Agency support the Applicant's position, outlined in the above paragraph?

My view, based on historical precedent and academic research, is that the significant erosional stresses to the shoreline occur due to North-easterly to Easterly storms and consequently that the Dunwich bank specifically protects the shoreline in the area of the proposed Sizewell C and Minsmere.