

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:36:47

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the report sent to you by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds dated 12th April 2022.

It is evident that the RSPB still have many outstanding issues of concern and there is evidence in para 1.1 of insufficient reassurance that issues have been satisfactorily resolved and secured by the DCO process. This is an unacceptable position given the risk that RSPB Minsmere would be exposed to.

These concerns are expressed throughout the report and lead me to conclude that there are still sufficient uncertainties around the potential impact on Minsmere to mean the Planning Inspectorate must decline the DCO. In para 1.26 the RSPB concludes that 'we cannot conclude that the coastal management scheme is sufficiently advanced to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC.'

In view of the fact that the RSPB and Minsmere Nature Reserve are in the front line of permanent damage if Sizewell C proceeds, all their concerns must be addressed before a decision can be made. As the decision on the DCO cannot be deferred, the decision has to be that the project is unacceptable and must be declined. To allow it to proceed and risk permanent damage to an internationally important nature reserve would be simply catastrophic and constitute an act of ecocide.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:38:09

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the letter to you dated 14th April 2022 from East Suffolk Council.

As the Hard Coastal Defence Features are so critical to the Sizewell C project, these matters should be agreed with ESC before a decision on the DCO is made so that Interested Parties might have the opportunity to comment on any matters raised.

Ideally any decision on the DCO should be delayed until this has happened but if this is not possible then permission for the development must be declined.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:39:09

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the letter to you dated 8th April 2022 from the Environment Agency.

This letter raises the whole question about the acceptability of the proposed desalination plant.

It is unacceptable that this important aspect of the project is still not fully understood. In any event it should be subject to the same rigorous analysis as the original proposal submitted for assessment by the Planning Inspectorate during the public hearing so that all interested parties could assess and challenge the proposals. As they stand, the proposals are totally unacceptable particularly as what was originally proposed as a temporary measure now seems to be permanent. The environmental pollution caused during the lifetime of the desalination plant was not analysed during the public hearing and therefore Sizewell C should be rejected as the original planning application was technically unable to be assessed as it was incomplete.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:39:22

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the letter to you dated 14th April 2022 from the Environment Agency.

In view of the outstanding issues raised by the Environment Agency, the DCO should be rejected as clearly there is insufficient detailed information upon which to make a reasoned decision.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:40:02

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the letter to you dated 14th April 2022 from the Natural England ref Size-SP004. In particular I refer to para 1.6 of that letter which I reproduce below for your convenience.

Natural England have been consulted on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken by the Environment Agency in their role as competent authority, to inform conclusions on the operational Water Discharge Activity (WDA) permit. However, we understand that the HRA remains draft at this time, pending editorial checks. It is then due to undergo a planned public consultation, associated with their proposed decision for this WDA permit. Until the Environment Agency has finalised this HRA, we cannot give unqualified advice as to our views on impacts to the integrity of the sites listed.

In view of this conclusion, it is evident that once again insufficient information is available upon which to make an accurate assessment of the impacts of building Sizewell C nuclear power station and therefore the DCO must be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:41:13

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the report sent to you dated April 2022 Revision 1.0 from the Environment Agency regarding the Updated Position Statement between Szc Co. and the Environment Agency on matters relating to the Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature.

In particular I would refer you to section 2 from which is clear that the Environment Agency remains unsatisfied that all the necessary potential future and /or storm scenarios have been evaluated and that there is no final agreement of Common Ground.

In view of this I question how a fully informed decision on the project can be made and therefore this project must be rejected immediately.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: SizewellC
Subject: Response to Secretary of State's letter to Interested Parties dated 25th April 2022
Date: 22 May 2022 19:41:25

Dear Sirs

I wish to respond to the report sent to you by the ONR dated April 2022 ref CM9 Ref 2022/20680.

In particular I refer to para 8.4 and note the test re protection against aircraft crash. But the more important question is that in the light of the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the threats to NATO countries, what would happen if a missile were to hit Sizewell C? The result would be catastrophic for the UK and it must be noted that the resultant impact of the missile attack would be significantly worse than that of a missile hitting a non-nuclear facility.

For this reason above all else Sizewell C should not be built. The protection of the UK is of significantly more importance than energy from this powerstation particularly as the UK's energy can be supplied from safer means.

The DCO should be declined as the safety of the UK should be paramount.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett
My ref 20026090

From: [REDACTED]
To: SizewellC
Subject: Comments on responses to the SoS's request for further information.
Date: 22 May 2022 19:43:34

My interested party reference 20026090

Dear Sirs

I have read the responses to the Secretary of State's request for further information and whilst I have commented individually on many of these, overall I am staggered by how many responses make reference to the lack of detailed information on many important aspects of the Sizewell C project.

For this to be the situation so late in the planning stage is unacceptable and, quite simply, should lead the Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to decline the DCO.

In addition to this lack of information, it is evident that there are still considerable concerns being expressed by the RSPB, Natural England and other interested parties regarding the potential impacts on RSPB Minsmere. Any damage to this internationally important wildlife reserve would be unacceptable. Indeed any damage to this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty would similarly be a crime against our environment. Furthermore there are unsupported biodiversity claims being made relating to the post construction period both at the construction site and the shingle/dune foreshore.

It should also be noted that the development of Sizewell Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest has unsatisfactory compensation plans as these currently do not meet the Environmental Act 2021. The requirements of this Act should be met fully in all respects.

There is also considerable concern regarding the site flood risk during the operational and decommissioning life of the plant. This is not something to which we should expose future generations particularly as at the moment there is no known way of dealing with the nuclear waste. Furthermore, the plan to deal with the long-term erosion after the operational life of Sizewell B places an unrealistic over-reliance on the Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan.

The lack of potable water supply for the operational phase of the Sizewell C reactors, the inadequate water supply during construction, the potential environmental damage caused by the long term need for a desalination plant (which should have been part of the original application and public hearing), the inadequate plans for dealing with road traffic in advance of starting work on the main site which will lead to heavy and damaging use of the B1122 are other issues which have failed to be properly addressed. All these factors should lead to a rejection of the DCO.

The Secretary of State is quoted as saying that this development will only happen if there is local support. This local support is not there, as evidenced by the considerable opposition expressed during the planning hearing and subsequently with marches and protests against the scheme.

In summary then, there are insufficient details to many of the developer's proposals to make a fully informed decision on this project and this is unacceptable on a development which has such life changing impacts on the environment, local residents and wildlife habitats.

I urge you to make the right decision and decline the DCO.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett