



The Planning Inspectorate

The Sizewell C Project

A report of responses to the Preliminary Meeting Participation Form

Contents:

[Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introductions](#)

[Agenda Item 2: The Examining Authority's \(ExA\) remarks about the virtual Preliminary Meeting](#)

[Agenda Item 3: The ExA's remarks about the Examination process](#)

[Agenda Item 4: Initial Assessment of Principal Issues](#)

[Agenda Item 5: The Applicant's proposed changes to the application](#)

[Agenda Item 6: Draft Examination Timetable](#)

- Deadlines for submissions and notifications
- Dates and format for hearings
- Arrangements for site inspections

[Agenda Item 7: Procedural Decisions taken by the ExA](#)

[Agenda Item 8: Any other matters](#)

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and introductions			
1	Cllr Michael Simons	Darsham Parish Council	Failure to visit Northern Park & Ride site and area
2	Peter Etheridge		1. I think item 5 should be discussed before 4 2. The dates conflict with election preparations and councillors will not be allowed to participate if discussions run into a second day.
3	Tim Beach	Snape Parish Council	To discuss the process throughout the hearings.
4	Alan Hatt		
5	Colin Palmer		<p>I will confirm that I wish to speak. * I note from the Wylfa report that any new nuclear proposals must include an approved and funded decommissioning programme. Can you please confirm whether the ExA will examine EDF's decommissioning programme and determine whether it gains their approval. *I also note that Para 5.8.4 of the Wylfa reports states that the Wylfa planning application was withdrawn at a late stage due to the lack of agreement on funding arrangements with the UK Government. Can you please confirm that the ExA's brief will include a thorough examination of the scheme's funding arrangements; it would help if you could give early advice of the timescale envisaged when you would expect to determine whether the funding arrangements were for Sizewell C were fully approved. * It is understood that East Suffolk District Council is placing a lot of support for its stand in favour of Sizewell C on their belief that the plant would be "low carbon". Do you expect that the ExA will examine the applicant's proposals on carbon emissions and control? * The complex contractual and funding arrangements supporting the construction and operation of Sizewell C would fall onto at least two foreign companies and countries [France and China]. These arrangements will cover building, financing, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of this multi billion pound installation; these arrangements are fraught with practical, financial, legal and translation problems. Please advise whether your brief will encompass examination of these complex issues. * The Strike Price for Wylfa was offered at £75 per mwh. Please advise whether in examining the Strike Price for Sizewell C you will make an early announcement stating whether or not the Price appears sufficient to justify to balance the scheme's financial calculations. * The December 2020 Energy White Paper calls for the future electricity bills to be "affordable". Do you envisage making an announcement on whether the scheme would be "affordable". * The Energy White Paper further states that the Government will liaise with Developers to form a new Advanced Nuclear Fund of up to £385m to develop Small Modular Reactors[SMRs], for which the UK is looking for partners. In its Press Release of 11 February 2021, Rolls Royce, one of UK's world renowned scientific and manufacturing companies, reported that its consortium [which includes the UK</p>

			government] is already well advanced with the "feasibility and investability" phase in the development of SMRs. Please advise whether the ExA will keep abreast of the SMR work and include reference to application of such plants in the UK's power needs. The Press Release includes valuable information on the design concepts, power output ranges, applications and financial feasibility. Such a development would be a remarkable achievement for Rolls Royce and its consortium partners; in addition it would place the UK back into the science and engineering of nuclear power. Hence coupled with the huge success of our wind farms and other renewable power supplies would obviate the need for Sizewell C. Colin Palmer
6	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
7	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter
8	Michael J.Taylor		The sequence of the process especially addressing Policy and Need.
9	Stantec	Suffolk Constabulary	General introduction from Suffolk Constabulary.
10	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.
11	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	This Item is for all to participate in.
12	Clive Lovelock		X
13	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.

14	David Peter Napier GRANT		I believe that Item 5 should precede Item 4
15	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	Introduction
16	Mr S Dorcey		Use of Size well Gap Rd for the 1st two years
17	Emma Bateman	Darsham Parish Council	Effects on groundwater and surface water, including Source Protection Zones, water dependent resources and receptors from the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.
Agenda Item 2: The Examining Authority's (ExA) remarks about the virtual Preliminary Meeting			
1	Alex Johnston		Require clearer understanding regarding criteria for Planning consent
2	Paul Collins	Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group	Item 5 should be considered before item 4 as the acceptance of the Applicant's proposed changes will have impacts into the Assessment of Principal Issues in item 4.
3	Alan Collett		Because a decision has not yet been made by the ExA on the revisions submitted by EDF to the application there is confusion around what EDF's proposal are now. Agenda item 5 must be dealt with before other agenda items can be considered.
4	Ian Rose		1. Having read Annex B I consider that item 5 is crucial enough to the examination to be considered before item 4.
5	Robert Flindall		Item 2 - The Agenda for the Preliminary Meeting Item 4 and Item 5 should be ordered differently.
6	Kim Vanhinsbergh		Seems items 4 and 5 are in the wrong order.
7	Robert Flindall		I would suggest that agenda item 4 and Item 5 are in the wrong order.
8	June Holmes		Agenda items 4 and 5 are in the wrong order. EDF have made additional changes to the original application to be discussed in item 5. These need to be discussed before item 4 is introduced . The impact could be immense. There is insufficient information on the detailsfor example the temporary BLF was not what we were consulted on NOR is it what is now being proposed. This must be reviewed by being addressed before attempting item 4 The discussion of agenda items should flow there is great risk that decisions in item 5 will greatly impact Item 4.

9	Peter Etheridge		I am concerned that investigation into the onshore work to be carried out by EDF have not been sufficiently investigated.
10	Anne Westover		It would seem more logical if Item 5 was considered prior to Item 4. The applicant has made proposed changes to the application which may affect topics to consider.
11	Paul Whitby	Martlesham Parish Council	Propose to reverse the order of items 4 and 5, as topics covered in item 5 will be relevant to item 4.
12	Paul B. Taylor		It seems to me that Items 4 & 5 are in the wrong order. The Annexes seem to be in the right order (ie. Annex B refers to Item 5; Annex C to Item 4).
13	Nigel Smith		I wonder if item 5 should come before item 4 given that the "principal issues" do not take account of those that have arisen in the light of EDF's revised proposals.
14	Amanda Taylor		I think that Items 4 and 5 should be switched please. The Annexes are in the right order - as in, Annex B refers to Item 5 and Annex C to Item 4.
15	Paul Tillcock		I believe that with complexities of this application and the fact that there are other energy projects in planning and with the Covid restrictions (hopefully being listed soon) as well as local government elections that the formal hearings should be delayed until we can meet you on a face to face basis
16	Sheila Galpin		Items 4 and 5 on the agenda are the wrong way round. The principal issues cannot be examined as the relevant representations submitted last September were based on the original EDF proposals and did not include the revised proposals.
17	Julie Tillcock		I HOPE THAT WITH THE LIFTING OF COVID RESTRICTIONS AND THAT LOCAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS AND THE FACT THAT EDF HAVE MADE CHANGES THAT THE PRELIMANRY MEETINGS CAN BE EXTENDED TO THOUROUGHLY GO THROUGH MATTERS AND HAVE ONE TO ONE MEETINGS NOT VIRTUAL
18	Marie Curtin		EDF has submitted proposed changes which are under consideration by the Planning Inspectorate and covered under Agenda Item 5. However Agenda Item 4 covers the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues which may be impacted by Agenda Item 5. Could the order of these be reversed? Thank you.
19	Philip Gough		Item 4 should not be placed before item 5 because the former will not include reaction to EDF's revised proposals.
20	Ian Patterson		It would seem sensible to take item 5 about EDF's revised proposals before coming to item 4, in order to allow people to comment on the impact of the revised proposals.
21	Nigel Hiley		On the agenda, Item 4 is listed as the initial assessment of the principal issues to be examined and item 5 is the applicant's proposed changes to the application. In meetings, it is customary for a motion to be introduced and then any amendments to the motion. The amendments are then discussed and voted on before there is any discussion of the main (un)amended motion. So, it seems illogical for item 4 to be

			discussed before item 5 as item 5 introduces changes to the submission and therefore issues arising from the proposed changes are not included.
22	Rosie Norton		I do not know at this stage what the issues are in Item 4 as at the moment I do not know if PINs has accepted all the additional changes that were submitted by EDF after the 30 September deadline. Therefore Agenda Item 4 is almost an unknown to normal members of the public, but to be on the safe side I may want to speak here.
23	Michael Wade		*I am concerned that Item 4 (which covers the principal issues) should come after Item 5 (EDF's revised proposals) *
24	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
25	Alison Downes	Stop Sizewell C (Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell Ltd)	The order of Items 4 and 5 should be reversed, as the discussion about the Applicant's revised proposals (item 5) will likely raise matters to be included in the Assessment of Principal Issues
26	Simon Mellen		I am uncertain I will be able to fully assess all the information included in the changes submitted by EDF
27	Francesca Mellen		If EDFs changes are accepted by PINs then we cannot be sure of our assessment of issues at item 4 will be complete.
28	Southwold Town Council	Southwold Town Council	Item 4 and 5 are in the wrong order
29	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter'
30	Nicholas Burfield		It seems to me that items 4 and 5 need to be transposed. The current agenda running order in relation to those two items means that EDF's revised proposals for examination will be considered after, and separately from, the Examining Authority's consideration of the principal issues thus excluding them from their logical and appropriate point in the deliberations.
31	Caroline Weatherby		querie about issues at item 4, in view of changes to be discussed at item 5, which surely should come before?
32	Michael J.Taylor		Agree with all your issues especially Policy and Need. Correctness of a revised EN6 for Sizewell C especially size of site/access, constructability, town water, flood risk and climate change and AONB/SSSI etc. BEIS had agreed should be in accord with IAEA siting standards. Issues which our regulators should have been involved in for an updated policy EN6. Regrettably there has been no regulatory involvement

			in Policy which is why I believe it is vital that all regulators views are able to be judged on all information from the developer and given adequate time to feed in to the planning process. Even if the planning process takes longer than the statutory 6 months. BEIS have failed to recognise the importance of the many regulatory views and licences in this extremely complicated planning procedure, reference your Annexe 11 advice.
33	Cllr David Beavnn	Green, Liberal Democrat and Independent Group on East Suffolk Council	The proposed changes in Item 5 should be covered before the issues in item 4.
34	Nigel Hiley	Saxmundham Town Council	The town council feels that it is wrong to consider the principal issues in Item 4 before it considers the changes that EDF has made to the submission document.
35	David Mears		Items 4 and 5 are in the wrong order.
36	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.
37	Susan Osben		Please could we have Agenda item 5 before Agenda item 4 so that we can know which of EDF's revised proposals, if any, are being accepted for the examination?
38	William R J Turnbull		The order of Items 4 and 5 on the agenda is illogical. Item 5 should be discussed before item 4.
39	Greg Walsh		The order of items 4 and 5 is inverted.
40	John and Amanda Sutherell		Agenda Sequence not in logical order. Applicant's proposed changes to the application (current Item 5) needs to be taken BEFORE Initial Assessment of Principle Issuers (current Item 4). The reason being that, if these proposed changes are accepted it might well affect the contents of the list of principle issues.
41	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	No specific points but would like the chance to comment if thought appropriate

42	Gwen Erskine-Hill		I believe that items 4 and 5 should be reversed. The applicant's proposed changes should be reviewed first in case that results in additional principal issues being identified.
43	Frances Crowe		Agenda items 4 and 5 seem to be in the wrong order. We need to know whether the applicant's proposed changes have been accepted in order to assess what needs to be included in the principal issues. The initial assessment of principal issues is based on our relevant representations which were submitted before the applicant unexpectedly launched a further consultation and amended elements of their application. We should not be disadvantaged by the applicant's late request to make significant changes.
44	Arthur Stansfield		If item 5 is accepted it will impact item 4, so the order of these two items should be swapped
45	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	ATC wishes to comment on the agenda of the PMs especially with regard to the order of items 4 and 5 as we believe we cannot identify the specific issues for ISHs before changes to the DCO are discussed (for example the temporary and permanent BLF). We also believe part 2 of the PMs should be delayed for at least 6 weeks until after the SCC elections, and until other interested parties and matters related to the changes proposed by the Applicant have been discussed/agreed, and to enable the DCO process and outcomes to benefit from full democratic participation, and increased non-virtual access as Covid-19 restrictions ease. We do not believe it is in anyone's interest (except the Applicant) to push ahead with part 2 of the PM, which will in turn immediately trigger the start of the 6 month Examination phase. As it stands the timing for Part 1 of the PM is extremely difficult for ATC as we are fully engaged in the DCO for SPR EA1N and EA2 which are still in process until 6th April.
46	Mrs Marilyn Checkley		Item 4 to become no. 5 as the contents of Item 5 from EDF are new. Item 5 to change to no. 4.
47	Marilyn Hands		I wonder if item 5 should come before item 4 given that the "principal issues" do not take account of those that have arisen in the light of EDF's revised proposals
48	Simon Ilett		I believe that the the Applicant's proposed changes to the application at item 5 should be considered and discussed before the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues at item 4 as the changes in particular to the beach landing facility are principal issues
49	SIMON ILETT	ST PETER'S CHURCH THEBERTON	Item 5 must be considered before 4 on the agenda
50	Charles Croydon		I request to speak on Item 2 as if the Planning Inspector accepts EDF's changes other issues will arise

51	SALLY ILETT		The applicants changes in item 5 should be discussed before item 4 as they are principal issues such as beach landing facility
52	Bill Parker		I would like to highlight that agenda item 4 – initial assessment of principle issues is before item 5 proposed changes from the applicant. I wish to suggest that these items are reversed to be more logical as it will be clearer for all to understand which of the applicants amendments have been accepted prior to identifying the key issues.
53	Anthony Ingram		Our assessment of issues at Item 4 cannot be complete, as other issues will arise if PINs accept EDF's changes which are to be discussed at Item 5 on the agenda
54	Patricia Dowding		Agenda Items 4 & 5 would appear to be in the wrong order. See comments under those Items
55	Neil Poole		The Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (Item4) should not be considered until we know whether The Applicant's proposed changes to the application (Item5) have been accepted and how they will be examined.
56	Brigitte D'Angelo		I believe the order is wrong. Item 4 should come after item 5. Also the temporary Beach landing facility is not as consulted on.
57	Brigitte D'Angelo	Rendham Parish Council	We believe the order is incorrect, that item 4 should come after item 5. Also the proposed temporary Beach landing facility is not what was proposed in recent consultation.
58	Henry Franklin		It is not possible to be explicit as to whether the list of principal issues is complete given that there is still scope for EDF to include further changes. On this basis, it is unclear what DCO documents I should be reviewing and responding to and the EDF changes that may or may not be accepted may in themselves be material.
59	Clive Lovelock		X
60	Joanne Peters	Sudbourne Parish Council	The Parish Council notes that agenda item 4 – initial assessment of principle issues is before item 5 proposed changes from the applicant. The Council would like to propose that these items are reversed to be more logical as it will be clearer for all to understand which of the applicants amendments have been accepted prior to identifying the key issues.
61	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
62	Stephen Brett	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	Item 5 should be considered before you consider the assessment of principal issues.

63	LJ Dowley		Items 4 and 5 appear to be in the wrong order
64	LJ Dowley		Items 4 and 5 should presumably be dealt with in reverse order
65	Joanne Peters	Wickham Market Parish Council	WMPC believe it would be helpful if Agenda item 5 was heard prior to Agenda Item 4 as EDF have submitted proposed changes which we do not yet know will be accepted by the examining authority. We would like to reiterate our concerns about the examination taking place during a pandemic and the difficulty that a virtual examination will cause for full engagement with the process, access to documents, liaison with the community and communication generally.
66	David Peter Napier GRANT		I believe that the hearing should not be hybrid; as a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner. This is an extremely complex scheme and the more elderly are challenged to represent their case well electronically
67	Michael Gower		Like others i would like to see which of the elements including in item 5 are to be accepted before we discuss the "principal issues" - so we might wish to reorder the agenda
68	Jennifer Kirtley		I feel item 4 & 5 are in the wrong order as I'm not sure that my assessment of some of the issues I commented on in my Relevant Representations will stay the same if the Planning Expectorate excepts the 17 changes EDF submitted after the closing date in September.
69	William Kendall		I wish to express dismay that the preliminary meeting is being held virtually when there are so many issues to be raised and many interested participants will be unable to or uncomfortable joining virtually.
70	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	The hearing should not be hybrid. As a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner.
71	Paul Clarke		I think it would be more helpful to have agenda item 5 -proposed changes to application - addressed before item 4 - assessment of principal issues. There may be issues raised by the proposed changes which should be considered as principal issues but were not known when initial representations were submitted
72	Fiona Judge		It is not clear that the issues at item 4 will be complete as other issues will arise if PINs accept EDFs changes. These changes are going to be discussed at item 5 of the agenda. I am concerned about the examination taking place during the pandemic and difficulty of accessing, discussing and examining documents and data being restricted to online methods.
73	Anne-Marie Robb		I believe item 4 and 5 are in the wrong order
74	Bridget Chadwick		Not sure our assessment of issues at Item 4 will be complete, as other issues will arise if PINs accept EDF's changes which are to be discussed at Item 5 on the agenda.

75	Peter Chadwick		I cannot be sure my assessment of issues at Item 4 will be complete, as other issues will arise if PINs accept EDF's changes which are to be discussed at Item 5 on the annex C will cover everything in the light of the applicants introducing new plans
76	Peter Chadwick	Save Our Sandlings (as Chairman of SOS)	I cannot be sure my assessment of issues at Item 4 will be complete, as other issues will arise if PINs accept EDF's changes which are to be discussed at Item 5 on the annex C will cover everything in the light of the applicants introducing new plans
77	Nicola Pilkington		Agenda items 4 and 5 are in the wrong place as the proposed changes that EDF submitted on the 11th of January 2021 to PINS have not been formally accepted. My Relevant Representation submitted at the end of September 2020 does not include the possibility to comment on these new as yet to be accepted plans.
78	Sonya Exton		The ability for all to access this PM in it's virtual state is still by the fact that not all interested parties wishing to speak may have the technology or confidence to do so. Question the positioning of Items 4 and 5, in that Item 5 refers to the proposed changes to the application and material changes. Item 4 refers to Principle Issues that are likely to relate to the changes in Item 5.
79	John Baker		because we don't know what details will be missed in Item 4 we may want to speak here.
80	Robert Hoggar		Item 2: Agenda for Preliminary Meeting. Clauses 5 and 4 were the wrong way about when presented. Should have been sorted before 4. Helping to sort the seventeen changes EDF suddenly put into the application as an addendum. and EDF issued a Consultation Document last November /December 2020. Not yet resolved. Not concluded yet.
81	Emma Bateman		Marine ecology and fisheries
Agenda Item 3: The ExA's remarks about the Examination process			
1	Julian Cusack		I wish to seek assurances that appropriate provision will be made for the views of local people to one hear and taken into account
2	Anne Westover		I am of the opinion that the examination should be delayed until the examination can be heard in a public arena (not virtual) in order that the complex issues can be properly debated with documentation available for all parties to study.
3	Paul Tillcock		See my comments above but also that during these preliminary meetings there are local elections being conducted is there any way that the initial process can be delayed until after the elections. This would also allow additional time for everybody to examine and respond on the EDF changes if you are to accept

			them this would also allow the local representatives to concentrate on the Sizewell C application as the SSE one would be coming to an end.
4	Alan Hatt		Written Ministerial Statement of Energy Infrastructure. EN1 and EN6. for Nuclear Power Generation to installations running by 2025. EN1 & EN6 though out of date and time govt. state "no relevant change of circumstances" means those policies stand. Absolutely wrong, great deal has changed, especially the assumptions that were made to produce the document.
5	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
6	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter
7	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizewell c construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.
8	John and Amanda Sutherell		The point about Agenda sequence made in para 10 above, if that has not been taken under Item 2
9	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	No specific points but would like the chance to comment if thought appropriate
10	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	Based on our extensive experience of participation in the DCO for SPR EA1N and EA2 we have information to inform the discussion, and wish to reserve the right to speak.
11	Louise Staples	National Farmers' Union	Agricultural issues including the impact on agricultural businesses, the impact on soils and land drainage.
12	Andrew McDonald		Applicant's failure to address significant development impact issues in a timely fashion throughout all phases of the consultation.

13	James Lawson	East of England Ambulance NHS Trust	- Provide a Coronavirus Position & Service Update - in light of its Resource Escalation Action Plan status (REAP level); - Implications arising for meeting the examination deadlines for evidence, relevant representation summaries, Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) & responses to any relevant submissions from the ExA Panel, applicant & other interested parties; - Special dispensation requested for extended timelines for EEAST submissions - to be precluded from any 'unreasonable behaviour' grounds;
14	Clive Lovelock		X
15	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
16	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	1. The hearing should not be hybrid. As a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner.
17	William Kendall		The proposal is that videoconferencing has severe limitations as are described in the notice letter. It is contemplated that the process will remain focused to avoid this. This underlines the fact that a virtual process is an inadequate means of conducting such an important meeting and is likely to lead to subsequent challenge.
18	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
19	Gregory Jones QC	Belinda Grant	ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk> [A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding [B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD ("SLR") Highways Adverse

			Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road
20	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	The hearing should not be hybrid. As a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner.
Agenda Item 4: Initial Assessment of Principal Issues			
1	Susan Margaret Morrice		The main issues being discussed are based on the representation submitted in September 2020. Since then EDF have revised their proposals. The revised proposals need to be examined alongside the original proposals.
2	Regan Scott		The listing here is alphabetical, and as a draft acceptably neutral. Some Principal Issues are linked e.g air quality and Climate Change and Policy and Need. The imperative theming (CO2/Net Zero) cuts across these. Might they be regrouped, or taken sequentially? Secondly, IROPI is under Biodiversity and Ecology, but crucially involves Policy and Need, apart from compensation and Appropriate Assessment issues. Can B&E and P&N be taken together or sequentially? How does Sustainability get discussed - under Policy & Need (PS1, NP6- NP6 Review etc) or Cumulative Impact -? 8-12 or more years impacts is a thematic principle. These questions arise from our Rel. Rep's concentration on "Pillars 2 and 3", though we will want to submit on some of EIA Pillar 1.
3	Laurence Moss		Air Quality - locally there is a concern that the Hearing may only consider air quality and air pollution within the site [which is certainly the focus for EDF], and not consider the wider community who will suffer from increases in air pollution - its effect on local people with respiratory problems, and the negative effects of pollution on educational attainment in schools next to feeder transport routes. Given the recent distressing case of Ella Kissi Debrah in South London (and legal ruling) more and more local people have prioritised air quality as an important issue, backed up by many citizen scientists and action groups who are monitoring the air quality. We want to be assured that the Hearing will give time to a consideration of the issue of air quality for the people of East Suffolk, and not just concentrate on SZC site issues, as we are all aware that air pollution can spread out from the site. We are particularly concerned with increases of NO2 levels resulting from increased traffic flow through Suffolk, and fine particulate PM2.5 pollution from varying sources.
4	Ian KH Galloway		As I understand it, the Principal Issues may have been determined by reference to the Relevant Representations made in later summer 2020 and therefore possibly prior to EDF bringing forward their late revisions to their proposals. Consequently, is it possible some issues may have alluded the determination of the Principal Issues? Perhaps Agenda Item 5 could precede Agenda Item 4 to ensure the inclusion of any issues pertaining to EDF's latter submission(s)?

5	Paul Collins	Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group	There are several areas that do not appear to have been included in the Initial Assessment of Principle issues including new items in the applicants proposed changes. Even ignoring those there is no specific mention of the Hard Coastal Defence and Soft Coastal Defence facilities and their potential impacts to the north and south of the site. These will also be impacted further assuming the Applicant's Changes are accepted. Whilst Carbon footprint is in the list, it is unclear whether this item will examine both the footprint of the build, its contribution to net-zero and the ongoing footprint of operation determined by the Life Cycle Assessment for an EPR station, which has not been submitted or published even during the Hinkley Point examination.
6	Julian Cusack		I wish to speak to the negative impact on the wellbeing of local people arising from the proposed denial of access to currently accessible walking routes, wildlife sites and landscapes with particular reference to Sizewell marshes and adjacent high value habitats
7	Alan Collett		In the list of Principle Issues 1. Under the section Radiological considerations should be added consideration of whether an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be a location for the storage of spent nuclear waste. 2. Consideration should be given to the impact of a nuclear explosion caused either by mechanical malfunction or terrorist attack and whether the location for Sizewell C is suitable given its proximity to urban development. 3. Since the DCO was submitted two report have been released relating to the impact of business decision on the world's biodiversity - the Dasgupta Review - The economics of biodiversity and the UN report - Making peace with Nature. In view of these, to the Principle Issues should be added a consideration of whether the recommendations in these reports relating to pricing in the cost to Nature of this development and the cost relating to the natural resources used during the construction and operating life of Sizewell C has been explicitly and correctly factored into the application.
8	Ian Rose		Agenda Item 4 EDFs proposals on sea defences and the impact of coastal erosion on this vulnerable coast should be considered. Also the effects of construction traffic on the local environment, on roads and access visitors and the proposed positioning of the workers accommodation in one entirely unsuitable location.
9	Roy Dowding		My previously submitted Representation is affected by issues arising from EDF's revised proposals, which have not yet been decided upon by PINS.
10	Edwina Galloway	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council is concerned that Relevant Representations made prior to the 5th Consultation exclude material issues created as a consequence of the amended proposals. As a lack of attention to detail has been evident in all the consultation rounds, it is important for clarity, that consideration is given to the order of proceedings.

11	Robert Flindall		<p>Item 4 - Initial Assessment of Principal Issues to be examined.</p> <p>Since it is based on our Relevant Representations submitted up to September 2020, issues arising from EDF's revised proposals will not be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 4 should come after item 5. • The Principal Issues must include coastal erosion, not just as a result of climate change; and more specifically examine the developer's proposed sea defenses and their impact. • The Climate Change issue should include the contribution of the proposed development project to the Government's target of net zero.
12	Wendy Cooper		<p>More information is required regarding coastal erosion and EDF sea defences.</p> <p>Agenda Item 4 cannot really be discussed until the materiality of the proposed changes at Agenda item 5 have been decided.</p>
13	Kim Vanhinsbergh		<p>Items 4 and 5 should be the other way round. There is no point discussing principal issues that might be changed in item 5.</p>
14	Robert Flindall		<p>My Relevant Representations were submitted in September 2020; issues arising from EDF's revised proposals were not included.</p> <p>Item 4 should follow item 5.</p> <p>The Principal Issues must include coastal erosion; not just as a result of climate change. And more specifically should examine EDF's sea defenses and their impact.</p> <p>The Climate Change issue should include the contribution of the project to the Government's target of net zero.</p>
15	Clare Rizzo		<p>Degradation of AONB and nature especially in relation to Minsmere</p> <p>Damage to tourism economy</p> <p>Rising sea levels and coastal erosion</p>
16	William John Rea Price		<p>The issues we raised in our relevant representation have now been superseded by EDF's revised submissions which will not it seems be considered in this agenda item which means that only partial consideration will be possible</p>
17	June Holmes		<p>To deal with Item 4 there will be points coming from the alterations listed under item 5 these need to be readdressed or full discussion on item 4 issues is not complete</p> <p>As well as this additional areas I wish to raise are</p>

			<p>1. Coastal erosion...hard and soft coastal defence is very vague in the plan .it needs to be a discussion area in its own right. If the planning inspectorate is expecting the nuclear safety body to take care, monitor and regulate coastal erosion. It should be lay out expectations for us all to see .Currently there is no structured proposals as to how this is to be .Coasts both north and south of the site will potentially have erosion effects and how is EDF going to monitor this.This needs to be discussed as an independent section to climate change.The proposals from EDF for their sea defences need to be examined in full details</p> <p>2. Carbon Impact and emissions ...this section should also include evidenced details of when the project will attain net zero status. How many years into the life of the reactor before it is CO2 equivalent should be discussed and evidenced.</p> <p>3.Noise and vibration.... currently Hinckley Point residents local to the site have been given high powered ear defenders to wear in their gardens because of noise. Please raise with EDF their plans for noise and the issue of ear defenders to the local populace .The house prices will in the local area be devalued because residents cannot make full use of their gardens.due to injurious noise , currently there is a time limit set on triple glazing but this should be open ended to protect the community in the local of the site and on road sides....please raise with EDF compensations to be paid on sale of homes that does not have a time limit imposition and a regulatory framework to monitor this.</p> <p>4.Compulsory acquisition. Where EDF have issued potential CPD notices to residents and land owners and logged the potential with any one who has a charge on the said land , E.g. A mortgage company ...they have not removed these when their interest in the land has been removed . please review land acquisitions procedures with EDF and the monitoring of their responsibilities not to hinder or hold up future house sales due to these potential notices still laying with the mortgage companies .</p> <p>5. Traffic and Transport ...please discuss and review the use of the suitability for safety of the A1122 in light of world wide nuclear disasters . EDF do not liane with the community , they have never wanted a D2 option from day one and this dog leg using the A1122 will not be completed for several years into the build, which means ambulance , general traffic, farm traffic and the increased HGV s are using a road that is little more than a country lane. EDF have continually promised highway mitigation measures but there are still no final package of measures produced for public consultation . . These need to be produced and publically discussed. Can the planning inspectorate have all public discussion for the proposed Sizewell link road and associated transport measures realistically done in 6 months? EDF needs to produce any package first. The D2road option should be looked at by the Planning inspectorate as a serious option</p> <p>6. Socioeconomic. ..Currently at Hinckley , “local “ for workers and locale is considered to be 19 minutes</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>drive from the site. This means that the very small local /local communities are not considered sufficiently in EDF s plans Please discuss that EDF have a plan for very local communities as well as wider communities in it plans for using local workers and community development .</p> <p>7. Cost . Please raise a point of discussion on Cost and how EDF propose this planning and upheaval is to be funded .</p> <p>8. community involvement. I want to ensure that the planning inspectorate understand that EDF do not work with the local community they do what they want and just carry on regardless . You need to be aware when bringing them to account.</p>
18	Martin Cooper		<p>EDF having changed their proposals from those they submitted in 2020 it has become difficult to assess the impact the new proposals will have. The impact of coastal erosion and EDF's proposals, for instance, make it difficult for us to judge the outcome of these and related issues. There is a need to extend the time required to properly examine them.</p>
19	Anne Westover		<p>Traffic issues relating to B roads in vicinity of SP&R site, in particularly significant increase in traffic passing through Wickham Market.</p> <p>Landscape impact, on the coastal area, AONB and cumulative impacts with other energy infrastructure projects. Apparent lack of a comprehensive landscape strategy to deal with landscape management and cumulative impacts on landscape character.</p>
20	Lynda Whitbread		<p>have concerns on all aspects of the plan to build a nuclear power station at Sizewell. The following bullet points are only a brief synopsis of my views.</p> <p>1. We have concerns over the construction of such a large development over such a long period of time in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and on a Heritage Coastline, next to RSPB Minsmere. No mitigation can guarantee to protect these areas from pollution, noise, negative impacts for wildlife, tourism, quality of life for local people.</p> <p>2. The B1122 is not fit for purpose for the volume of traffic that uses it today. With SZC under construction, even with a relief road, traffic will increase considerably due to SZC and the wind farm developments running concurrently. We have been told there will be no relief road until two years into the construction period. This is not acceptable. Some residents in Middleton Moor have front doors that are 2m from the B1122. EDF have not listened to local people, their proposed route is in the wrong place. Famers will be left with pockets of land that they cannot farm.</p> <p>3. The proposed relief road will cut communities off, closing country lanes used by locals to get to shops, GPs, schools etc. This will result in diverting local traffic onto roads that will already be overloaded with construction traffic and transportation for the work force. If a relief road is constructed, country lanes should remain open by being bridged.</p>

			<p>4. The holiday trade will be seriously affected reducing visitor numbers and the financial benefits they bring to this area. We have seen the negative effect Hinkley has had on tourism in Somerset.</p> <p>5. Reports indicate Sizewell will be under water within 50 years (or less) as sea levels rise due to global warming. This information came from government led studies.</p> <p>6. This area of Suffolk is rural, it does not have the facilities to support a large workforce that will be imported from other areas of the country during the construction period. The infrastructure is already stretched in schools and with local health providers.</p> <p>7. The increased amount of traffic using the A12 will cause chaos all around this area and beyond. The A12 is a busy road now, classed as one of the most dangerous roads in the UK and is not fit for the volume of traffic using it. High winds close the Orwell bridge, causing more chaos around Ipswich. The projected numbers of HGVs, buses, workers vehicles and vans will lead to increased levels of noise and air pollution, affecting the quality of life for local people and wildlife.</p> <p>8. The cost of this project is immense for a nuclear system that is out of date. Without correct funding, it could be left to the British tax payer to cover costs over a long period of time.</p> <p>9. The construction of this power station will not be carbon free. There is still an issue on where spent fuels will be stored safely.</p>
21	Julia Brown		<p>EDF have put in revised submissions.</p> <p>It would appear that they are not considered in this agenda. Our Relevant Representations were based on those submitted last September therefore limiting what is possible to be considered here.</p>
22	Richard Cooper	Marlesford Parish Council	<p>1. We believe that Item 5 which addresses the Applicant's proposed changes to the DCO should be taken before Item 4 in order that an understanding of the how ExA proposes to deal with the changes can be gained before the DCO itself is discussed.</p> <p>2. We believe that in the Examination, adequate time must be given to considering the Applicant's approach to consultation. In particular:</p> <p>a) A consideration of why widespread urging by statutory and other consultees (from an early stage in the consultation process) to consider marine led and rail led construction material freight strategies appeared to have been largely ignored at the submission of the DCO. It is not right for the Applicant to claim (as it has done in its proposed changes to the DCO) that subsequent to the submission of the DCO, it "listened" to responses from consultees and it was this "listenening" that brought about their proposed changes to the DCO. These responses had been voiced many times prior to the submission of the DCO and were capable of being acted upon at an earlier stage.</p> <p>b) to consider the evidence for the early abandonment of the marine led freight strategy.</p>

			<p>c) to consider the way in which negotiations were entered into with Network Rail to gain adequate capacity on the East Suffolk Line to facilitate a rail led strategy.</p> <p>3. We request that an Issue Specific Hearing is devoted to the proposed Two Village Bypass (TVB). Since 1995 when a route was approved for it, plans have been on the table for a Four Village Bypass (FVB) of Farnham, Stratford St Andrew, Little Glemham and Marlesford. An extension to the proposed TVB, (now or in the future) to bypass Marlesford and Little Glemham would relieve the longstanding traffic pressures on these two villages. Without a realignment or enhanced design for the TVB, its provision will almost certainly preclude the timely and cost effective bypassing of these two villages and as a result will adversely prejudice the health, welfare and amenity of the residents of these two villages.</p> <p>4. We ask that the ExA devotes an Issue Specific Hearing to the subject of Cumulative Impact. Cumulative impacts will be felt as a result of the proposed onshore works for Scottish Power's EA1-N and EA2 windfarms, the Sizewell C construction works and other developments such as new housing adjacent to the A12. These cumulative impacts will be felt in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road traffic - Air Quality - Vibration - Noise - Availability of properties for rent by local people - Effect on tourism <p>5. We ask the ExA to allow time to give due consideration to how works outside the application boundary will be conditioned. Highway works are proposed in Wickham Market to mitigate the effects of traffic passing through the village to reach the Southern Park and Ride and works are also proposed to the A12 in Marlesford and Little Glemham (in the absence of a bypass of these villages) to mitigate the worst effects of fear and intimidation from the increased traffic on this stretch of the A12.</p> <p>6. We ask the ExA to allow time to give due consideration to how works inside the application boundary, the plans for which are marked "Not for Approval", will be conditioned. We are particularly concerned that where such plans refer to on-site buildings, their delivery should be properly controlled within the planning process.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>7. We request that the ExA allows sufficient time in the Examination to consider the use of the Bentwaters warehousing and storage facilities in relation to the Sizewell C development. Any increase in the use of the rural roads surrounding Bentwaters will have a significant effect on local residents and their ability to use the local road network.</p> <p>8. Time must be set aside in the Examination to consider the consequences of a failure to secure adequate funding for Sizewell C if this were to happen post a commencement of the Sizewell C works.</p>
23	Robin Sanders	Woodbridge Town Council	<p>The scope of the ISH on Air Quality should examine the impact of the rail freight proposal on the air quality in the populated and urban area along the East Suffolk line such as Woodbridge</p> <p>The scope of the ISH on biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine should examine the potential impact of the rail proposal on the adjacent Deben Valley RAMSAR and SPA</p> <p>The scope of the ISH on Noise and Vibration should examine the fundamental assumptions of the noise assessment for the East Suffolk line through Woodbridge and appropriateness of the noise and vibration survey for the assessment. This should extent to the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The scope of the ISH on Health and Wellbeing should examine the most appropriate methodology for assessing impact related to noise and vibration.</p>
24	Stephen Faulkner	Norfolk County Council	<p>Seek clarification of the Principal Issues - in particular suggest need for the following items to be addressed at the Hearings: (1) socio-economic section / Effects on Labour Market - add in references to / consideration of skills and employment strategies; (2) Suggested need for a Section on Grid Connection and impacts on the wider Onshore Electricity Transmission Network; relationship with BEIS led Offshore Transmission Review etc</p>
25	Paul B. Taylor		<p>I reiterate that I believe this item should come after Item 5. I would like to raise concerns regarding coastal erosion (not just due to Climate Change) with a particular focus on EDF's proposed sea defences (including their impact further along the coast).</p> <p>I would also like to examine this project's contribution to the government's 'net zero' target, with particular emphasis on the timescale eg. exactly WHEN this project might contribute.</p>
26	Nigel Smith		<p>See comments under item 2.</p> <p>Coastal erosion has been a historic issue on this part of the Suffolk coast – it needs to be considered in the round – not just in the light of climate change.</p> <p>I have seen various assertions as to the contribution of the development to net zero carbon. The matter needs proper examination and consideration as a principal issue.</p>
27	Amanda Taylor		<p>As above, it seems to me that this Item should follow on from Item 5. I would like to raise my concern about coastal erosion which is a recognised characteristic of this coast before Climate Change was added</p>

			<p>to the mix.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the locally acknowledged climate emergency I would also like to drill down into this project's contribution to the governments 'net zero' target and when it thinks this might start to contribute</p>
28	Richard Cooper		<p>1. We believe that in the Examination, adequate time must be given to considering the Applicant's approach to consultation. In particular:</p> <p>a) A consideration of why widespread encouragement by statutory and other consultees (from an early stage in the consultation process) to consider marine led and rail led construction material freight strategies appeared to have been largely ignored at the submission of the DCO. It is not right for the Applicant to claim (as it has done in its proposed changes to the DCO) that subsequent to the submission of the DCO, it "listened" to responses from consultees and it was this "listenening" that brought about their proposed changes to the DCO. These responses had been voiced many times prior to the submission of the DCO and were capable of being acted upon at an earlier stage.</p> <p>b) to consider the evidence for the early abandonment of the marine led freight strategy.</p> <p>c) to consider the way in which negotiations were entered into with Network Rail to gain adequate capacity on the East Suffolk Line to facilitate a rail led strategy.</p> <p>2. We request that an Issue Specific Hearing is devoted to the proposed Two Village Bypass (TVB). Since 1995 when a route was approved for it, plans have been on the table for a Four Village Bypass (FVB) of Farnham, Stratford St Andrew, Little Glemham and Marlesford. An extension to the proposed TVB, (now or in the future) to bypass Marlesford and Little Glemham would relieve the longstanding traffic pressures on these two villages. Without a realignment or enhanced design for the TVB, its provision will almost certainly preclude the timely and cost effective bypassing of these two villages and as a result will adversely prejudice the health, welfare and amenity of the residents of these two villages.</p> <p>3. We ask that the ExA devotes an Issue Specific Hearing to the subject of Cumulative Impact. Cumulative impacts will be felt as a result of the proposed onshore works for Scottish Power's EA1-N and EA2 windfarms, any further expansion of the Friston substation site, the Sizewell C construction works and other developments such as new housing adjacent to the A12. These cumulative impacts will be felt in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road traffic - Air Quality - Vibration

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise - Availability of properties for rent by local people - Effect on tourism <p>4. We ask the ExA to allow time to give due consideration to how works outside the application boundary will be conditioned. Highway works are proposed in Wickham Market to mitigate the effects of traffic passing through the village to reach the Southern Park and Ride and works are also proposed to the A12 in Marlesford and Little Glemham (in the absence of a bypass of these villages) to mitigate the worst effects of fear and intimidation from the increased traffic on this stretch of the A12.</p> <p>5. We ask the ExA to allow time to give due consideration to how works inside the application boundary, the plans for which are marked "Not for Approval", will be conditioned. We are particularly concerned that where such plans refer to on-site buildings, (eg Southern Park and Ride) their delivery should be properly controlled within the planning process.</p> <p>6. We request that the ExA allows sufficient time in the Examination to consider the use of the Bentwaters warehousing and storage facilities in relation to the Sizewell C development. Any increase in the use of the rural roads surrounding Bentwaters will have a significant effect on local residents and their ability to use the local road network.</p> <p>7. Time must be set aside in the Examination to consider the consequences of a failure to secure adequate funding for Sizewell C if this were to happen post a commencement of the Sizewell C works.</p>
29	Paul Tillcock	<p>I am a bit confused as how to answer this as item 5 should surely be decided upon first and then that would be brought in to reference as all the changes EDF have suggested are not in my relevant representation as I didnt know about them at the time !!!</p> <p>In my relevant representation I am concerened about the lack of detail of the EDF application especially with respect to how they will mitigate pollution during construction and how they will mitigate light and nuisance caused by traffic using the proposed link road. EDF have ignored the calls for the D2 link road and using more rail and sea deliveries until after the application was submitted I am also concerned with respect to coastal erosion and the effect it will have on the beaches and wildlife either side of any defences EDF are planning around Sizewell Surely the whole coast line from lowestoft through to Felixstowe should be under scrutiny. I understand that when Hinckley C was proposed a full plan was</p>

			prepared before application so that experts could study and respond yet again there is just not enough detail in EDFs plans.
30	Sheila Galpin		Agenda item 5 needs to be considered before item 4. Coastal erosion needs to be looked at in more detail and in particular EDF's sea defences and their impact. How the project contributes to the government's net zero carbon agenda also need to be considered.
31	Julie Tillcock		HOW CAN WE LOOK AT THIS MATTER WITHOUT BRINGING EDFS CHANGES INTO THE MIX AT ITEM 5 I DETAILED MY CONCERNS IN MY RELEVANT REPRESENTATION STAGE AND HOPE THAT THESE CAN BE LOOKED IN DETAIL BY YOURSELVES BUT ALSO THE NEW CHANGES NEED TO DETERMINED BEFORE YOU CAN STUDY THEM
32	Stephen Beaumont		Item 5 should be heard before Item 4 as the content and result will affect Item 4
33	Philip Gough		I am very concerned that rising sea levels make Sizewell a completely inappropriate site for two new (with unproven technology) nuclear reactors and that this needs to be properly addressed. There is also considerable coastal erosion not caused by climate change. Proposals to mitigate the nuclear site becoming an island would have very detrimental effects on adjacent coastlines and the local ecology. I would also find it inexplicable not to take into account the complete and true carbon emissions caused by mining of resources for the building as well as those caused by the construction. It would be decades before these emissions were, if ever, made up for supposing the reactors were ever working properly. Sizewell C will make a zero carbon economy less not more likely.
34	Alan Hatt		There is not enough time between this preliminary and the full examination for experts to be contracted and work carried out in consideration of the new EDF, material change/non material change proposals in the "Consultation Document November/ December". Known as the 5th consultation. 174 pages.
35	Josie Bassinette	Walberswick Parish Council	Some key issues are missing particularly in light of the amendments EDF proposed. In particular, would like the Planning inspectorate to look specifically at the impact of the development on coastal processes and erosion north of the site and south of the site. This needs to be at least up to Southwold to north. Second, should look specifically at whether the development contributes meaningfully to net zero given the huge carbon footprint of construction. Not clear from current list, but should consider timing of when mitigation is provided -- specially, whether construction can start before mitigation is in place as proposed.
36	Nigel Hiley		Coastal erosion has been ongoing for hundreds of years (Dunwich was once a great port but is now almost completely destroyed). Examination of the project should include this process as well as the

			<p>particular impacts (unknown but almost certainly of major significance) due to climate change. It must also include the impact of catastrophic events such as earthquake and tsunami as happened at Fukushima. We know that there is volcanic activity in both Iceland and the Canary Islands and the impact of a major eruption would be unpredictable.</p> <p>Under the heading of Climate Change and Resilience, there should also surely be an examination of the contribution of the Sizewell Project towards the government's stated aim of net zero by 2050 and whether it will be a net contributor or detractor from the target.</p> <p>Under Policy and Need, there should be an examination of whether this project is now necessary, given the advances in wave and solar power and the means of storing excess energy such as batteries, hydrogen production and storage etc.</p> <p>Radiological considerations should include the fact that there is not yet a long-term solution to the storage of high level waste and whether it is acceptable for future generations to be burdened with the cost of disposing of this waste.</p>
37	Ann Mitchem		<p>Air Quality. Biodiversity and ecology. Climate change resilience. Health and Well-being. Historic environment. Landscape impact. Noise and vibrations. Radiological considerations. Socio-economic. Traffic and transport.</p>
38	Colin Palmer		<p>I confirm that I wish to speak.</p> <p>* I note from the Wylfa report that any new nuclear proposals must include an approved and funded decommissioning programme. Can you please confirm whether the ExA will examine EDF's decommissioning programme and determine whether it gains their approval.</p> <p>*I also note that Para 5.8.4 of the Wylfa reports states that the Wylfa planning application was withdrawn at a late stage due to the lack of agreement on funding arrangements with the UK Government. Can you please confirm that the ExA's brief will include a thorough examination of the scheme's funding arrangements; it would help if you could give early advice of the timescale envisaged when you would expect to determine whether the funding arrangements were for Sizewell C were fully approved.</p> <p>* It is understood that East Suffolk District Council is placing a lot of support for its stand in favour of Sizewell C on their belief that the plant would be "low carbon". Do you expect that the ExA will examine the applicant's proposals on carbon emissions and control?</p>

			<p>* The complex contractual and funding arrangements supporting the construction and operation of Sizewell C would fall onto at least two foreign companies and countries [France and China]. These arrangements will cover building, financing, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of this multi billion pound installation; these arrangements are fraught with practical, financial, legal and translation problems. Please advise whether your brief will encompass examination of these complex issues.</p> <p>* The Strike Price for Wylfa was offered at £75 per mwh. Please advise whether in examining the Strike Price for Sizewell C you will make an early announcement stating whether or not the Price appears sufficient to justify to balance the scheme’s financial calculations.</p> <p>* The December 2020 Energy White Paper calls for the future electricity bills to be "affordable". Do you envisage making an announcement on whether the scheme would be “affordable”.</p> <p>* The Energy White Paper further states that the Government will liaise with Developers to form a new Advanced Nuclear Fund of up to £385m to develop Small Modular Reactors[SMRs], for which the UK is looking for partners. In its Press Release of 11 February 2021, Rolls Royce, one of UK’s world renowned scientific and manufacturing companies, reported that its consortium [which includes the UK government] is already well advanced with the "feasibility and investability" phase in the development of SMRs. Please advise whether the ExA will keep abreast of the SMR work and include reference to application of such plants in the UK’s power needs. The Press Release includes valuable information on the design concepts, power output ranges, applications and financial feasibility.</p> <p>Such a development would be a remarkable achievement for Rolls Royce and its consortium partners; in addition it would place the UK back into the science and engineering of nuclear power. Hence coupled with the huge success of our wind farms and other renewable power supplies would obviate the need for Sizewell C.</p>
39	Rosie Norton		<p>Since at this stage it is not known what changes will be accepted by PINs regarding the additional and late changes submitted by EDF after 30 September it is impossible to say EXACTLY what will be missing from your list in Annexe C by the time of the Preliminary Meetings. It is impossible to guess what will be missing. With the list such as it is there are 14 areas that I am interested in, and any 1 or more of those may have information missing by 23 March.</p>

40	Michael Wade		<p>*This item should come after Item 5 as the revised proposals will have an influence on the principal issues.</p> <p>*I have concerns over coastal erosion and the effect and impact of sea defences</p> <p>*Consideration to be given to local underlying geology and its implications for structures and defences</p> <p>*The timing of the project to net zero carbon footprint.</p>
41	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
42	Alison Downes	Stop Sizewell C (Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell Ltd)	<p>We would like assurances that the following issues will be included in the Assessment of Principal Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The stability of the Sizewell site from coastal erosion; we can see that the effects of the adaptive approach on coastal erosion is included but under FRA we wish to see a discrete consideration of the offshore geomorphology. - The same is true for EDF's various sea defences. - Under Climate Change, the project's Life Cycle Assessment of carbon emissions (not just for construction) and contribution of the project to the UK's net zero targets. Note that EDF's LCAs are NOT in the public domain. - Under Policy and Need OR Alternatives, the Applicant's case for IROPI and consideration of alternative sites - Under Policy and Need the financing questions outstanding for the project, not just for Compulsory Acquisition - Under Air Quality OR Agriculture & Soils, the effect of EDF's proposals for borrow pits (quarries) and large spoil heaps on the neighbouring - Under Marine ecology and Fisheries, the implications of EDF's not proposing an Acoustic Fish Deterrent at Sizewell C (which EDF is seeking permission to withdraw from the Hinkley Point C DCO).
43	Debbi Tayler	Farnham with Stratford St Andrew	The parish council believes the issue of the proposed Two Village Bypass around Farnham and Stratford St Andrew should be considered as a single issue rather than be subsumed into other topic areas which will potentially dilute the facts and our views. We strongly feel the bypass should be discussed at an Issue Specific Hearing. The issues concerning the route of the proposed bypass will strongly affect many other surrounding parishes as well as any future plans by the local authority for a Four Village Bypass thus alleviating pressure on adjacent villages and roads. This is in addition to the impact on local residents who live on the route of the new bypass and the impact on the surrounding countryside and wildlife.

44	Simon Mellen		<p>The impact of both sound and light pollution specific to the green rail route .</p> <p>The spoil heap impacts to existing viewpoints and vistas</p> <p>The road traffic management specific to diversions and detrimental access issues</p>
45	Francesca Mellen		<p>There appears to be no mention at all of the light pollution that the construction and subsequent site are likely to cause. In an area close to SSSI the darkness is imperative for wildlife and an important part of why many people live here, the night sky is second to none here and we feel this has not been considered. We live on the green rail route and aside from the additional trains that have been added in the new changes, there appears to be only mention of visual impact on the site, but spoil from construction of the rail route will impact views in most directions because of the sheer volume of soil that will be dumped on ours and other local fields.</p>
46	Southwold Town Council	Southwold Town Council	<p>Principal issues must include coastal erosion</p> <p>Climate change issues also to be included</p>
47	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	<p>May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter</p>
48	Ivor Murrell		<p>There are so many problems with the EDF proposal, but put briefly some of these are;</p> <p>The technology proposed has already been superceded.</p> <p>Rolls Royce are now building smaller, safer, much cheaper nuclear plants which can be sited closer to their point of need.</p> <p>The vast EDF nuclear plants are yet to delivery anywhere they have been built.</p> <p>EDF are vastly undercapitalised for another project of this scale.</p> <p>The coastal site is under constant erosion.</p> <p>Sited two more nuclear plants in an area of outstanding natural beauty is a crime against nature and Suffolk.</p> <p>The massive disruption this will cause for many years to an area that has been successfully building its tourist industry over the last five or even six decades.</p> <p>The continual promise of large numbers of jobs is not believable, but the potential loss of employment in our thriving tourist industry is. After Covid the tourist industry in Suffolk for 'staycations' will have a massive boost</p>
49	Gill Clare		<p>Adverse impacts on the marine environment will be considered under different headings. Potential harm to the marine environment from Sizewell C comes from many sources. Each is scheduled to be considered separately, according to planning requirements.</p>

			<p>There is public sympathy for maintaining the natural environment and avoiding climate change. Few would want the sea to be used as a sewer and degraded, even though this may be permitted by legislation within the regulatory framework.</p> <p>It would be in the public interest if the combined and potentially cumulative effects on the marine environment were to be considered by the Planning Inspectorate as well as the potential harm from the individual activities. This is equivalent to dealing with land sites such as Minsmere. It is particularly important to form a holistic view, as some of the water discharge activities environmental permits are judged by different Government Departments.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the Planning Inspectorate could explain how it will judge the quality of evidence submitted by the Applicant. For example, how will the Planning Inspectorate judge the robustness of modelled predictions, what monitoring would be expected?</p> <p>Members of the public would be interested in understanding the consequences of the decisions taken. For example, if the project was to go ahead and there were unacceptable levels of faecal microbes would they be warned not to swim locally, with clear signs on the beaches?</p>
50	Nicholas Burfield		<p>Regarding my earlier point at 2 above this item clearly aims to cover the principal issues but, unless items 4 and 5 are transposed on the agenda, deliberations will be based only on those Relevant Representations that were submitted last September. This means that there will be no focus on, or coherent consideration of, EDF's revised proposals which is entirely unsatisfactory.</p> <p>In my view the principal issues must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of SZC on the local economy and the local labour market in particular; • The contribution of SZC to net zero carbon emissions in view of climate change and the policies in connection with that of both UK Government and the Suffolk local authorities, which themselves acknowledge the climate crisis; and • The inevitability of escalating coastal erosion, EDF's sea defence proposals and the impact thereof.
51	Caroline Weatherby		<p>Some of these are not covered by PINS initial list of Principle issues.</p>
52	Michael J.Taylor		<p>National Grid, grid stability issue due to excessive power output from Nuclear 3.2GW. Need or otherwise for new /reinforcements to grid when the energy system is in transition to smart grid including Electric</p>

			<p>vehicles. Risk that NPS will have to be load following and thereby risk extra pollution and harm to health. Potential electromagnetic health risk particularly at Aldringham Park, Aldringham where grid lines are immediately overhead of housing. This was understood to be a planning error and obviously is a very sensitive issue. A number of ongoing and recent cases may have relevance. Hinkley C removal of Cooling System fish deterrence PINS inquiry potential landmark case due for assessment in June, re damage to fish stocks and species risks. Recent Wylfa decision by PINS.</p> <p>It would appear useful for the PINS officers to understand the regulatory role particularly the Office of Nuclear Regulation and the EDF site licence application. This requires consideration of the Financial structure and liabilities of an operator which may not be EDF. This also include spent fuel, decommissioning and safety of the EPR reactor, the site and the existing Sizewell B reactor.</p>
53	Clr David Beavnn	Green, Liberal Democrat and Independent Group on East Suffolk Council	There is no specific mention of the Hard Coastal Defence and Soft Coastal Defence facilities and their potential impacts to the north and south of the site. These will also be impacted further assuming the Applicant's Changes are accepted.
54	Dr David Lambert	Fish Guidance Systems Ltd	An Acoustic Fish Deterrent (AFD) system was originally included in the mitigation measures proposed by EDF for the cooling water system, but that was subsequently removed by EDF between public consultations. Will the requirement for an AFD system be covered during the main hearing, or by an 'Issue Specific Hearing (ISH)'?
55	Stantec	Suffolk Constabulary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) - adequacy of DCO requirements and s106 mitigation package 2) Socio-economic - including details about the Community Safety Assessment 3) Traffic and Transport
56	Joan Girling		Item 4 Geology of the SZC site is not available
57	Nigel Hiley	Saxmundham Town Council	<p>Air Quality must include a thorough examination of traffic flows and the actions taken by EDF to avoid additional traffic flow through towns such as Saxmundham. Any monitoring should include particulate matter in addition to nitrogen dioxide which is currently monitored by the district council at the traffic lights.</p> <p>Alternatives must include an examination of why preferred alternatives such as upgrade of the East Suffolk Line to allow two-way running during the day and the provision of a south of Saxmundham road route were not considered to be achievable.</p> <p>Amenity and recreation should consider the impacts of up to six overnight rail movements on</p>

			<p>Saxmundham residents - particularly during the summer months when bedroom windows would normally be left open. It should also examine the impact on the tourist industry of prolonged work along one of our best-loved stretches of coastline.</p> <p>Given that even climate scientists find it impossible to predict the likely long term impacts of climate change, we need a thorough examination of the models that EDF have used to base their sea defences on.</p> <p>Given the current and proposed developments, including but not restricted to, wind farm infrastructure and the Saxmundham Garden Village development, a conclusion needs to be reached on the overall impact of these overlapping projects.</p> <p>Flood risk, groundwater and surface water should include analysis of the overall demand for fresh water in the area and a conclusion drawn as to whether this demand can be satisfied from current sources without further degradation of the environment.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing should include analysis of the employment figures that EDF have put forward for local residents and the likelihood of those being fulfilled.</p> <p>Saxmundham is an ancient settlement with many older properties, particularly in the town centre and around the railway line. The town council will need to be convinced that the proposal for up to six overnight freight movements through the town does not cause damage to the buildings foundations and that EDF is taking seriously the concerns of its residents. As well as vibration damage, noise from the trains, particularly during the summer months, has the potential to become unbearable to parts of the town's population. EDF must provide proven mitigation measures and give details of compensation for damage through vibration and health issues caused by sleep disruption.</p> <p>Radiological considerations must include whether Sizewell is a secure long term depository for radioactive waste and, if not, what alternative arrangements can be made.</p> <p>Socio-economic analysis should include the impact of house prices and rents on the area. And what impact proposals for mitigation by EDF will have on the opportunities for local people to continue to find affordable accommodation.</p> <p>Saxmundham has a mixture of campsites and bed and breakfast accommodation for tourists visiting the area. What effect will the construction work have on tourist numbers and how much will the town's tradespeople be affected if construction work leads to a reduction on those numbers.</p> <p>How many people from the East Suffolk area does EDF expect to be employed on site during the construction. And will those numbers lead to a lack of workers in the tourist and retail sectors.</p> <p>Traffic and transport should include analysis of the likely total vehicle movements along the A12 together with the likelihood of Sizewell contractors and workers using Saxmundham as a short-cut to get</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>to and from the site.</p> <p>The impact of freight movements on the running of passenger services and the likelihood of rail disruption if problems arise should also be looked into.</p> <p>The suitability of the A12/Rendham Road junction proposal in the event of the garden village construction coinciding with Sizewell C also needs to be considered.</p>
58	David Mears		<p>Although the main issues are covered, conclusions reached are unfortunately based on Relevant Representations presented last September 2020! Therefore ignoring any issues arising from EDF's revised proposals!</p> <p>All coastal erosion should be considered, not just that generated by climate change. The impact of EDF's sea defences should also feature. And any climate change considerations should include contributions to net zero.</p>
59	Catherine Bacon		<p>I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal.</p> <p>The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete.</p> <p>I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.</p>
60	Susan Osben		<p>In the event of EDFs revised proposals being accepted for examination, there will have been no opportunity to respond to some of the newly raised issues in the Relevant Representations submitted last year. Coastal erosion and EDFs proposed sea defences and beach landing facility will need to be considered, also Climate Change and the proposed project's contribution, or otherwise, to net zero.</p>
61	William R J Turnbull		<p>As mentioned earlier, item 5 should surely be dealt with before item 4. Among the Principal Issues, EDF's plans for sea defences must be included, as well as the erosion of the coastline (not simply restricted to climate change). The project's contribution to the target of net zero should also logically be part of the climate change issue.</p>
62	Greg Walsh		<p>Recent EDF revisions devalue Relevant Representations of September 2020.</p> <p>Coastal erosion (beyond climate change) must be included.</p>

			<p>The impact of sea defences must be included.</p> <p>The contribution of Sizewell C to climate change Net Zero must be included.</p>
63	John and Amanda Sutherell		<p>CLIMATE CHANGE AND RESILIENCE: 1) The impact on coastal conditions needs a separate bullet and should include specific mention of the impact some distance north and south of the proposed site, areas already experiencing problems. 2) The bullet on carbon footprint needs expanding to a proper analysis of the contribution (or not) to carbon zero in defined time periods. This whole issue needs rigorous and objective examination.</p> <p>HEALTH AND WELLBEING: 1) This item should specifically include the psychological as well as physical dimension of human health and the factors should include heightened stress and anxiety resulting from the whole project. 2) 'local' needs to be defined. Many of these impacts will be suffered not only by those living close to the site but by communities and individuals living some distance away, especially along routes affected by the increased traffic flow.</p> <p>SOCIO-ECONOMIC. add bullets: 1) Impact on local inhabitants of (eg) changes in the labour market and property/rental values. 2) Police, Fire and Welfare increments required and who to pay.</p>
64	Jackum Brown		<p>Item 4 should become Item 5.</p> <p>EDF's sea defences should be examined with coastal erosion in mind, erosion likely to be caused by these sea defences and not simply erosion caused by climate change.</p> <p>Within climate change issues, SZC's contribution to net zero carbon should be looked at - to me it seems there will be none at all, just extra carbon throughout the whole life cycle including way after it has stopped generating power.</p>
65	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	<p>TASC would like to mention a number of issues that we believe may not be included in PINs initial list of Principal Issues but realise they may already be covered. We would like to add that we cannot be sure our assessment of issues will be complete, as other issues could arise if PINs accept EDF's changes which are to be discussed at Item 5 on the agenda. Our list of potential issues is as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative impact of entire SZC project alone Geology & land quality of the entire licenced site Suffolk coastal geomorphology Adequacy of Flood Risk Assessment of the Sizewell C development on residents, businesses and land-owners throughout East Suffolk Funding statement Value for Money Review of meeting the aims of the government's '25-year plan for the environment' Decommissioning including meeting requirements of Energy Act 2008 [says must show adequacy of

			<p>funds to meet decommissioning & waste storage]</p> <p>Policy & need to include review of Appraisal of Sustainability; the 2017 Scoping report for the Sizewell C site and the Written Ministerial statement (referred to in Annex B, page B3)</p> <p>Marine Biodiversity to include all fish & marine biota impacts</p> <p>Adequacy of electricity transmission lines & stability of the national grid [reference the cumulative requirements of windfarms/SZB/interconnectors/SZC and the high output from each SZC EPR reactor]</p> <p>Climate change impacts to include full period of interim waste storage</p> <p>Carbon footprint - full lifecycle calculation of the twin EPR reactors planned for Sizewell required</p> <p>The competence of the developer and operator</p> <p>Unproven nature of the European EPR design</p> <p>Emergency planning</p> <p>Potable water during operation</p> <p>Sewerage treatment</p> <p>Exit strategy including timeline on completion of construction operations</p> <p>Strategy for removal of the entire Sizewell C structure on cessation of use ie when spent fuel finally removed from site</p> <p>Consideration of the lack of a proven storage medium for spent fuel cell disposal in a GDF</p> <p>Radiological considerations to include adequacy of consultation with local residents regarding plans for Sizewell C to be a nuclear waste store for an indefinite period</p>
66	Gwen Erskine-Hill		<p>This should be item 5 on the agenda. Please see my comments under item 2.</p> <p>Coastal erosion is not included in principle issues. Notwithstanding climate change issues, coastal erosion is a big problem in this area, I have watched the cliffs at Sizewell crumbling away over the last 15 years.</p> <p>“Suffolk’s coastline is facing an uncertain future – and has some of the “fastest eroding beaches in Europe”.</p> <p>Will the proposed sea defences be adequate and how will they affect the coastline above and below these defences.</p>
67	Rachel Fulcher	Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth	<p>We want to be sure that certain issues will be fully examined, including missing topics. For example, fungi are not addressed in the documents. We also want to point out that we would like proper weight to be given to County Wildlife Sites as well as to the SSSIs and EU sites.</p>
68	Frances Crowe		<p>Agriculture and soils</p> <p>- The impact of increased tropospheric ozone pollution and dust on vegetation (especially protected</p>

			<p>habitats) and crops needs to be evaluated and mitigated for.</p> <p>Air quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ground level ozone: monitoring of and mitigation for tropospheric ozone pollution as this is a significant pollutant in rural Suffolk and is likely to be exacerbated by increases in other pollutants due to construction and traffic, including shipping. - Particulates: Particular emphasis should be given to PM2.5 particulates and their mitigation as, according to the WHO, there is no safe level of this pollutant for human health. - Impact of shipping on air quality must be evaluated and mitigated for. Docking, manoeuvring and idling close to the beach are likely to have significant air pollution impacts. - Seasonal, meteorological and climate change impacts on air pollution must be assessed. - Action plan in event of forecast air pollution exceedances required, as well as consideration of preventative and mitigatory measures for the worst affected - especially the elderly, those with respiratory problems and children/schools. <p>Adequacy of measures to monitor their contractors' compliance.</p> <p>Climate change and resilience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of whether this development will contribute to achieving net zero carbon within necessary timescales. Given the very long timescales to deliver this project (and the applicant's track record of delays) this should include analysis of the project's carbon footprint by year and also the carbon footprint of future defence of the coast, longterm storage of the nuclear waste and decommissioning. - Evaluation of the capacity of future generations to defend and keep safe this development in the light of the huge upheaval and geo-political and social transformations (and potential resource scarcity) that are likely to arise from the climate catastrophe we are facing. To include evaluation of likely costs and carbon footprint. - Measurement of actual performance against submitted figures and implementation of mitigation measures. <p>Coastal erosion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This needs to be considered in its own right, not just in view of climate change impacts. - The suitability of the applicant's sea and flood defences needs evaluation. - The impact of these and the applicant's marine activities (such as; dredging, grounding of barges and construction of jetties) on the region's coastline must be examined.
--	--	--	--

			<p>Health and well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adverse impacts on emergency services and ability to reach hospital quickly in an emergency. Journey times to hospital are already among the highest in the country and traffic congestion is likely to significantly increase travel times (for example at the Melton/Woodbridge intersection). The lack of alternative routes in the event of congestion for residents living east of the A12 must be evaluated. Mitigation measures to be considered. - Risk management in event of future pandemics needs to be evaluated in view of the very high number of incoming workers working/living in close proximity. - Impact on emergency services and hospital facilities in the event of a major incident. - Provision of adequate health facilities (including mental health) for a resident population likely to be under increased stress and for the very large influx of workers. - Impact on quality of regional potable drinking water supplies. - Evaluation of impact on frequent swimmers in Sizewell vicinity - including water quality, and impact of water warming (eg jellyfish blooms). <p>Noise and vibration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequacy of measures to monitor their contractors' compliance. <p>Socio-economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects on local residents (and small businesses) in sourcing services - eg plumbers, builders, electricians, garden and house maintenance etc <p>Traffic and Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects on operation costs of local businesses/self-employed and of public services due to travel delays/congestion. - Measures for communication of works and impact on the public (including
69	Arthur Stansfield		<p>The ongoing monitoring of traffic to ensure minimal impact and that initial assumptions are correct and do not change.</p> <p>There is insufficient control of routes used by LGVs and workers' journeys to work to ensure they follow preferred routes</p>
70	Dr Stuart Checkley		<p>Compensatory habitats. Do they hold sufficient prey for the March Harriers for which they have been created? Have the prey populations been studied? Have RSPB's emailed questions about the adequacy</p>

			<p>of the compensatory habitats been answered?</p> <p>The limits of habitat compensation. Do replacement habitats which have been designed for one species, such as the Marsh Harrier, provide for all the protected species that are at risk, including otters and water voles for example?</p> <p>Interconnectivity between habitats. What are the effects upon protected species such as bats, otters and water voles of the proposed SSRI crossing as compared to a bridge?</p> <p>Effects of noise on wildlife. Bats are known to avoid noise which interferes with their ability to catch their food by echo location. Are the ambient noise levels to which bats will be exposed likely to interfere with their ability to forage and therefore to survive?</p> <p>Marine life. How many fish are likely to die as a result of being sucked into the water cooling system of the proposed Sizewell C? What will be the consequence of their destruction on marine life and on the birds that feed on them? How much of this environmental damage could be prevented by the use of an Acoustic Fish Deterrent?</p> <p>Natterjack Toads. What will be the effect of the North Eastern Water Management Zone on the populations of Natterjack toads which hibernate in that area? Is there an alternative site for the Water Management Zone?</p> <p>The effects of coastal erosion on the sea defences of Sizewell C (including its radioactive waste) and the effects of the sea defences on coastal erosion further down the coast.</p> <p>Climate Change. What is the Project's contribution to net zero when the entire lifetime of the project is taken into account?</p>
71	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	We wish to comment on the specific issues identified and others that may be of relevance to the examination.
72	Mrs Marilyn Checkley		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waste Disposal plans to include decommissioning, taking into account coastal erosion and on-site disposal - see below. 2. The effect of proposed sea defences and permanent and temporary BLFs on erosion and deposition on the coastline north and south of Sizewell. And on dangers relating to offshore geology, including the

			<p>possible collapse of the Norwegian shelf.</p> <p>3. How does EDF plan to offset the effects on bird and mammal marine species that depend on the 3,000,000 fish that will be poisoned or sucked into the cooling ducts?</p> <p>4. An assessment of the total carbon footprint over the lifetime of SZC, including decommissioning.</p> <p>5. The effects of predicted changes in water levels on SSSI and marshes; and of light, noise and dust pollution on wildlife and RSPB Minsmere. The effect of the SSSI crossing on otters, bats, voles and other wildlife.</p> <p>6. The effects of damage to wildlife on visitor levels to the RSPB and SSSI sites and the world heritage status of RSPB Minsmere.</p> <p>7. Has EDF given a satisfactory answer to all RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife's questions in "Shared Concerns of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and Suffolk Wildlife Trust"?</p> <p>8. Effects on local job market: including commuting distances, importation of HPC workers, temporary (average 3 years) nature of most jobs. Effect on local businesses, including accommodation - hence effects on tourist economy.</p> <p>9. Effects of noise, light pollution, traffic blight on local residents' physical and mental health.</p>
73	Dr Stuart Checkley		<p>Compensatory habitats. Do they hold sufficient prey for the Marsh Harriers for which they have been created? Have the prey populations been studied? Have RSPB's emailed questions about the adequacy of the compensatory habitats been answered?</p> <p>The limits of habitat compensation. Do replacement habitats which have been designed for one species, such as the Marsh Harrier, provide for all the protected species that are at risk, including otters and water voles for example?</p> <p>Interconnectivity between habitats. What are the effects upon protected species such as bats, otters and water voles of the proposed SSRI crossing as compared to a bridge?</p> <p>Effects of noise on wildlife. Bats are known to avoid noise which interferes with their ability to catch their food by echo location. Are the ambient noise levels to which bats will be exposed likely to interfere with their ability to forage and therefore to survive?</p> <p>Marine life. How many fish are likely to die as a result of being sucked into the water cooling system of</p>

			<p>the proposed Sizewell C? What will be the consequence of their destruction on marine life and on the birds that feed on them? How much of this environmental damage could be prevented by the use of an Acoustic Fish Deterrent?</p> <p>Natterjack Toads. What will be the effect of the North Eastern Water Management Zone on the populations of Natterjack toads which hibernate in that area? Is there an alternative site for the Water Management Zone?</p> <p>The effects of coastal erosion on the sea defences of Sizewell C (including its radioactive waste) and the effects of the sea defences on coastal erosion further down the coast.</p> <p>Climate Change. What is the Project's contribution to net zero when the entire lifetime of the project is taken into account?</p>
74	Keith Martin	Suffolk Coast Acting for Resilience	<p>The Suffolk coast is a fragile and vulnerable asset which has suffered significant erosion and depletion for centuries. Nor can the coastline be regarded as a series of independent, discreet sections - an event in one place has knock on effects elsewhere. This does not seem to be recognised by the Rule 6 letter and there appears to be no provision to discuss the adverse impact of the development upon coastal processes. It may be intended that the list of Principle Issues covers this under Resilience; we request that this be clarified by adding the effect on coastal processes and the neighbouring coastline of the development.</p> <p>We wish to be able to speak to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The inadequate provision of information regarding the design of the HCDF/SCDF and the Beach Landing Facilities and the potential impact of those features upon coastal processes * The definition of the zone of influence of SZC upon coastal processes and the narrowness of the geographical area for monitoring * The proposal to cease monitoring at the time the plant ceases to be operational when it will continue to inhibit coastal processes long after that time * The lack of information or evidence provided in the application in respect of coastal processes in the Greater Sizewell Bay area and beyond.
75	Marilyn Hands		<p>See comments under item 2.</p> <p>Coastal erosion has been an historic issue on this part of the Suffolk coast - it needs to be considered in the round - not just in the light of climate change.</p>

			I have seen various assertions as to the contribution of the development to net zero carbon. The matter needs proper examination and consideration as a principal issue.
76	Simon Ilett		As previous mentioned item 5 should be discussed before item 4 as alterations are relevant. Coastal erosion other than climate change should be included and in particular the impact of the proposed sea defences to the already fragile coast even north of Dunwich and south of Thorpeness
77	SIMON ILETT	ST PETER'S CHURCH THEBERTON	As above item 5 should be considered before 4 as it may form part of the principal issues should the EA decide to accept the changes Parishioners of the Yoxmere Benefice (8 churches stretching from Sibton in the West to Dunwich on the coast and Theberton in the South) are mainly retired and elderly. The proposed link road and additional LGV, buses and vehicles will make their access to services more difficult and for some impossible as footpaths and roads are stopped up. St Peter's church grade 1* listed is on the edge of the B1078 and in the early stages could suffer structural damage from vibration of the increased traffic passing close to the building.
78	Lisa Chandler	East Suffolk Council	ESC welcomes the identification of principal issues put forward by the Examining Authority (ExA). However, we consider there to be a small number of omissions / suggested revisions to the list that would be of benefit to the ExA. We note the interrelationship and overlap between Principal Issues, however, we would like the following to be considered explicitly by the ExA: a. The list refers to the beach landing facility under Transport, and the defence adaptations under Climate Change. The proposed hard coastal defence together with the soft coastal defence (that is proposed as mitigation for the negative impact of the former) plus the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities have potential to cause significant impacts on coastal processes. All the above was the subject of significant design changes in the January 2021 submissions. At the time of writing, we are awaiting the supply by the Applicant of full details of those changes and a comprehensive updated assessment of their impacts. It is essential that these issues should be given thorough scrutiny as part of the Examination process. We therefore request that the Coastal Geomorphology topic, covering the aforementioned items and the Coastal Monitoring and Mitigation Plan, should feature more prominently in the list of Principal Issues and that coastal processes be considered as an item for an Issue Specific Hearing. b. The location of the Main Development Site in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is considered to be a key issues, and we raise a concern that its inclusion under "impact on landscape and visual amenity, including the setting of protected landscapes", may not give it the prominence that it warrants as a nationally protected landscape, designated as such to protect the

		<p>land so as to conserve and enhance its natural beauty. ESC considers that impacts on the AONB will need to be appropriately considered as a Principal Issue alongside and as part of landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>c. Recreational Displacement is not mentioned explicitly in either Amenity and recreation or under Habitats Regulation Assessment matters. We consider that this should be included for clarity.</p> <p>d. Potable / non-potable water supply is a key issue that should be given prominence in the list of Principal Issues rather than as part of the waste (conventional) and material resource topic. Alongside this, the use of borrow pits is not identified under this heading and we consider that it should be specifically identified as a Principal Issue and examined accordingly.</p> <p>e. ESC has a concern that potential impacts on local communities has not been given the prominence it deserves in the initial assessment of principal issues. Health and wellbeing and socio-economic topics may not adequately cover potential impacts arising from an influx of non-home-based workers to the locality; this includes areas outside of local law and order including anti-social behaviour, local attitudes, and worker attitudes to one another. The residual community impacts need a place to be discussed.</p> <p>f. ESC considers the socio-economic section should be expanded to include reference to skills enhancement packages.</p> <p>g. The Council considers the deliverability of the freight management strategy, transport management plans, and the need for vehicular movement caps should be included under Traffic and transport topic.</p>
79	Charles Croydon	<p>While the list is set out in Annex C in the Rule 6 letter includes</p> <p>Air Quality – to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality impact baseline assessment methodology. • Effects on air quality arising from dust and particulates during the construction phase including through construction activities, emissions from construction traffic and equipment/plant and changes in traffic flows. <p>Annex C C2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on air quality arising from dust and particulates during the operational phase including through changes in vehicular activity and

			<p>changes in distances between sources of emissions and air quality sensitive receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed mitigation, monitoring and control measures for air quality, dust suppression, control and use of equipment/plant and construction traffic management and how such matters would be secured and enforced including by the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). • Effects on air quality arising from dust and particulates during the decommissioning of the Proposed Development including through construction activities, emissions from construction traffic and equipment/plant and changes in traffic flows. • Adequacy of the environmental measures incorporated into the design and mitigation proposal and whether all reasonable steps have been taken and would be taken to minimise any detrimental impact on amenity from emissions. <p>I believe there are air quality issues that affect a wider geographic area</p>
80	SALLY ILETT		<p>Item 5 should be discussed first</p> <p>The proposed link road will mean that we have to cross a busy road with hundreds if not thousands of vehicle movements to service our livestock on land in Eastbridge. We need to do so with quad bikes etc and this will put operators at risk as there is no proposed way to cross the road other than to join and leave it.</p>
81	Luella Williamson	Marine Management Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The topic of Coastal Geomorphology should be given focus as a principle issue - Underwater noise should be considered in 'Noise and vibration' - Which principal issue will the disposal of dredged material at sea be considered under
82	Louise Staples	National Farmers' Union	<p>principal issues we would like to see discussed.</p>
83	David Gordon		<p>Assess against the two principal challenges of our time. Biodiversity crisis. Climate crisis</p>
84	Bill Parker		<p>I have raised many issues in my responses to the various EDF stage 3,4 and 5 consultations and relevant representation to the Planning Inspectorate. Whilst some are covered in the published current Initial Assessment of Principles I wish to ensure that the following concerns are included:</p> <p>The site, Coastal and Marine Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site selection and location of the proposed station

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance to government policy EN-1 and EN-6 - The lack of proposals and detailed designs for flood / sea defences and SSSI crossing and requirement to meet ONR/EA FCERM advice. - Adequacy of the flood risk assessment and vulnerability to exceptional events - Understanding and interpretation of coastal processes and geomorphology - Consequential impacts on the adjacent coastline and its management - The implications of long term climate change on the site and its critical functions - Potential contravention of habitat regulations of intake and discharge proposals - Consequences of beach access loss - Lack of independence assessment of proposals and development oversight inc: SSSI crossing and culvert function lacks clarity and hydrology is poorly assessed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear future for fresh and potable water management and Minsmere Sluice • Potential in-combination risks ignored <p>Local Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woefully inadequate road infrastructure to deal with huge increases in traffic/HGVs. Marine/rail options not fully explored. No legacy value in road improvements. • Delayed access to emergency services due to congestion on the road network and inadequate capacity within the health care system. • Threat of a heightened pandemic risk affecting the area. • Distortion of the housing sector due to worker influx. <p>Economic impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devastation of tourist economy and infrastructure with predicted loss of visitors. • Disruption to existing long term businesses through loss of staff for unsustainable short-term EDF roles. <p>Environment and Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exacerbation of poor air quality in particular the existing high regional ozone pollution • Disastrous impact on landscape which is impossible to compensate for • Catastrophic destruction of fragile protected habitats: impossible to mitigate for; intolerable given UK biodiversity losses. • Poor understanding of ground and surface water relationship despite being a Scoping Report Opinion requirement. <p>Long Term Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consequences of a contaminated residual core and its impact the coastline for perpetuity.
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change predictions do not take the precautionary approach are woefully underestimated. • Build, operational and decommissioning issue monitoring and mitigation enforcement.
85	Andrew McDonald		Transport strategy and its lack of sustainability; impact on biodiversity; negative impact of new roads; cumulative impact of energy developments on the heritage coast
86	Anthony Ingram		That there are a number of points not covered by PINs initial list of Principal Issues (PINs' list is set out in Annex C in the Rule 6 letter).
87	Patricia Dowding		<p>Given EDF have submitted revised proposals I do not yet know how this will effect the Representation I made until ExA have made a decision as to whether they are material differences or not.</p> <p>What must be borne uppermost in mind throughout this Examination Process is the impact on the population of East Suffolk, particularly those living en-route to the site (A12, B1122, B1125, A1120) or within noise/light/environmental pollution, Please keep in mind that PEOPLE MATTER on virtually every item examined within the DCO.</p> <p>Also the timing of Examination Process overlaps with the SPR DCO. Each impacts on the other and it is essential that they are examined in that light and not separately.</p>
88	Neil Poole		<p>I have lived in Suffolk for most of my 65 years. I have witnessed dramatic changes to the Suffolk coast during that time. We know that the dynamic nature of those changes is a complex issue. We know that historic attempts to resist coastal erosion have usually resulted in unexpected consequences. We are all familiar with the local history of lost settlements, lost churches, lost lighthouses, the inundation and loss of farmland, the loss of direct access to the sea from previously thriving ports, the changing routes of rivers in this low-lying landscape and the points at which they discharge to the North Sea. To these natural forces we now have to add the impact of climate change, rising sea level and increased severe weather events. My parents witnessed and were affected by the devastating impact of the North Sea Flood of 1953.</p> <p>It is impossible to predict with any degree of certainty, the impact that the construction of another nuclear power station in this location would have on the geography of the east coast. We can be certain however, that the necessity of protecting a new hard intervention in this soft and fragile landscape would have impacts on the coastal geography for many miles to the north and south of the proposed site.</p>

			<p>I am desperately concerned about the inevitable adverse impact that the proposals would have on RSPB Minsmere in particular but also on the SSSIs to the north and south, which characterise this unique but fragile part of the country.</p> <p>The existing historic pattern of coastal erosion and its unpredictable impacts are, on their own, sufficient reasons for concluding that this is simply not the correct location for a new nuclear power station. The Applicant's proposed sea defences can only address the protection of the proposed development site. Their impacts can only be guessed at. History tells us though, that they will be unexpected and, in all probability, damaging over a far wider area than they are prepared to acknowledge or capable of addressing financially.</p> <p>To proceed in the knowledge that climate change will add further levels of uncertainty and risk, would be folly.</p> <p>The Climate Change heading in Annex C should include an additional bullet point item covering the government's legal commitment to achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050. The full carbon cost of the entire proposed Sizewell C project should be examined in detail.</p>
89	Michael Moll	Suffolk County Council	See Suffolk County Council's Written Submission sent to the Sizewell C Case Team on 10 March 2021.
90	Brigitte D'Angelo		<p>Covering principal issues, but since it is based on Relevant Representations submitted last September, issues arising from EDF's revised proposals will not be included.</p> <p>Item 4 should come after item 5.</p> <p>The Principal Issues should include coastal erosion (not just as a result of climate change) EDFs hard and soft coastal defences and their impact along the coast.</p> <p>The Climate Change issue should include the contribution of the project to net zero. Carbon impact.</p>
91	Mrs Annabel Ward		<p>1/ I am very concerned about global rising sea levels & what effect this will have on the sea defences - ref Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant</p> <p>2/ The nuclear industry has no sustainable plan for nuclear waste disposal. What will the half life of Sizewell C nuclear waste be? How will this waste be stored? Chernobyl plant has to be entombed for 20,000 years</p> <p>3/ Sizewell C will involve prototype technology</p> <p>4/ Hinkley appears to be behind schedule & over budget</p> <p>5/ Why would this country want to entrust such vital technology to a foreign power, particularly to</p>

			<p>China?</p> <p>6/ Has a scientific, independent environmental assessment been conducted into the affect this development will have on the local area, particularly Minsmere?</p> <p>7/ What will be the unit cost of electricity supplied by Sizewell as compared to that supplied by wind & solar farms?</p> <p>8/ What guarantee will EDF give that, if Sizewell C is granted planning consent, the whole scheme will be finished on schedule & within budget?</p>
92	Brigitte D'Angelo	Rendham Parish Council	<p>Principle issues are based on written representations submitted in September before EDFs revised proposals and consultation period. Therefore item 4 should come after item 5.</p> <p>Principle issues must include coastal erosion, not just as a result of climate change. Edfs hard and soft coastal defences should be examined and their impacts along the coastline.</p> <p>The climate change issue should include the contribution of the project to net zero. Carbon impact.</p>
93	James Lawson	East of England Ambulance NHS Trust	<p>- Add "Effect on highway network" to the list of salient matters raised in EEAST's relevant representations (Sec 56);</p> <p>- Concerning the SoCG, EEAST would be amenable to incorporating its position concerning highway network delays in SoCG's submitted by Suffolk Constabulary &/ or Ipswich & East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group;</p>
94	Henry Franklin		<p>Under Policy and need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. vulnerability of accepting Chinese investment in a nuclear project; 2. further investigation as to whether one large site as opposed to smaller, 'portable' reactors in line with new technology - i.e. why are we investing in old technology when the new technology points to smaller, local reactors close to point of use thereby cutting energy loss in the transportation of the electricity via extended network <p>Climate change and need</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. whether the true net Carbon zero assessment has taken into account the alternatives of smaller 'local' reactors being developed by the likes of Rolls Royce which would not require 1000s of tonnes of concrete, steel and earthworks all of which are hugely carbon positive 2. whether EDF are proposing historic technology when we should instead be focusing on modern technology with shorter build periods and greater flexibility.
95	Clive Lovelock		X

96	Joanne Peters	Sudbourne Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council has detailed its concerns in its response to the various EDF stage 3, 4 and 5 consultations. Whilst many are covered in the published current Initial Assessment of Principles it is currently unclear if the following Parish Council concerns have been included, such as:</p> <p>A full assessment of the ecological impact and proposed mitigation plans. Clarity on what transport strategy is being proposed and the consequent impact on parish residents and visitors, from a combination of road, rail and marine and what mitigation will be in place The impact on resident health and access health care and to hospital esp. with the cumulative impacts of both traffic and increased demand due to multiple and concurrent infrastructure projects. Overall impact on the AONB landscape including light pollution and mitigating measures Clear agreed proposals for robust, independent, accountable monitoring and mitigation for all aspects of the proposed works.</p>
97	Sasha Ayres	Mollett's Partnership	<p>We wish to request that an Issue Specific Hearing be held to fully consider the Two Village Bypass associated development as a single topic. This would ensure that examination of the many factors contributing to fundamental aspects of this scheme (such as route-selection and mitigation for those that would be negatively impacted by its construction and operation) are not adversely fragmented or diluted by being considered separately. It will also allow the ExA to explore why the 'greater good' appears to have been ignored by the applicant, despite wide support and consistent local feedback during their pre-application 'consultation' exercises - much to the frustration of all concerned.</p> <p>We also suggest that an Issue Specific Hearing would be appropriate to holistically consider Cumulative Impacts. A multitude of infrastructure and development projects are likely to take place in parallel with the Sizewell C project and have the potential to create a 'perfect storm' of traffic, air quality, vibration and noise issues, as well as having consequential adverse impacts on tourism and local businesses.</p>
98	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
99	Stephen Brett	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	There is no specific mention of the impact of the hard and soft coastal defence temporary and permanent and beach landing facility. We need to discuss the zone of impact of those facilities.
100	LJ Dowley		Effect of the proposals on our Grade 2 listed house, historic parkland and adjoining heritage assets. These will be affected by, inter alia, the Sizewell Link Road, the proposed destruction of a belt of

			<p>woodland, the noise and vibration from the SLR, the light and other pollution arising from the proposed roundabout at the main entrance to the site. There will presumably be air pollution and dust from the proposed borrow pits which will affect our house, garden and parkland. On none of these matters has NNB briefed us, consulted us or even visited us to discuss.</p> <p>There is a myriad of points which I will raise in relation to our agricultural and shooting businesses whose interests I have separately registered under SIZE-AFP125.</p>
101	Emma Dowley		<p>The construction of SZC will have a material adverse effect on our grade II listed house, other heritage assets within the grounds of the house and its historic parkland, which adjoin the projected building site. The issues include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. noise, light, vibration and air pollution arising from the construction of a roundabout at the entrance to the site as well as a link road to the site from the A12, the SLR, both during the construction phase and once the project is finished. It is as yet unclear what the extent of these factors will be because EDF has so far not clarified what the mix of road, rail and sea transport to the site will be, but at the very least there will be considerable pollution of all types. 2. noise, light and air pollution arising from borrow pits close to the house and its grounds. 3. potential pollution of our domestic water supply which comes from a well in our grounds. 4. environmental damage which will affect the flora and fauna on our land, which is next to Minsmere Bird Sanctuary. EDF have failed so far to come and discuss such issues with us despite having ample time to do so before Covid-19 set in. 5 potential flood risks 5. the lack of any attempt by EDF to discuss with us possible mitigation measures. 6. the disruption/permanent damage to our business and other local businesses, especially those associated with agriculture and tourism which will adversely affect the local community and its way of life. 7. numerous issues related to our farming and associated businesses, including a small camp site on our land, which I have registered separately under SIZE-AFP126
102	LJ Dowley		<p>Effect of the proposals on our agricultural and other businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - land take will effect the farmability and financial viability of our arable acreage - siting of the SLR/main site entrance roundabout and borrow pits will affect the viability of other activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on our land (noise, light, dust, general disturbance) - viability of arable operation will affect viability of our national prize winning c. 200 head Simmental beef herd

			<p>- hydrological effect on Eastbridge marshes where we graze our cattle. NNB have admitted that water levels will rise (albeit only by a small amount). This is likely to make the marshes even more marginal as grazing; it will also significantly affect the precious ecology of the marshes</p> <p>- the noise, dust and light pollution from the borrow pits is likely to force us to close the camp site at Eastbridge; effect on tourism, income for the village pub etc</p> <p>- drainage issues from SLR onto our land</p> <p>NNB have not visited us to look at the effect of their proposals on site and have not addressed the major implications for our businesses, employees etc</p>
103	Laura Bonnett		<p>Does examination of access for emergency services annex c include possible evacuation of area due to incident at operational Sizewell B during construction of C?</p> <p>Does traffic modelling include trip-chaining journeys made by local community, in particularly women serving needs of children and elderly parents?</p> <p>Has enough consideration been made to impact on families and children's mental health in the area - access to nature, their journeys to recreation, nursery and school, family and friends and prolonged length of car journeys due to increased traffic congestion? Will Leiston High Street and surrounding villages have protected status as a child-friendly areas when also serving needs of a such a considerable imported migrant workforce from a non-family demographic?</p> <p>Is the recent discovery of historic shipwrecks on the Suffolk coast and the impact on importance of coastal heritage being examined?</p> <p>Does the proposed campus add value to our community? Will the campus meet the highest standards for environmental responsibility?</p>
104	Alison Andrews	The Alde and Ore Association	<p>The Association would like to suggest that the list of Principal Issues should include - Coastal geomorphology, and processes and possible impact on them of the Proposed Development This is more than the issue of Climate change and resilience which is listed as a Principal Issue on page C3. The issues include:</p> <p>-The impact on the length of Suffolk coast, not just the Greater Sizewell Bay, needs examination. The</p>

			<p>coast is both fragile and dynamic and is not divided into separate and discreet sections. It is the result of a long and continuing geomorphological history of deposition, erosion and sedimentation flows along its entire length. The structures of the Proposed Development could affect coastal defence or existing natural formations both which contribute to the economy, settlements and environmental features at least as far south as Shingle Street.</p> <p>-The Proposed Development is not a temporary structure- it will affect coastal processes for decades, possibly a hundred or more of years. As the Applicant recognises, it will protrude into the sea even during the time the Project is in operation and shingle recycling will be necessary to protect the front. The potential impact of these need examination.</p> <p>-The Application plans, the original and the supplementary, are incomplete and so have not yet enabled a proper assessment of the impact on the coast. The supplementary consultation in December 2020 contained significant variations in the plans in relation to the HCDF, SCDF and the permanent and temporary beach landing facilities but the lack of detail prevents an assessment of any impact they may have on coastal flows.</p> <p>-A monitoring and mitigation plan is proposed but its scope is highly localised and time limited and makes no allowance for longshore impacts in neighbouring parts of the coast. It omits considering Policy Development Zone 5 (Thorpeness to Orfordness) of the Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan 2.</p>
105	Joanne Peters	Wickham Market Parish Council	<p>TRAFFIC</p> <p>We request that the traffic issues relating to Wickham Market are fully debated including the assessment/consideration of any scheme developed for dealing with increased volumes (through traffic calming and speed controls) of traffic through the village, the possibility of comprehensive tracking and monitoring of all vehicles to the SP&R and SZC sites, and local (SZC traffic) weight restrictions which might restrict LGVs travelling through the village to the SP&R site.</p> <p>We request that the cumulative impact with other traffic through the village arising from further housing development is considered.</p> <p>We request that the processes of ensuring that the above measures are implemented and controlled through the planning process are fully explored.</p> <p>SP&R DETAILS AND IMPACTS</p> <p>We request that the SP&R site suite of plans titled 'not for approval' are fully considered in terms of their impacts and that the ExA consider how the details contained therein are assessed i.e. lighting, buildings, structures, ancillary features and then fully controlled through the planning process.</p> <p>We request that our own recommendations for providing a more comprehensive scheme of landscape</p>

			mitigation, including immediate off-site mitigation measures is fully considered. We request that time be given to fully consider and visit the viewpoints of the SP&R site from Wickham Market which were not assessed within the EDF LVIA.
106	David Peter Napier GRANT		Should be Item 5 first
107	Michael Gower		Point raised above. We do need to find plenty of time to explore the impact of a "hard Point" on the coast on coastal processes to both the north and south of the site. Given the importance placed on net zero by the Developer we must give ourselves time to really explore and fully understand the impact of the build on net zero
108	Emma Dowley		I would like to make representations in respect of our family farming business which is based round Eastbridge and next to the EDF's proposed SZC development. There are a number of issues that will affect the business and is various different operations: 1. We have an integrated operation which involves arable farming, a prize-winning herd of Simmental beef cattle, a commercial shoot and a small camp site and all aspects of our business will suffer harm arising from the SZC proposals. 2. EDF would like to take some of our land for the project - for the entrance roundabout to the site, the Sizewell Link Road (SLR) and for borrow pits. This will fundamentally alter the farmability of the remaining land and its viability such that our business will have to fold. 3. In addition to the loss of land, there will be (as yet unquantified by EDF) harm arising from noise, air, vibration and light pollution affecting our ability to carry on our normal business. 4. Taking arable land for borrow pits, with their associated air, dust, light and noise pollution, will make the remaining land impossible to farm, from both a practical and financial point of view. 5. The borrow pits will also be sited in close proximity to our camp site at Eastbridge and most likely put off campers and result in its closure, meaning not only a loss for our operations, but also a substantial loss of business for the pub at Eastbridge. 6. EDF has admitted that water levels on marsh-land beside the 'New Cut' will rise, which will mean a consequential loss of grazing for our cattle which we would not be able to substitute elsewhere, as well as substantial damage to the overall ecology of the land. 6. Both the roundabout at the entrance to the SZC site and the land-take from us beside the B1122, will mean that our shoot will also be unviable, with the loss of both full-time and casual employment.

109	Cameron Sked	Environment Agency	<p>The EA welcomes the identification of Principal Issues put forward by the ExA. We note that the interrelationship and overlap between Principal Issues is recognised, however we consider the following suggested revisions to the list would be of benefit of the ExA: ·</p> <p>* Flood risk modelling. Although the list broadly refers to flood risk, we have not yet reached agreement on some important parts of the Development Consent Order application (DCO). We await full flood risk modelling for the Sizewell Link Road and the associated FRA to support that element of the project. We cannot properly advise on the flood risk associated with this road proposal without it. ·</p> <p>* WFD impacts of SSSI crossing. Although “The design and options for the SSSI crossing”, has been identified within the ‘biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine’ Issue we consider that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) impact of the SSSI crossing should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*The cooling water system. Although marine ecology and fisheries issues have been identified as a Principal Issue, we consider that the potential impacts of the cooling water system, including WFD compliance, should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*Coastal Processes. The proposed hard coastal defence, together with the soft coastal defence, and the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities have potential to cause significant impacts on coastal processes. With the submission of the changes application these elements have departed from the design submitted within the original DCO, some significantly. The assertions made about the management of coastal defence features are entirely different from those made originally and we have yet to see evidence to support the new proposals. In fact we have yet to receive full details of any of these changes, the supporting modelling, or a comprehensive, and updated, assessment of their impacts. We consider it is</p>

			<p>essential that this topic be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process. ·</p> <p>*Sustainable water supply. We await information to demonstrate that there can be a sustainable water supply provided to the development, both during construction and operation. Given the scale of the work that remains to be undertaken, the associated timescales, and the uncertainties that remain, we consider it essential that the supply of potable and non-potable water be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process.</p>
110	Rosie Sutherland	The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (the RSPB) and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT)	Please see the RSPB and SWT's Rule 6 Response letter
111	Simon Barlow	Environment Agency	<p>The EA welcomes the identification of Principal Issues put forward by the ExA. We note that the interrelationship and overlap between Principal Issues is recognised, however we consider the following suggested revisions to the list would be of benefit of the ExA: ·</p> <p>* Flood risk modelling. Although the list broadly refers to flood risk, we have not yet reached agreement on some important parts of the Development Consent Order application (DCO). We await full flood risk modelling for the Sizewell Link Road and the associated FRA to support that element of the project. We cannot properly advise on the flood risk associated with this road proposal without it. ·</p> <p>* WFD impacts of SSSI crossing. Although “The design and options for the SSSI crossing”, has been identified within the ‘biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine’ Issue we consider that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) impact of the SSSI crossing should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*The cooling water system. Although marine ecology and fisheries issues have been identified as a Principal Issue, we consider that</p>

			<p>the potential impacts of the cooling water system, including WFD compliance, should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*Coastal Processes. The proposed hard coastal defence, together with the soft coastal defence, and the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities have potential to cause significant impacts on coastal processes. With the submission of the changes application these elements have departed from the design submitted within the original DCO, some significantly. The assertions made about the management of coastal defence features are entirely different from those made originally and we have yet to see evidence to support the new proposals. In fact we have yet to receive full details of any of these changes, the supporting modelling, or a comprehensive, and updated, assessment of their impacts. We consider it is essential that this topic be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process. ·</p> <p>*Sustainable water supply. We await information to demonstrate that there can be a sustainable water supply provided to the development, both during construction and operation. Given the scale of the work that remains to be undertaken, the associated timescales, and the uncertainties that remain, we consider it essential that the supply of potable and non-potable water be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process.</p>
112	Carol Bolt	Environment Agency	<p>The EA welcomes the identification of Principal Issues put forward by the ExA. We note that the interrelationship and overlap between Principal Issues is recognised, however we consider the following suggested revisions to the list would be of benefit of the ExA: ·</p> <p>* Flood risk modelling. Although the list broadly refers to flood risk, we have not yet reached agreement on some important parts of the Development Consent Order application (DCO). We await full flood risk modelling for the Sizewell Link Road and the associated FRA to support that element of the project. We cannot properly advise on the flood risk associated with this road proposal without it. ·</p> <p>* WFD impacts of SSSI crossing. Although “The design and options for the SSSI crossing”, has been identified within the ‘biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine’ Issue we consider that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) impact of</p>

			<p>the SSSI crossing should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*The cooling water system. Although marine ecology and fisheries issues have been identified as a Principal Issue, we consider that the potential impacts of the cooling water system, including WFD compliance, should feature more prominently within the issues to be discussed in the list. Compliance with the WFD is integral to a DCO permission and this is not yet demonstrated. ·</p> <p>*Coastal Processes. The proposed hard coastal defence, together with the soft coastal defence, and the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities have potential to cause significant impacts on coastal processes. With the submission of the changes application these elements have departed from the design submitted within the original DCO, some significantly. The assertions made about the management of coastal defence features are entirely different from those made originally and we have yet to see evidence to support the new proposals. In fact we have yet to receive full details of any of these changes, the supporting modelling, or a comprehensive, and updated, assessment of their impacts. We consider it is essential that this topic be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process. ·</p> <p>*Sustainable water supply. We await information to demonstrate that there can be a sustainable water supply provided to the development, both during construction and operation. Given the scale of the work that remains to be undertaken, the associated timescales, and the uncertainties that remain, we consider it essential that the supply of potable and non-potable water be given thorough and proper scrutiny as part of the Examination process.</p>
113	Andy Smith	Fellixstowe Town Council	<p>Capacity of rail network Effects on traffic issues at Seven Hills roundabout Traffic access route to Freight Management Facility</p>
114	Jennifer Kirtley		<p>Again, as stated in Item 2 it is difficult to comment until we know if the 17 changes will be accepted by The Examining Authority. I do feel however it is vitally important that Principal Issues must include the coastal erosion that is happening at an alarming rate along this part of the East Coast and a thorough examination of EDF's sea defences and the impact they will have on other parts of the coastline must take place. We at least owe this to future generations as to the effects of Climate Change and sea rise</p>

			surrounding Nuclear Installations, however high they build the wall. Other principal issues should include Cumulative impact of the entire Sizewell C project and the ongoing Windfarm projects, Geology & land, quality of the licenced site, Suffolk coast geomorphology, Marine Biodiversity including all fish/marine biota impacts, the visual impact of the ever increasing 'feature' wall and Potable water during operation.
115	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	<p>The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. the space provided permits room only for the topic headings. however for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. Sizewell: C <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD ("SLR") Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts</p>

			Heritage Issues Link Road
116	William Kendall		TBC
117	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	<p>[13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts</p>

			Heritage Issues Link Road
118	Paul Clarke		<p>Climate change - the profile of emissions versus savings over the construction and working life of the project. When does it become net zero? discounted cash flow type approach to carbon emissions.</p> <p>Sea defence proposals - both hard and soft - still not specific.</p> <p>southern park and ride proposals for alleviation in and around Wickham Market & B1078 remain vague - what will actually be part of DCO?</p> <p>submission of changes has made this process so difficult for public like me to engage with and understand what is being proposed and when to comment on what.</p> <p>Timing of proposed upgrades to road routes in relation to when increased traffic will be generated</p> <p>Is application sufficiently tightly defined? It seems many areas are still vague. Have they been clear enough for consultees to make representations?</p>
119	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	<p>[13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way</p>

