

GOOD MORNING. I AM STUART IAN ROBSON AND AM AN ALDEBURGH RESIDENT.

WHILST I SHARE OTHERS CONCERNS ABOUT SEALINK'S IMPACT, I WILL SPEAK TODAY ABOUT RELEVANT ASPECTS OF ITS DESIGN AND NEED.

SEALINK'S PURPOSE IS STATED AS BUILDING GRID RESILIENCE WHICH THE APPLICANT TOLD ME MEANS INCREASING CAPACITY AND REMOVING THE VULNERABILITY DERIVING FROM SIZEWALL'S SINGLE OVERHEAD CABLE CONNECTION FOR THE 30 MILE RUN SOUTH TO BRAMFORD.

TURNING FIRST TO CAPACITY, WITH SIZEWALL C'S START UP DATE NOW PUSHED BACK TO THE MID 2030'S, NAUTILUS RELOCATED TO GRAIN AND LIONLINK UNCONSENTED THE JUSTIFICATION ON CAPACITY GROUNDS ALONE SEEMS WEAK. ALSO I SEE SIZEWALL B & C'S COMBINED POWER IS TO BE CARRIED BY OVERHEAD WIRES ALONE BETWEEN THE SIZEWALL SITE AND FRISTON. SO PLEASE LOOK CLOSELY AT THE CAPACITY JUSTIFICATION.

TURNING TO THE SINGLE LINE VULNERABILITY. REMOVING THIS THROUGH SEALINK SEEMS HIGHLY SENSIBLE. EXCEPT THAT THE PROPOSALS DON'T CURRENTLY DELIVER THAT BETWEEN SIZEWALL AND FRISTON.

THIS MEANS AN EVENT AT JUST ONE PYLON IN THAT STRETCH COULD TAKE ALL SIZEWALL B&C PRODUCED POWER OFF GRID. SPENDING BILLIONS ON SEALINK BUT LEAVING SUCH A VULNERABILITY ISN'T SENSIBLE SO I URGE YOU TO INVESTIGATE FURTHER.

THE APPLICANTS SAY THEY WANTED TO TERMINATE AT SIZEWALL BUT WERE TOLD THERE WAS NO SUITABLE SPACE. IT IS THEIR APPARENT INABILITY TO QUESTION THAT WHICH HAS LED DIRECTLY TO ALL THE EXTRA INFRASTRUCTURE NOW PROPOSED IN EAST SUFFOLK.

AND IN MY VIEW THE REAL ISSUE HERE IS NOT OF COURSE SPACE AT SIZEWALL AS THE AREA SEALINK REQUIRES IS VERY SMALL. INSTEAD, THE RESPONSE LIKELY RESULTS FROM DISJOINTED THINKING AND EXCESSIVE CAUTION AMONGST THE MULTIPLE PARTIES THAT OWN AND OPERATE AT SIZEWALL.

THE GOOD NEWS IS THAT, AS THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY, YOU HAVE THE ABILITY TO SCRUTINISE WHY FULL DUAL ROUTING ISNT BEING DELIVERED AND I URGE AN ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING ON THS ISSUE.

TO ASSIST I WILL NOW GIVE YOU THREE REASONS WHY THE NO ROOM AT SIZEWALL RESPONSE MAY BE WRONG.

FIRSTLY, THIS JUNE IT WAS ANNOUNCED THAT THE OLD SIZEWALL A TURBINE HALL HAD BEEN DEMOLISHED CLEARING AN AREA THE SIZE OF A FOOTBALL PITCH FOR UNSPECIFIED FUTURE USE. THE QUESTION YOU WILL WANT TO EXAMINE IS WHY NOT USE THAT SPARE LAND FOR SEALINK.

LIVING LOCALLY, I KNOW ALSO THERE ARE MANY STAFF NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE DAY TO DAY OPERATION OF SIZEWALL B WORKING ON SITE. COULD THEY NOT BE RELOCATED TO A NEARBY OFFSITE OFFICE?

ALSO EDF STATE THAT 750 PEOPLE WORK AT SIZEWALL B WHICH EXPLAINS THE SIZE OF THE ON SITE CAR PARK. BUT THERE ARE NOW TWO REMOTE CAR PARKS ESTABLISHED WITH BUS TRANSPORT FOR SIZEWALL C WORKERS. PERHAPS THOSE SAME REMOTE PARKS COULD BE USED TO REDUCE ONSITE PARKING TO NUCLEAR OPERATION CRITICAL ROLES ONLY.

TO CLOSE, AN ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING TO INVESTIGATE TERMINATING SEALINK WITHIN THE SIZEWALL SITE TO DELIVER FULL DUAL ROUTING AS WELL AS TO CONSIDER THE CAPACITY NEED WOULD BE OF HUGE BENEFIT TO ALL.

THANK YOU