



IP no: 20026281

Dear Mrs McKay and fellow Planning Inspectors,

We now find ourselves at the end of what has often felt like a long, frustrating, planning inquiry on the SZC DCO. After observing and participating in the ISH's, at times an eye-opening experience, I have to say the lack of detail and the constant changes to the DCO, by the applicant, has made the whole process extremely difficult for IPs to respond to and I commend and support all the excellent reports and submissions sent to the EXA by IPs. The majority of these submissions were from local people, fearful for their property, livelihoods and mental health. Others including the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife are rightly concerned for the abundant wildlife sanctuaries surrounding the development. The silence at RSPB Minsmere always strikes me as something that can't and won't be mitigated.

A huge amount of time and commitment by local campaign groups has gone into raising awareness and supporting those affected by the build and there has been massive local support for the campaigns, culminating in a beach gathering in September that saw over 600 folks from all over Suffolk form a human wall where the sea defences will destroy the landscape.

At no fault of the EXA, I feel it was extremely regrettable that both the MMO and Natural England did not have the resources to attend the DCOs. Both are partly Government funded public bodies and therefore it is in the public interest for them to attend the hearings on such an important DCO, in such a sensitive part of Suffolk.

There were so many questions directed at NE and all remained unanswered at the ISHs. The EA constantly referred back to NE position and even the applicant seemed surprised NE were not in attendance, although managed to turn it to their advantage. It would also have been useful to hear the MMO response to yet more unanswered questions on the Marine environment and later the desalination plant.

I also found, at times, the applicants QC was rather patronising and dismissive to IPs and some may have found this attitude intimidating, especially in a process unfamiliar to many.

### **Desalination Plant**

Although the applicant tried to reassure us that the desal plant will be 'temporary' what I fail to understand is, that if, NWL cannot supply the water for the safe operation of the stations, a polluting desal plant would have to be permanent or the plant could not operate. A future planning application for a treatment plant would hardly be turned down if the plant was near completion. The applicant has been aware of the lack of water in the area for years and as East Anglia is one of the driest parts of the country and with our fast-changing climate, who knows what water shortages lay ahead. A Nuclear Power Station should not be given planning permission without a reliable water

source, guaranteed by the relevant water company, for at least 60 years plus decommissioning. We should not be leaving future generations to deal with problems that could be exacerbated by climate change.

My ongoing concerns are many. Sizewell was one of several sites identified throughout the UK and it now seems probable, the most environmentally sensitive of all the sites and should never have been chosen as the front runner. The applicant constantly referred to the urgent need throughout the DCO examination but the building of SZC will take many years and the damage caused through construction will not help the urgent need for reduction of CO2 in the next decade, it will add to it.

I urge the EXA to advise the Secretary of State that this is the wrong place for such a damaging build.

Jennifer Kirtley