			<p>Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
120	Jennifer Wilson		<p>I would like to ensure PINS will be examining the following issues:- My house is in floodzones close to the river hundred approximately 2 miles from the Sizewell C main development site. Coastal erosion has been evident on the Suffolk coast even before climate change impacts are taken into account - the flood risk assessment must take into account the impact of the applicant’s hard coastal sea defences and other associated developments on all property owners who could be potential victims of the applicant’s endeavours to protect their own site, for the period from construction through to when the last spent fuel is removed from the Sizewell C site. In event that such damage is caused by Sizewell C, I would like the Examination to determine who will be held liable for that damage: the owners, developers, operators or government? The examination should assess the full lifetime carbon footprint of the project (including all associated works and developments) ie from cradle to grave as well as its contribution (if any) to meeting the government’s net zero targets. Due to the European EPR design being unproven, with no working examples, I think the examination should assess the risk of the project never being completed, even if it is approved. If PINS decide to accept the applicant’s proposed changes more issues might arise.</p>
121	Gregory Jones QC	India Bacon	<p>[13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the</p>

			<p>assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
122	Gregory Jones QC	Nat Bacon	<p>ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p>

			<p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
123	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley Esq. (Personal)	ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC < sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk >

			<p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
124	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley – (Registered Suffolk Business)	ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email

			<p>address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
125	Fiona Judge		<p>TRAFFIC</p> <p>I would like the traffic issues relating to Wickham Market to be fully debated. This should include assessment of any scheme put forward to deal with increased traffic e.g. traffic calming and control of</p>

			<p>vehicle speeds through the village, tracking and monitoring of all traffic going to and from the SP&R and SZC sites and weight restrictions impacting on LGVs travelling through the village to the SP&R site.</p> <p>I would like the process of implementation and control of these measures to be conducted through the planning process.</p> <p>SP&R DETAILS AND IMPACTS</p> <p>I would like the SP&R site suite of plans titled 'not for approval' to be fully considered in terms of their impacts and that the ExA consider how the details within these plans are assessed i.e. lighting, buildings, structures, ancillary features and then fully controlled through the planning process.</p> <p>I would like the parish council working group recommendations for providing a more comprehensive scheme of landscape mitigation, including immediate off-site mitigation measures is fully considered. It is important that time be given to fully consider and visit the viewpoints of the SP&R site from impacted villages and communities.</p>
126	Gregory Jones QC	EL Dowley (Personal)	<p>ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology Hydrology and Flooding</p>

			<p>Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
127	Gregory Jones QC	EIDowling (registered business from Suffolk)	<p>ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology</p>

			<p>Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
128	Gregory Jones QC	David Grant Esq	<p>ITEM 4 [13] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology</p>

			<p>Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
129	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	<p>ITEM 4 [14] The points we wish to make relate to the inadequate manner in which the following matters have been addressed. The space provided permits room only for the topic headings. However for the assistance of the Examination we have sent an expanded version directly to PINS via the Sizewell C email address. SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk></p> <p>[A] ISSUES RE OVERALL ADVERSE IMPACTS OF SIZEWELL C DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition and Compelling Case Requirement Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment Ecology</p>

			<p>Hydrology and Flooding Construction Compound Sites Balance Ponds Creation of Public Rights of Way Borrow Pits, Waste and Spoil Heritage and Light Pollution Private Water Supply Field Drainage Soils Dust/Irrigation Funding</p> <p>[B] ISSUES PARTICULAR TO SIZEWELL LINK ROAD (“SLR”) Highways Adverse Impacts on Farm Holdings and Businesses Adverse Impacts of Lighting Ecological Impacts Heritage Issues Link Road</p>
130	Carina Wentzel	The Heveningham Hall Estate	<p>The Heveningham Hall Estate (the HHE) agrees with the ExA’s Initial Assessment of Principal Issues. While noting that the ExA’s list is not intended to be exhaustive, the HHE requests that in assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Historic environment (terrestrial and marine), particular consideration is given to the effect of construction traffic on heritage assets and the proposed Yoxford Roundabout on listed Cockfield Hall; •Traffic and Transport (particularly the suitability of proposed associated development of park and ride sites, bypasses, junction improvements, rail extensions and beach landing facility), specific attention is given to mitigation measures for and management of the Northern Park and Ride and the Yoxford Roundabout. Please see our comments in relation to Agenda Item 6 for further details.
131	Nathaniel Bacon	N J Bacon Farms	<p>We have asked Gregory Jones QC to summarise our principal issues at the preliminary meeting. In addition to the points made by our representative, we would like to urge PINS to pay particular attention to the coastal defences and the rigour with which they have been designed.</p>
132	Anne-Marie Robb		<p>Item 4 should come after item 5. Principle issues must include coastal erosion and the impact of the proposed defences. Principle issues must also include how the project impacts climate change through net zero contributions</p>

133	Bridget Chadwick		About pollution from construction and traffic plus bottlenecks due to increased traffic. Inadequate Public Right of Way access to the beach from Kenton Hills used by locals and tourists. Loss of biodiversity of local interest in relation to Suffolk priority habitats and species
134	Peter Chadwick		Cannot be sure that items mentioned in Annex C will cover everything in the light of the applicants introducing newly introduced proposals.
135	India Bacon	Ward Farming Ltd	We have asked Gregory Jones QC to summarise our principal issues at the preliminary meeting. In addition, we have concerns regarding the coastal erosion and how the SZC defences will affect the area.
136	Peter Chadwick	Save Our Sandlings (as Chairman of SOS)	Cannot be sure that items mentioned in Annex C will cover everything in the light of the applicants introducing newly introduced proposals.
137	Nicola Pilkington		Not included in the initial Assessment of Principal Issues are the Cumulative impacts of the entire plan for SizewellC on East Suffolk. Neither have the Cumulative impacts of plans for East Anglia1 and 2 and other associated Wind Farm developments alongside Sizewell C been properly incorporated into the DCO process. Not only will all these Projects have a negative impact on the benefits that Suffolk offers as a good place to live but they will also have devastating Ecological impacts. The Marine Environment will suffer greatly from the combined proposals. The recent win to overturn a decision on Norfolk Vanguard by Judge Holgate has firmly placed the issue of Cumulative Impacts at the centre of National Infrastructure Planning Law.
138	Sonya Exton		Looking at our current position in relation to our climate emergency and tipping point deadline, along with the state of our world's health in this pandemic, all of these principle issues need to have the question 'Is this the right time to be causing more disruption to our fragile bio-diversity and emitting more carbon into the atmosphere?'
139	James Sandbach	Saxmundham Town Councillor	The Principal Issues must include coastal erosion (not just as a result of climate change) and more specifically examine EDF's sea defences and their impact.
140	John Baker		At present this list only includes things submitted by EDF up until 30 September. The 14 changes they issued in the middle of October – such as building another jetty and running night trains, just to mention 2 of them, are not included so no-one has had a chance to comment on them. Therefore you cannot say what is missing from the list if you don't know what the list will include by 23 March! The Planning Inspectorate has not announced whether or not they are accepting EDF's changes yet so we are in the dark about this.
141	Robert Hoggar		Item 3 : The Examining Auth. or I have not been able to fully assess as yet the Suffolk's receding coast and rising sea levels around a site considered far too small creating an island location for this, the largest

			twin EPR nuclear power Station ever to have been attempted in an AONB and only at first once considered simply a 'potential' site until of recently, should now be seriously reconsidered. The Marine Management Organisation consider the sea bed would be very damaged as would fish and biota stocks. Water for all needs would definitely be insufficient and is not fully considered by EDF.
142	Audrey West		I am concerned that not enough weight will be given to the huge loss of and damage to trees and hedgerows caused by the enormous extent of the land take for the construction of the plant plus new roads and railways. We are already suffering climate change and this is not the time to be destroying carbon absorbing woodland.
Agenda Item 5: The Applicant's proposed changes to the application			
1	Susan Margaret Morrice		As the planning Inspectorate has yet to make a decision as to whether it accepts EDFs revised proposals it is not possible for me to make any further written or verbal representation as I do not know which proposals I should respond to.
2	Ian KH Galloway		I understand that a final decision as to whether EDF's revised proposals will be accepted for examination has yet to be made. Consequently, I am nervous that preparation work necessary for my constructive participation may be compromised, insofar as I don't yet have clarity on what proposals I should respond to.
3	Paul Collins	Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group	This item should be heard before item 4. Several of these changes are lacking detailed designs and plans including the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities, changes to the position of the "northern mound" with potential impacts on the permanent BLF and possible reduction in the site footprint. At no point during 9 years of consultation and now DCO submission and proposed change have any engineering plans for the Hard and Soft Coastal Defence structures been published which means assessment of the suitability and impact of these plans for acceptance and examination remains compromised. Without a clear indication of whether these changes are accepted, in part or in full, or not at all, can a valid discussion of the Principle issue for assessment be undertaken.
4	Alan Collett		This is a very complex application for most people to understand. We must be clear what the full details of the application are before any part of the hearing process including the second part of the Preliminary Meeting takes place. Indeed Agenda item 5 should be determined before agenda item 4 and then people should be given an opportunity to revisit agenda item 4 at a later date.
5	Ian Rose		When the Authority will let us know whether the applicants revised proposals may be accepted for examination has not been stated. The preparation of responses by persons such as myself will be made more difficult especially as we do not have the resources that the Authority and EDF have at their disposal.

6	Roy Dowding		This is connected to item 4 above. It is difficult to submit another Representation until it is known which of EDF's modified proposals have been accepted. When this will happen has not been advised.
7	Edwina Galloway	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	As a Parish which will see significant adverse impacts from the project (should it go ahead), Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council is concerned how much weight to attach to the most recently proposed changes and consequently, how best to make effective responses in such challenging circumstances. Consideration does need to be given to whether the cart is before the horse on this point.
8	Robert Flindall		Item 5 - The Applicant's proposed changes to the application. It is unclear when the Examining Authority will take the decision to accept or not accept the developer's revised proposals for examination. This makes preparing to submit future written representations very difficult because it is not clear which proposals I need to respond to.
9	Wendy Cooper		The Planning Inspectorate's decision regarding which of the proposed changes to the application are accepted needs to be made before there can be a discussion about, or assessment of, the Principal Issues.
10	Robert Flindall		It is not clear when the Examining Authority will take the decision to accept or reject the developer's revised proposals for examination. This makes preparing written representations difficult, as I do not know which of the proposals to respond to.
11	Clare Rizzo		Arrival by sea instead of road-initially rejected EDF sea defence and their impact Impact on climate change must include contribution of project to net zero
12	William John Rea Price		AS we do not yet know whether and when the examiners will decide to accept EDF's new submissions we have no idea what on proposals we should be submitting new representations
13	June Holmes		These areas of change produced by EDF mean the original application is now very very different from the original submission. This should not be discussed before item 4 as implications of the two areas interlink in too many areas. but more importantly it should be understood that until the inspectorate make a final decision on the points raised here , we as the general public cannot make correct and informed submissions about the plans.
14	Martin Cooper		EDF are asking the Planning Inspectorate to accept their revised proposals .The residents, Councilors both County and District and other Interested parties will be disadvantages by this further reduction of time to consider their responses fully. The amount of time set aside for all interested parties must reflect the importance of what will be raised by EDF..
15	Anne Westover		I am not clear when the Examining Authority will decide whether to accept/or not EDF's revised proposals for examination. I would like to understand whether, if accepted there will be opportunity to

			submit revised or additional relevant representations. This may impact on issues we may wish to raise at Examination
16	Julia Brown		I am perplexed because without knowing whether EDFs new submissions are accepted, I am lost in finding what is an appropriate response.
17	Richard Cooper	Marlesford Parish Council	1. See comments above.
18	Paul B. Taylor		As this meeting does not cover EDF's revised proposals it is impossible to know which proposals we have to respond to as we don't know the Examining Authority's response to these revised proposals.
19	Nigel Smith		I am not at all sure as to where we stand with EDF's revised proposals and when and if they will be accepted by the examining authority. I really do need to know what I am looking at, if I am to respond properly when I make further written representations. I am not sure how the examining authority will deal with any of the revised proposals that are contingent on third party agreements or further investigation (e.g. increased use of rail and the form of any jetty). Early clarification would be appreciated.
20	Amanda Taylor		As this meeting does NOT cover EDF's revised proposals no-one knows which proposals we need to respond to as we don't know the Examining Authority's response to them...
21	Richard Cooper		See above.
22	Paul Tillcock		If EDF are able to bring in more materials by rail and sea as has been requested virtually from the start then I cannot see why a Sizewell link road is needed North of Saxmundham The early years traffic will be using the existing road network until the rail and sea options are open and then the levels of traffic would drop to a level that with careful monitoing could use the existing net work and any road improvements would have a legacy value rather than none which is the case with the existing SLR plan. basically the early years traffic will happen without it and therefore proves that it is not needed. My understanding is that Middleton & Therberton landdowners have instigated and supplied the inspectorate more upto date facts and figures on the the proposed SLR and I would wish for the inspectorate to look very caerfully at this report.
23	Sheila Galpin		It is unclear at the moment if the Examining Authority is accepting EDF's revised proposals for examination. It is therefore difficult at this stage to prepare an adequate response.
24	Julie Tillcock		WE NEED MORE TIME TO EXAMINE THESE CHANGES AND WHETHER YOU ARE ACCEPTING THEM OR NOT AND EDF NEED TO GIVE MORE DETAILS
25	Marie Curtin		I understand from today's East Anglian Daily Times that PINS has asked for more details on EDF's Proposed Changes; specifically of the permanent and temporary beach-landing facilities, and also the

			<p>latest designs for the crossing over the Sizewell Site of Special Scientific Interest, which involves a single span bridge with embankments.</p> <p>In addition, PINS wants to see details of the temporary construction area on the seaward side of the platform extending from the end of the SSSI crossing to the southern end of the main platform, including the ends of both beach-landing facilities. I believe these to be material changes - hence my earlier note regarding the Agenda as we would need to know the status of these changes and whether PINS are minded to reject or accept as this will affect Development Consent Orders and thus Written Representations.</p>
26	Stephen Beaumont		It is important that the changes proposed by EDF to the DCO should be considered before Item 4
27	Philip Gough		When please will EDF's revised proposals be looked at? If people like me don't know when they will be, how will we know when to respond?
28	Alan Hatt		<p>Draft examination timetable. (D)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Due to the extra material changes introduced in Nov-Dec. and the acceptance that PINS should/will extend the consultation period then all dates be put back. 2. By the end of April there is a likely hood that there will be no further lockdown. PINS should be booking venues now in the locality such as Snape Maltings for the expected return of normality and drop virtual meetings during the examination period and beyond. 3. The "Draft examination objectives" are incomplete however "all aspects" of the examination will be covered. The timetable for this is too short.
29	Josie Bassinette	Walberswick Parish Council	It is not understood what EDF is proposing. There were various options. Also, some options were dependent on investment by Network Rail and others. This has to be clarified before hearings begin so that we have time for updating relevant representations.
30	Nigel Hiley		As we do not have a timetable for the review of EDF's changes - which have been made after eight years of 'consultation' with the community - it is difficult to know what written representations we should be making.
31	Rosie Norton		A lot of important changes were submitted after 30 September and as yet it is unknown whether PINS will accept 1 or more or none of them. Really there should have been another round of consultations. I really think that the changes are so important, and will have such a great influence on this whole project, and are what you term 'material changes'. We really need to start again as the changes affect so many people - night trains and the new jetty as examples. These changes were submitted only about two weeks after the closing date of 30 September, and really they have moved the goal posts. The public

			need time to find out what is happening and it would not be fair for PINs to hold an examination when people have not been consulted about all the changes and the details.
32	Michael Wade		Confirmation of EDF's Revised proposals
33	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
34	Alison Downes	Stop Sizewell C (Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell Ltd)	As previously stated, we suggest that this item should come before item 4. We are concerned that many of the Applicant's revised proposals lack detail, especially sea defences, beach landing facilities and including whether rail delivery is definitely possible at the level proposed. Clearly you share this view as you have requested more information from the Applicant, but this will not be available to us much in advance of the Preliminary Meeting - if at all - making it even more difficult to contribute thoughts on Principal Issues. We consider that the changes EDF has proposed to be very significant, although whether they are "material" is a matter for you to determine.
35	Simon Mellen		I feel the changes EDF have made are massively different to the initial submission that they be rejected on the grounds that not enough public consultation has been done for the changes to be fully understood by all parties
36	Francesca Mellen		We just don't feel there has been proper opportunity to consider the changes proposed. The country has been in lockdown, there have been no meetings allowed and we feel that these significant and material changes have been proposed at a time when the affected parties have been disadvantaged in their ability to react.
37	Southwold Town Council	Southwold Town Council	We do not know which proposals to respond to as it is unclear when the EA will take the EDF revised proposals for examination
38	John Rhodes	Quod - planning advisers to SZC Co.	able to explain proposed application changes and their materiality, if helpful
39	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter
40	Ivor Murrell		The whole process of consultation has been thwarted by Covid-19 restrictions and cannot seriously be considered valid.

41	Nicholas Burfield		From the documents available it is not clear to me how, when and whether the Examining Authority will decided to accept and examine EDF's revised proposals. Clarification is required so that I can prepare a further Written Representation.
42	Caroline Weatherby		Problem with EDF's latest changes and PINS acceptance of them as material or non material, which is not yet known This will effect the DCO and our responses to that. i.e new jetty, higher sea defenses, the site encroaching further into the Heritage Coast, and more rail traffic.
43	Michael J.Taylor		Materiality of the many changes and lack of key information.
44	Cllr David Beavnn	Green, Liberal Democrat and Independent Group on East Suffolk Council	This item should be heard before item 4. Several of these changes are lacking detailed designs and plans including the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities, changes to the position of the "northern mound" with potential impacts on the permanent BLF and possible reduction in the site footprint. At no point during 9 years of consultation and now DCO submission and proposed change have any engineering plans for the Hard and Soft Coastal Defence structures been published which means assessment of the suitability and impact of these plans for acceptance and examination remains compromised.
45	Joan Girling		Item 5 Proposed material changes by the Applicant to the permanent and temporary beach landing facilities, Discharge of water from SZC site to the sea Lack of information on proposed changes to SSSI Fen Meadow and Bridge/culvert Rights of Way (CROW ACT) lack of readable maps no Grid lines or area identification
46	Stephen Stansfeld		I will argue that EDF's changes are material changes.
47	David Mears		Since it is unclear when the decision to accept EDF's revised proposals will be examined. Therefore it is clearly difficult to present valid Written Representations, as it is not known what proposals to respond to!
48	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.

49	Susan Osben		When will we know whether any or all of EDFs revised proposals will be accepted for examination? We need to know which proposals to respond to in future Written Representations.
50	William R J Turnbull		Since we don't yet know which of EDF's re-worked proposals will be accepted for examination, how are we to know which proposals we should respond to?
51	Greg Walsh		To facilitate a meaningful response, the Examining Authority must state a date on which the acceptance, or otherwise, of EDF's proposals will take place.
52	John and Amanda Sutherell		This item should be taken before Item 4. Until it is known which of the revised proposals are to accepted by ExA it is difficult to respond coherently.
53	Jackum Brown		Item 5 should become Item 4. As we don't know if all these new proposals are even going to be accepted, how do we know what to respond to? There just isn't enough time to deal with all this properly. If EDF's changes are considered material, we should be given another proper consultation.
54	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	TASC feel that we won't know, until PINs decide whether to accept EDF's proposed changes, what DCO documents we are responding to in our Written Representations and consider it to be grossly unfair if we have insufficient time and have to incur additional costs because of the Applicant's actions. TASC would like PINs to treat EDF's new proposals as a material change, not because the final product, ie 2 new EPR reactors, will be different but because the method of getting to that position will have changed significantly as will the impacts from the entire project. TASC feel that the consultaion on the proposed changes was inadequate.
55	Rachel Fulcher	Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth	We wish to make our points about materiality of the applicant's proposed changes.
56	Frances Crowe		It is not possible to prepare Written Representations without knowing whether EDF's revised proposals will be accepted for examination. Clear timescales allowing sufficient time to respond are essential. Moreover, I consider the changes that the applicant proposes to be material and to have impact on the relevant representations submitted prior to the amendments. I find it hard to understand how after 4 consultations, the applicant could make such significant changes to their application within a few days of the deadline closing for submission of relevant representations. It feels in any case very difficult and onerous responding to this application due to covid restrictions making all meetings impossible. But it is being greatly worsened by the applicants' moving of the goal posts. I feel our time is being wasted and the lack of clarity in an already difficult process is very exhausting given the pressure we are all already under our personal and working lives at the moment. It seems that this is likely to benefit the applicant who is able to plan and resource its team accordingly

			to handle the application while everyone else (including our councils and statutory bodies) flounders due to shifting goalposts and the difficulty of responding effectively in a virtual world, on top of all the other challenges being caused by the covid-19 pandemic.
57	Arthur Stansfield		There are substantial changes to the DCO made after submission, some of which add little or anything in terms of mitigation. Some will have an adverse impact on the heritage coast. These changes should not be accepted.
58	Dr Stuart Checkley		It is impossible to say until I see the revised proposals
59	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	We wish to discuss the proposed changes (not the merits of them which will be dealt with in the examination itself) but the process of the DCO, and relationship with the DCO as originally submitted.
60	Mrs Marilyn Checkley		Can we have some dates for your acceptance of EDF's revised proposals so we can respond appropriately?
61	Dr Stuart Checkley		Impossible to answer until I see the revised proposals
62	Marilyn Hands		I am not at all sure as to where we stand with EDF's revised proposals and when and if they will be accepted by the examining authority. I really do need to know what I am looking at, if I am to respond properly when I make further written representations. I am not sure how the examining authority will deal with any of the revised proposals that are contingent on third party agreement or further investigation (e.g. increased use of rail and the form of any jetty). Early clarification would be appreciated.
63	Simon Ilett		This should be discussed before item 4
64	SIMON ILETT	ST PETER'S CHURCH THEBERTON	again should be discussed before 4
65	Lisa Chandler	East Suffolk Council	In response to the ExA questions, ESC considers that the submission of the changes to the DCO do not, in substance, change the DCO as originally applied for. ESC agrees with the Applicant's assessment of which changes are to be considered material, but we do not conclude that the substance of the proposal is different to the original proposal as a result of the proposed changes. If accepted by the ExA, the change submission should be examined as an integral part of the DCO examination; it would not be practical to examine the change submission as an addendum to the original proposal. We are still awaiting some modelling from the Applicant in relation to the changes to the beach landing

		<p>facilities and coastal defences, and we may be inhibited in our ability to respond depending on when that information is received. If receipt of that information is delayed, it may be that these elements will need to be examined later in the Examination timetable to enable full input from ESC.</p> <p>The Council notes that the change application explains that the amount of material required for the Sizewell C construction is now assumed to be increased by 20% compared to the original DCO application. The Council considers that, if the element of the change application which concerns the freight management strategy, i.e., beach landing facility and additional train paths, is not accepted, the updated information on the amounts of materials would result in a change to the number of HGV movements which was not assessed in the Transport Assessment submitted with the original DCO application (nor in the change application). Whilst it is not clear if the 20% increase of materials would equate to a 20% increase in HGV movements, it is considered that the consequential change of traffic impacts would be material. In short, the Council considers that there would be a material change in transport terms, even if the proposals within the change application were not accepted, and time would need to be allowed in programming the Examination for (1) the Applicant to provide updated documentation showing the full effects of the increase in materials in that scenario and (2) for Interested Parties to have a full opportunity to engage with that additional information.</p> <p>ESC also notes that there is, at the present time, some uncertainty about the deliverability of both the beach landing facilities and the required Network Rail improvements to allow for the additional train path. Should the change application be accepted, the Council would want these issues to be considered and this may affect the timing of some parts of the Examination.</p>
66	Charles Croydon	<p>I request to speak on Item 5 to not accept EDF's latest proposed changes</p> <p>I also consider EDF's new proposals (which include, higher sea defences, an expansion further onto the Heritage Coast) to be material changes</p> <p>If you accept EDF's changes, it will affect my representations on many other aspects of the Sizewell C project.</p>
67	SALLY ILETT	This item should be discussed before 4

68	Luella Williamson	Marine Management Organisation	<p>- The MMO is still awaiting modelling in relation to the assessment of impacts from the proposed changes to the Beach Landing Facilities and Coastal Defences. The MMO will be unable to robustly advise on the materiality of the proposed changes until we have reviewed this additional information with sufficient time.</p> <p>-The MMO is of the opinion that the proposed changes could be considered alongside the current proposal, but it is advised that the changes, and how they impact the environmental statement conclusions, are clearly presented throughout. The MMO advise that the proposed changes are fully considered, assessed and submitted prior to the examination, to allow for one set of hearings for the entire project as a whole.</p>
69	Bill Parker		<p>In the December 2020 consultation from EDF there were an array of proposals some with options. I would like to understand what the Examining Authority will accept and what exactly EDF are proposing. This makes it very challenging to present appropriate written representations.</p>
70	Anthony Ingram		<p>It remains unclear whether PINs will accept EDF's latest proposed changes as material or non-material or whether they will be accepted at all. It is our Opinion that these should not be accepted as they are significantly different to those proposals which were Consulted and therefore formed the Basis of Objections.</p> <p>As we won't know, until PINs decide on this, what DCO documents we are responding to in our Written Representations.</p> <p>We consider EDF's new proposals (which include, amongst other changes, a new jetty, more rail journeys, higher sea defences, an expansion further onto the Heritage Coast) to be material changes (see bottom of Page B3 of the Rule 6 letter for an explanation of the implications of the changes being material). If PINs accept EDF's changes, it will affect therefore our written representations on many other aspects of the Sizewell C project.</p>
71	Patricia Dowding		<p>Given I do not know which of the items submitted after Representation will be accepted by ExA or which will be considered material differences I cannot submit a future representation. Agenda item 5 should in my view precede 4.</p>
72	Neil Poole		<p>I would like to comment on this item but until we know whether the Applicant's revised proposals have been accepted for examination, I am unable to do so.</p>
73	Michael Moll	Suffolk County Council	<p>See Suffolk County Council's Written Submission sent to the Sizewell C Case Team on 10 March 2021.</p>

74	Brigitte D'Angelo		When will we know if the Examining Authority make the decision to accept EDF's revised proposals for examination? Written Representations difficult to prepare for if not know which proposals to respond to in advance.
75	Brigitte D'Angelo	Rendham Parish Council	It is unclear exactly when the Examining Authority will take the decision to accept EDF's revised proposals for examination. This makes future written representations difficult to prepare for as we do not know exactly which proposals we are responding to.
76	Henry Franklin		The proposed extension of the land required is a material change to the proposal and will affect response to the DCO.
77	Clive Lovelock		X
78	Joanne Peters	Sudbourne Parish Council	In the December 2020 consultation from EDF there were an array of proposals some with options. The Parish Council seeks clarification as to what EDF are proposing in order to be able to provide a considered response to the Examining Authority.
79	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
80	Stephen Brett	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	Over nine years of consultation to now have a proposed change to the DCO without any engineering plans for the hard and soft coastal defence means that any assessment of suitability and impact on the coast is compromised. Unless we know that these changes are accepted we cannot properly assess or discuss the impact of these changes.
81	Brian Hunt	Nacton Parish Council	Issues with your journey from the A14 to the Freight Management Facility and back again.
82	Laura Bonnett		How do these changes impact Item 4? Shouldn't they be addressed before work on list from Item 4?
83	Joanne Peters	Wickham Market Parish Council	If the changes are accepted as part of the submission, we request that there is sufficient time for people to fully understand the specifics of these, the implementation mechanisms, and consider the proposals and make further Relevant Representations. Firstly there are a number of options that EDF have submitted. These will need to be clarified.
84	David Peter Napier GRANT		This should be Item 4
85	michael gower		we need to understand if the examining body is going to accept the Developers latest proposal

86	Cameron Sked	Environment Agency	<p>We understand that the consideration of the requested changes to the DCO application, at the Preliminary Meeting, will be limited to a discussion on the materiality of the proposed changes and their examination, if accepted. As already stated we await the justifications and modelling that is required to support the proposed changes to the beach landing facilities (and associated jetty) and changes to the coastal defence design and management arrangements. Assessment of such modelling can be highly complex and time consuming.</p> <p>Responding to this information, and offering an opinion on it to the Examination process, will be dependent upon that information arriving within a suitable timescale. This may prove impossible to undertake within the Examination window if sufficient review time is not available.</p> <p>We suggest that either, this information is to be submitted promptly, and further time is given in the pre-examination period to consider it, or this matter is programmed towards the end of the examination – by when it is hoped that we may have arrived at some conclusions on the awaited material, enabling a more proper input from the EA.</p>
87	Rosie Sutherland	The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (the RSPB) and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT)	Please see the RSPB and SWT's Rule 6 Response letter
88	Simon Barlow	Environment Agency	<p>We understand that the consideration of the requested changes to the DCO application, at the Preliminary Meeting, will be limited to a discussion on the materiality of the proposed changes and their examination, if accepted. As already stated we await the justifications and modelling that is required to support the proposed changes to the beach landing facilities (and associated jetty) and changes to the coastal defence design and management arrangements. Assessment of such modelling can be highly complex and time consuming.</p> <p>Responding to this information, and offering an opinion on it to the Examination process, will be dependent upon that information arriving within a suitable timescale. This may prove impossible to undertake within the Examination window if sufficient review time is not available.</p>

			<p>We suggest that either, this information is to be submitted promptly, and further time is given in the pre-examination period to consider it, or this matter is programmed towards the end of the examination – by when it is hoped that we may have arrived at some conclusions on the awaited material, enabling a more proper input from the EA.</p>
89	Carol Bolt	Environment Agency	<p>We understand that the consideration of the requested changes to the DCO application, at the Preliminary Meeting, will be limited to a discussion on the materiality of the proposed changes and their examination, if accepted. As already stated we await the justifications and modelling that is required to support the proposed changes to the beach landing facilities (and associated jetty) and changes to the coastal defence design and management arrangements. Assessment of such modelling can be highly complex and time consuming.</p> <p>Responding to this information, and offering an opinion on it to the Examination process, will be dependent upon that information arriving within a suitable timescale. This may prove impossible to undertake within the Examination window if sufficient review time is not available.</p> <p>We suggest that either, this information is to be submitted promptly, and further time is given in the pre-examination period to consider it, or this matter is programmed towards the end of the examination – by when it is hoped that we may have arrived at some conclusions on the awaited material, enabling a more proper input from the EA.</p>
90	Jennifer Kirtley		<p>Again, I will find it very difficult to comment in future Relevant Representations if I don't know what changes will be accepted. I don't feel there is sufficient time to study these changes and I imagine it must be the same for many of the NGO's with limited funds at their disposal. I would urge the Planning Inspectorate to give us all as much time as possible to comment on the late changes submitted by EDF before the Planning Process starts. After all, EDF have had over 8 years to address these plans and still they submit substantial changes after the initial DCO submission.</p>
91	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	<p>Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely impacted by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.</p>

92	William Kendall		These are numerous and complex and will require very thorough discussion. Not possible via Microsoft Teams
93	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
94	Paul Clarke		The proposed changes to the application make it very difficult to understand what is part of the application at what stage and what to respond to. Will there be time between changes being accepted or rejected and us being able to submit responses?
95	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
96	Jennifer Wilson		I hope PINS will consider the applicant's changes as material as, whilst the end product might be similar, the method to get there will be significantly different and will likely have significant effects on designated sites including Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB as well as the marine environment. If the proposed changes to the transport strategy take place, examination is needed to assess whether all the environmentally damaging road schemes are still required. Surely if many aspects of my written representation are no longer relevant as a result of the proposed changes, then the overall project is fundamentally different.
97	Gregory Jones QC	India Bacon	Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended .

98	Gregory Jones QC	Nat Bacon	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended .
99	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley Esq. (Personal)	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended .
100	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley – (Registered Suffolk Business)	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
101	Fiona Judge		If the changes are accepted as part of the submission, I request that there is sufficient time for people to fully understand the specifics of these, the implementation mechanisms, and consider the proposals and make further Relevant Representations. Firstly there are a number of options that EDF have submitted. These will need to be clarified.
102	Gregory Jones QC	EL Dowley (Personal)	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.

103	Gregory Jones QC	EIDowling (registered business from Suffolk)	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
104	Gregory Jones QC	David Grant Esq	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
105	Gregory Jones QC	Belinda Grant	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
106	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	ITEM 5 Regarding the proposal for a material change request: My clients are adversely affected by aspects of the proposed amendment. However, notwithstanding the consultation process, my clients have still not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments, such as, but not only, all we have received in respect of the additional balancing ponds is their location. We are thus prejudiced in making representation on the proposed amendments before a decision is made. In addition, my clients are prejudiced by not knowing whether they should now be responding to the scheme as amended or not amended.
107	Anne-Marie Robb		Decision of planning authority to accept edf's amended proposals impacts the content of and ability to give further relevant represenrations
108	Bridget Chadwick		We do not know what changes made by EDF will be accepted and so what DCO documents will be included

109	Peter Chadwick		whether PINs should accept EDF's latest proposed changes as material or non-material or whether they should be accepted at all. A problem with these changes is that it is unclear when or if PINs will accept EDF's changes, meaning we won't know, until PINs decide on this, what DCO documents we are responding to in our Written Representations. Another point to make is that we consider EDF's new proposals (which include, amongst other changes, a new jetty, more rail journeys, higher sea defences, an expansion further onto the Heritage Coast) to be material changes (see bottom of Page B3 of the Rule 6 letter for an explanation of the implications of the changes being material). If PINs accept EDF's changes, it will affect our written representations on many other aspects of the Sizewell C project.
110	Peter Chadwick	Save Our Sandlings (as Chairman of SOS)	Whether PINs should accept EDF's latest proposed changes as material or non-material or whether they should be accepted at all. A problem with these changes is that it is unclear when or if PINs will accept EDF's changes, meaning we won't know, until PINs decide on this, what DCO documents we are responding to in our Written Representations. Another point to make is that we consider EDF's new proposals (which include, amongst other changes, a new jetty, more rail journeys, higher sea defences, an expansion further onto the Heritage Coast) to be material changes (see bottom of Page B3 of the Rule 6 letter for an explanation of the implications of the changes being material). If PINs accept EDF's changes, it will affect our written representations on many other aspects of the Sizewell C project.
111	Nicola Pilkington		It is impossible to make proper comments here as PINS is still in the process of deciding which new Plans from EDF it wants to accept and incorporate into the DCO. It means future Relevant Representations are entirely hypothetical. Change no6 which relates to a new design for the SSS1 Crossing is a matter of great concern as the area is of such ecological importance that Experts need to have time to make site visits and write detailed reports of sufficient depth and quality to do justice to the expected environmental impacts.
112	Sonya Exton		For the same reason as stated at 13.
113	John Baker		The changes are 'material' (PINs words) and that they should not be accepted by PINs until a public consultation has been carried out.
114	Robert Hoggar		The 17 changes should not be accepted as insufficient time. There is insufficient time to involve all parties with Covid 19 still important. Only EDF seem to have sufficient funds and have spent vast sums to promote for the product to be commenced. EDF have no financial security and would rely on outside, hopefully British funding.
115	Audrey West		I am concerned that after Consultation 4 and everyone had responded the Applicant suddenly put forward 17 changes to their plans which, as far as I know, have not so far been accepted as part of the Application. Therefore, like many people I will feel handicapped when commenting in future Relevant Representations on some drastic changes the Applicant has sprung on us.

Agenda Item 6: Draft Examination Timetable

1	Christopher G.Hudson		As a County Councillor, the election rules will affect discussion and the effects of Covid on participation.
2	Susan Margaret Morrice		<p>As the Preliminary meetings are being held while we are in lockdown and in the run up to the County Council elections this will impact on the ability of people to participate fully in the examination process.</p> <p>We need to know</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the proposals EDF has submitted will be examined. What the cumulative impact of other major developments may have on the local communities. The Scottish Power Renewables DCO is currently running until 6th April. The examination of two projects at the same time during a time of political uncertainty will make it difficult for Council officers NGOs and individuals to give due consideration to both projects. <p>People need to be given the opportunity to participate fully in the examination process due to current covid restrictions this is not possible as not everyone is able to join in remotely.</p> <p>As it is hoped that the current restrictions may be lifted in June arrangements need to be made and venues booked so that face to face meetings can be held as soon as it is safe to do so. It is most important that people have the opportunity to attend the open floor meeting and the opportunity to speak in person.</p> <p>If as hoped the restrictions are eased in June many interested parties may be visiting their families or taking their first holiday in many months.</p> <p>It would be prudent to delay or extend the timeframe between parts 1 and 2 of the preliminary meetings so that the points I have raised can be addressed.</p>
3	Ian KH Galloway		<p>Obviously Covid-19 has placed a heavy and additional burden on a great many people, none more so than those operating in the Public and Charitable sectors. However, I remain hopeful that within their finite resources most of the essential preparatory work will have been undertaken to enable them to make a fitting a valuable contribution to the SZC dDCO Examination.</p> <p>However, I am gravely concerned that the proposed timetable may inadvertently lead to a direct and adverse impact on the democratic representation of people, who will find their County Councillors subject to pre-election purdah. Moreover, as I understand it, in Suffolk this may mean no effective County Council until early May, perhaps longer if there is a significant shift in public opinion and/or a split Council.</p>

			<p>In seeking clarity on these issues, I was also reminded that Suffolk's Local Authorities are also heavily involved in the Scottish Power project(s) as well as their 'normal workflow'.</p> <p>One has to question whether the foregoing circumstances will best serve the public at large or those directly impacted by an extraordinary workload in extraordinary times!</p> <p>Whilst I understand that it is probably too late in the day to see any major change in the (immediate) timings, hopefully the ExA will be able to make some provision for easement should the summer see a loosening of Covid-19 measures.</p> <p>Finally, although I greatly regret that EDF have pursued getting the dDCO considered during this uniquely stressful time, I do fully understand why the ExA has taken the decision to largely 'go virtual'.</p> <p>However, I anticipate that there will be considerable public interest and an eagerness to participate and would ask the ExA that, as soon as is permissible and sensible, actions are put in hand to increase F-2-F meetings and exploit the acknowledged value of Open Floor Hearings for as long as possible.</p>
4	Paul Collins	Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group	<p>It is inappropriate that the first preliminary meeting is the day before District and County councils enter the period of pre-election purdah potentially compromising the hearing, especially considering the second PM is right in the middle of purdah. There is also overlap with the end of the Scottish Power EA1N and EA2 DCO hearings that finish on 6th April. Currently the initial OFH period is well before any potential of these meeting to be held in person, although the initial ISH period is potentially beyond the earliest date for complete removal of covid restrictions. Preferably, it should be planned to hold all OFH and ISH meetings in person after the 21st June, if that date is held by government, to be the end of covid restrictions for unlimited indoor meetings. It may also be possible to hold meetings at indoor venues at half capacity from 17th May which would potentially allow the initial OFHs to be held in person, although it may require additional sessions to accommodate all those wishing to speak. In order to further facilitate in-person meetings, it would be helpful if the second preliminary meeting was delayed for 6 weeks to 26th May which would also allow additional time to consider the proposed changes by the Applicant and any effects on our Relevant Representations, always assuming these are accepted for examination.</p>

5	Julian Cusack		I wish to make representations if needed to ensure that the planned site visits include visits to the at risk wildlife habitats walking routes and landscape views that will be materially impacted by the project if it proceeds
6	Alan Collett		This is a very complex application for most people to understand. There is public confusion around the impacts of the SPR wind farm proposals and those of EDF relating to Sizewell and as there has been no opportunity for face to face discussions and meetings due to Covid restrictions many people, particularly those who visit this area for holidays, recreation and day visits, are simply unaware of the application, the hearing process and the potential impact on their 'visitor experience' in the years to come. The second Preliminary Meeting should be delayed until face to face open hearings can be held, the council elections have been completed and the SPR DCO is finished. This would enable fair and open hearings to take place which is not possible under the current proposed timetable.
7	Ian Rose		The proposed timetable for preliminary meetings coinciding with the pressures of managing the current pandemic on councils at all levels and at the same having to deal with elections will put a huge burden on them and on others who may wish to make representations. As the hoped for relaxation of lockdown will be into the middle of summer, again it will make it difficult for all those hoping to relax and to take holidays. This project is of great importance to the UK as a whole and responses should not be limitedly timing that make it more difficult for lay people to be involved. I believe the Examining Authority should delay or extend the period between Parts 1 & 2 to address these concerns. It is vital that the authority should return to in-person meetings as soon as is practicable especially as many people do not have access to computers or the facility to utilise them.
8	Roy Dowding		The Preliminary Meetings have been badly timed. They will clash with the County Council period of Purdah (March 24th to 6th May) so their ability to be represented is affected. It will overlap the Scottish Power Renewables DCO, stretching the capabilities of council officers and other parties making Representations. The examination period will run through the period following 21st June, when so many people will be looking to be able to take long overdue holidays. The Preliminary Meetings should be delayed to allow in-person open floor hearings as soon as Covid restrictions permit. The Preliminaries are not bound by a strict time frame, so this could be done.
9	Edwina Galloway	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	Our Parish has a significant elderly population some of whom are not fully confident or conversant with internet technology. Combined with that, some areas of the Parish do not enjoy robust broadband. On the plus side, vaccines are being effectively and swiftly rolled out here and there is a roadmap out of the Pandemic in place. On the basis that (should it go ahead) there will be in excess of 12 years

			construction, it would not seem unreasonable to delay a short while to ensure that Open Floor Hearings are permissible as part of the process.
10	Robert Flindall		<p>Item 6 - Draft Examination Timetable.</p> <p>The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah”. There will be no new County Council until 7 May 2021. This will impact upon its representation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scottish Power Renewables DCO is still running until 6 April. This overlap will put a burden on Council officers, NGOs and individuals. • The examination runs throughout the summer. With hopes of lockdown lifting in June, people will be looking to take their first holidays for a considerable period of time making the process unfair to many. • The Examining Authority should agree to use in-person meetings as soon as Coronavirus (Covid 19) restrictions permit. • The Examining Authority should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the process, based on need. • Since the Preliminary Meetings do not adhere to a strict timeframe (while the main examination by law will end 6 months after the close of the Preliminary Meetings) I urge the Examining Authority to delay the Preliminary Meetings, or the extend the period between Parts 1 and 2 to be at least 6 weeks, to address these issues.
11	Wendy Cooper		<p>The timing of the preliminary meetings is unfortunate. County Councillors who may wish to speak will be precluded from doing so between 24 March and 6 April. The Scottish Power Renewables DCO does not conclude until 6 April thereby placing a burden on those who are involved with both of these matters. The very result of the Scottish Power DCO will be impactful on any conclusions regarding cumulative impact on this area.</p> <p>With regard to EDFs proposed changes, the time frame should not move forward until the Inspectorate has reached its decision and interested parties have had the opportunity to consider and comment on that decision.</p> <p>Clearly the first date of the Preliminary Hearing will stand but further hearings should be delayed to take account of the above.</p>
12	Kim Vanhinsbergh		<p>It would be better if the meetings were held face to face hopefully after 21st June when COVID restrictions are lifted? Especially as County council representation is restricted when they go into purdah for the elections in May. So there should be a delay of at least 6 weeks between parts one and two of the preliminary meetings.</p>

13	Robert Flindall		<p>The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah”. There will be no new County Council until 7 May. This will affect representation.</p> <p>The Scottish Power Renewables DCO is still running until 6 April. This overlap will put a burden on Council officers, NGOs and individuals.</p> <p>The examination runs throughout the summer. With hopes of lockdown lifting in June, people will be looking to take their first holidays for many months creating a degree of unfairness in the examination process.</p> <p>The Examining Authority should use in-person meetings as soon as Coronavirus (Covid 19) restrictions permit.</p> <p>Many people will wish to speak, so the Examining Authority should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the process, based on need.</p> <p>Since the Preliminary Meetings do not adhere to a strict timeframe; while the main examination by law will end 6 months after the close of the Preliminary Meetings. I urge the Examining Authority to delay the Preliminary Meetings, or to extend the period between Parts 1 and 2 to at least 6 weeks, to address the concerns above.</p>
14	William John Rea Price		<p>EDF's plans for Sizewell C are of enormous significance to local communities. The decision to hold this examination at a time when the country is in crisis and the national lockdown and there are such difficulties in communication for community organisations and ordinary people like me and my wife just confirms the sense that this is a rushed rubber stamping exercise, the outcome of which is a foregone conclusion.</p> <p>This will be happening at a time when district democracy is suspended by the local elections. The decision that the examinations for a project of this scale can be satisfactorily conducted online is an outrage and effectively disenfranchises people like us with minimal computer skills</p> <p>As national lockdown ceases in June the entire process should cease to be online and all hearings must be suspended until all interested parties can participate in person. If lockdown is extended beyond June, the examination as a whole should be suspended</p>
15	June Holmes		<p>Please note that the Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March – 6 May). This means that because of election law We will have no new County Council until 7</p>

			<p>May. I am greatly concerned this will affect representation.</p> <p>The Scottish Power Renewables DCO is still running until 6 April. This review is going to overlap and will put a burden on Council officers, NGOs and individuals who are common to both concerns especially in this pandemic.</p> <p>The examination runs throughout the summer. With hopes of lockdown lifting in June, people will be looking to take their first holidays in nearly a year. A lot of Suffolk residents are involved in the tourist industry and become very busy or may even want to holiday them selves.</p> <p>The Examining Authority should use in-person meetings as soon as covid restrictions permit.. we need to get back to full and proper representation .Not all residents and objectors are IT literate or have IT access. You deny proper representation by moving everything to IT methods only.</p> <p>lots of folk will want to speak, and should have the right to do soso the EA should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the process, based on need.</p> <p>May I ask that As t he Preliminary Meetings do not adhere to a strict timeframe , while the main examination MUST by law end 6 months after the close of the Preliminary Meetings, that you as the examining Body delay the Preliminary Meetings, or extend the period between Parts 1 and 2 to be at least 6 weeks, to address the concerns above. you are denying proper and true access for discussion and representation by not doing so.</p>
16	Martin Cooper		<p>The timing of the Preliminary Meetings is unfortunate and will preclude the County and District Councilors from having any part in the Examination Process until the elections yet again reducing a full engagement in the democratic process In person meetings will also be disrupted. I would ask for the second part of the Preliminary Meetings to be postponed until the after the 7th of May. There will be a build up of major infrastructure projects in the area that will impact on the Sizewell Project, which are already being developed at "full pace" most notably the Scottish Power Renewables DCO. This will increase the pressure on responsible officers, Councilors and residents who wish to take a full part in the process and they should be given the opportunity to do that.</p> <p>In person meetings with Examining Authority are an important part of the process to enable people to express their opinion and should be used as soon as COVID conditions allow.</p> <p>All in all it would be prudent to delay the process in order to be fair to all sides.</p>
17	Anne Westover		<p>I am concerned about the SCC election purdah period starting on March 24th ending 7th May, and how this will impact on the PM dates and input from elected members.</p> <p>I would like to request that PINS delay the examination until such time as it can take place in reality. Not virtual.</p>

			This will also assist with comprehensive site meetings with all interested parties and also attendance at open floor meetings. This will also enable proper dialogue at Parish level where at present we cannot get together in meetings to study, discuss and debate the complexity of the submission, proposals for Wickham Market traffic impacts and the January amendments.
18	Paul Whitby	Martlesham Parish Council	That the examination be postponed until after the anticipated June 21st lifting of lockdown, to allow the proceedings to be held in the real. This will have the added benefits of 1) avoiding the county council election blackout (a.k.a. purdah), and 2) avoid overlap with the otherwise contemporaneous Scottish Power Renewables enquiry.
19	Julia Brown		The overwhelming impact on local communities of this proposed build are enormous. The restraints of lock down on people equally enormous. Communications have been strained at all levels. I have struggled at every stage to follow this planning process but cannot escape the conclusion that it's outcome is a forgone conclusion. As soon as restrictions allow, this process, in the interests of natural justice must be held in the public domain. I note that our county council representatives will be unavailable due to the May elections and that simply feeds into my comment raised previously.
20	Robin Sanders	Woodbridge Town Council	The ExA should use best endeavours to be prepared to immediately switch to Examination in person as soon as government guidance allows such meetings. Bandwidth for virtual meetings can be problematic even in towns in East Suffolk. SoCG requests should include the Applicant and town/parish councils and the Applicant is not engaging with them.
21	Paul B. Taylor		I am concerned about the timing and on line format of this meeting. There will be no Council business taking place from 24th March until 7th May (due to the elections), compounded by the fact that there is likely to be a higher than usual number of people taking holiday immediately after lockdown is ended (June 21), and I fear that this will negatively impact proper consideration of the issues raised at the Preliminary Meeting. This is compounded by the concurrent Scottish Power consultation, and council personnel and resources will surely be overstretched as it will be the same department considering both issues. I also feel strongly that the online nature of this meeting is inappropriate for the enormity of this project and the huge number of people who have concerns about it. Surely it would be better to wait (just 2-3 months?) until this meeting can be held in person.
22	Nigel Smith		The preliminary meetings coincide with the start of pre-election purdah for the county council. I am concerned that this will affect representation – particularly by our local county councillor who has strong

			views on the proposed development. Moreover, with the Scottish Power DCO still running, officials from the district and county councils and various NGOs will have their work cut out to respond properly at the preliminary hearings. Accordingly, I believe at the very least, the second preliminary hearing should be delayed until after the county elections on 6 May.
23	Amanda Taylor		A - worried about timing and on-line format of proposed meeting - both during lockdown and clashing with end of lockdown and all that will entail B - Council will not be able to be involved from 24 March to 7May due to elections C - running concurrently with Scottish Power consultation - with the best of efforts neither will be given due attention D - For the Examining Authority to use face-to-face meetings as soon as allowed E - I understand that, unlike the Main Examination, Preliminary Meetings do not have to stick to a strict timetable so please delay the Preliminary Meetings to allow for/mitigate all the above... F - thank you
24	Paul Tillcock		As above with Covid restrictions hopefully ending soon and the local elections in the midst of your timetable I would hope that the preliminary matters and changes can be extended to allow for virtual meetings to take place
25	Sheila Galpin		The timetable and format of the preliminary meetings is of concern. Involvement by the County Council will be compromised as the meetings will take place during the local elections. The examination takes place during the summer months when many people will be taking advantage of going on holiday. The whole on-line and virtual nature of the meetings is challenging for many local people, many of whom lack the skills and equipment and have poor internet coverage. As the easing of lockdown measures are now in sight it seems much fairer and more sensible to delay the preliminary meetings until such time as face to face open floor hearings can take place.
26	Julie Tillcock		I HOPE THAT WITH THE LIFTING OF COVID RESTRICTIONS AND THAT LOCAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS AND THE FACT THAT EDF HAVE MADE CHANGES THAT THE PRELIMINARY MEETINGS CAN BE EXTENDED TO THOROUGHLY GO THROUGH MATTERS AND HAVE PERSONAL MEETINGS NOT VIRTUAL BEFORE THE FORMAL EXAMINATION STARTS
27	Marie Curtin		Might it be possible to delay the final Preliminary Meeting scheduled for 14 April? As we need to await the Planning Inspectorate decision regarding EDF's proposed changes it is not possible to begin to prepare Written Submissions in advance. Also, our local council elections mean that councillors will be in 'lockdown' from 24 March until 6 May and not able to be involved in the process. Whilst the Virtual Meetings are a necessary result of the Covid-19 restrictions, it is NOT ideal or conducive to full

			involvement of those impacted. The prospect of being able to hold open, in-person meetings would be beyond helpful for the local communities. Thank you.
28	Stephen Beaumont		Your Timetable conflicts with Local Elections and will bar our elected Councillors from giving their opinions at the times you specify. Democratically this cannot be right. At least you should delay the 2nd Preliminary Hearing
29	Philip Gough		It is of the utmost importance that nothing obstructs the public's ability to express its view on this application. Forthcoming local elections and the emergence from lockdown will contribute to difficulties of ensuring access to the process. The Preliminary Meetings must be delayed.
30	Ian Patterson		Because of the overlap between enquiry meetings and council elections, some elected officials will be unable to take part in discussions. This seems prime facie undemocratic and undesirable. It would be sensible, therefore, to extend the time available to allow the fullest participation of all interested parties. It is to be hoped, too, that the relaxation Covid restrictions will enable as many as possible of these meetings to be held in person rather than virtually.
31	Alan Hatt		PINS cannot treat the 5th Consultation Document Nov- Dec. as a slight alteration or update of the 55000 page DCO. To publish a 174 page document three to four weeks after submitting the DCO is a contempt of procedure. To introduce an extra massive jetty with attendant piling and significant road and bypass changes means I have to engage and pay for extra professional help. Eight years and dozens of EDF road shows and after all this a few weeks to consider significant added requirements .i.e a jetty. I object to the time allowed to consider the new requirements and submit written evidence. I challenge the observation that this is an UPDATED change. It is a massive new addition.
32	Josie Bassinette	Walberswick Parish Council	Timing needs to be reconsidered. First, we have local elections and purdah rules will make it impossible for Suffolk County Council to participate if current timing remains. Delay until after purdah ends is a minimum. Second, the development of Scottish Power at Freiston is ongoing. We are tiny local communities and we don't have the people, money or time to be engaging in both meetings at the same time. Please wait until Scottish Power finishes. It is unfair to expect us to handle both while EDF has an army of lawyers, specialist, etc at its disposal. Third, we are so close to lock down ending. Can we not wait until we can do these meetings in person? It is a matter of a month or two. Fourth, no time line should start until after a decision is made on EDF's amendment and sufficient time of a month or two at least is provided to prepare relevant representations.
33	Nigel Hiley		As you will be aware, elections are due to take place on the 6th of May. County Councillors will go into "purdah" from the 24th of March and, as a consequence, will be unable to play an active role in consultations between those dates. Additionally, many other councillors and concerned individuals will

			<p>be participating in the election campaigns and will be unable to devote their full attention to the meetings.</p> <p>There is also another local planning examination taking place for the SPR DCO. This will further weaken the ability of people to take part in both examinations.</p> <p>The Examining Authority has mentioned the fact of internet fatigue. As a regular attendee of online meetings, I can confirm that it is much more difficult to maintain attention in front of a computer screen. Sufficient time must be set aside for Open Floor Hearings to be available to allow everyone who wishes to the opportunity to speak.</p> <p>For the reasons above, I urge the Examining Authority to either delay the Preliminary Meetings until the elections are complete or at the very least to ensure that the timescale is sufficient to allow all participants to full contribue.</p>
34	Rosie Norton		<p>Due to the problems of these additional changes submitted by EDF after the closing date of 30 September I would like to suggest that the Preliminary Meetings be deferred until a later date when all the details have been presented to the public so that it can be discussed and all the implications are known. Another problem for those of us that do not have audible internet access or smart phones and who want to take part, is that we can only do so over a telephone, which is very inconvenient if there is a great deal to say (which there is). The examination process would be so much more thorough and fair if it were face to face, and held somewhere in Suffolk. Additionally we will still be under Coivd-19 restrictions this summer until 21 June and after that people will be going on holiday and wanting to go out, so is just the worst time for an Examintaion of this importance. I would like to make a point here to ask for further consultations (perhaps another three) so that everyone can see the changes and their implication, and to have the PMs and Examinations starting in either the autumn this year or next year. Considering the impact of these far reaching changes I do not think it is a lot to ask of PINs.</p>
35	Graeme Murray	Anglian Energy Planning Alliance (AEPA)	<p>I wish to re emphasise the impossible burden the public are being asked to bear here.</p>
36	Michael Wade		<p>I would request a delay in the start date of meetings a) because of lack of representation from my County Councillor due to elections b) because I feel open floor hearings in person are preferable when covid restrictions relax.</p>
37	Richard Dwelly		<p>I feel there should be a delay in the date t which the preliminary hearing ends for he following reasons :- County council elections are taking place at this time which will interfere with their ability to participate. The recent changes submitted by EDF will no have had time to be assessed.</p>

			We will still be under Covid restrictions until at least June 21 at the earliest so public face to face meetings will not be possible.
38	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
39	Alison Downes	Stop Sizewell C (Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell Ltd)	<p>The timing of these meetings is very difficult, overlapping with the Scottish Power Renewables DCO (EA1N and EA2, scheduled to run to 6 April) and on the eve of Suffolk County Council's pre-election period beginning (which will run to 7 May and include the 2nd Preliminary Meeting). We feel strongly this will impact the capacity and ability of individuals and Councillors to participate.</p> <p>The ongoing uncertainty about whether the Applicant's revised proposals will be accepted is hampering our ability to instruct experts or begin work on Written Representations. From your correspondence with colleagues, we now understand this decision will not be made until 21 April, after the 2nd Preliminary Meeting. We urge you to make this decision sooner, and/or delay the start of the formal examination either by convening a 3rd PM, or extending the period between the two meetings.</p> <p>The scale and complexity of the Sizewell C project disadvantages individuals and small NGOs. We consider that these disadvantages could be in part ameliorated if the start of the examination was delayed until face to face meetings somewhere in the local area were possible.</p>
40	Simon Mellen		I feel item 6 should be delayed until all covid restrictions are lifted and at the earliest late summer early autumn . Forcing this to be any earlier will disadvantage me against the applicant
41	Francesca Mellen		We feel for the same reason stated in agenda point 5 that the examination process should be delayed. Interested parties have been disadvantaged because of Covid 19 and in the coming weeks the council will be busy with scottish power, people will be away and there are probably still going to be restrictions in place. We need more time to consider and put our interests together in a normal world where we can meet and discuss the issues.
42	Southwold Town Council	Southwold Town Council	<p>We are concerned that representation will be affected by the elections as SCC are affected by the election dates</p> <p>In person meetings should be used as well</p> <p>Open floor hearings to continue</p>

43	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter'
44	Nicholas Burfield		<p>The timing of the EDF's proposals has been cynical and unhelpful, especially the recent revisions which have come well into the DCO / planning process and following 8 years of previous consultations and opportunities for EDF to have shared information in a timely fashion and to have responded positively to the enduring concerns of consultees. For that reason it is especially important that all further stages of the planning process should be robust and allow for all local parties to engage fully and meaningfully. Because the Preliminary Meetings coincide with the County Council going into pre-election purdah (24 March – 6 May), and because there will be no new County Council until 7 May (and Cabinet and portfolios almost certainly not established until some time after that) it is clear to me that the Preliminary Meetings can be neither sufficiently robust nor adequately engaging since they will diminish or preclude altogether input from Suffolk County Council which is the principal local democratic voice with significant expertise regarding the likely economic, social and environmental impacts of SZC. I am further concerned that, since the Scottish Power Renewables DCO will still be running until 6 April there will be an overlap with the SZC Preliminary Meetings, a clash which will impact negatively on the capacity of local consultees to engage, not least: council officers, NGOs such as RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust, the statutory agencies and individuals like myself who already struggle to keep up with these highly complex processes.</p> <p>Given that the examination looks likely to run through the summer, and that the Covid-19 lockdown is scheduled to be lifted on 21 June, and the commensurate fact that many people will be looking to take their first holidays for over 15 months (as evidenced by booking levels nationally) that fact will also reduce participation in the examination process.</p> <p>Nonetheless I believe that the Examining Authority should not resort to on-line meetings during this critical process and should instead use in-person meetings wherever possible and certainly as soon as permitted by the Covid-19 restrictions (21 June as things stand).</p> <p>For all of these reasons I believe that the Examining Authority should put back the Preliminary Meetings by at least 6 weeks, or expose itself to the criticism that the process has been unreasonably and unnecessarily compromised to the probable detriment of full, considered and properly democratic and inclusive engagement.</p>
45	Caroline Weatherby		Deadlines, Dates, Site inspections: As it stands at the moment, the 6 monthly Examination Process will start on April 15th the day after the closing of the Preliminary meeting. I wish to ask this be deferred, as we won't by then know PINS's decision on the proposed changes from EDF, which could affect the

			amount of time left for written representations before May 26th. It will be a bit rushed, especially as the council, and others involved, will also be dealing with Scottish Powers DCO in April as well. Another reason is that Suffolk County Council will be in purdah from March 24th - May 6th because of elections. We need proper face to face meetings, and covid restrictions will still be in place till June. This is too important a project to be done half cock, the PM closing date needs to be delayed
46	Michael J.Taylor		In view of the complexity of this case and involvement of many regulatory bodies in carrying out their statutory duties over their own resource led timescales, 6 months appears insufficient to enable a full understanding of the plans for a project such as this which has impacts potentially lasting at least 200 years. Special request to Government to extend the completion of the PINS process may prove essential to ensure the Secretary of State can make a robust decision.
47	Cllr David Beavnn	Green, Liberal Democrat and Independent Group on East Suffolk Council	It is inappropriate that the first preliminary meeting is the day before District and County councils enter the period of pre-election purdah potentially compromising the hearing, especially considering the second PM is right in the middle of purdah.
48	Joan Girling		Item 6 Request for an extension of time to start date of the Examination due to lack of knowledge re, if Applicant changes are accepted more written work may need to be undertaken by respondents. An added problem is due to purdah.
49	Stephen Stansfeld		I think that the closure of the PM should be deferred to allow time to prepare final submissions. The current problems with COVID and lockdown could impair a proper examination which ideally should be face to face.
50	Nigel Hiley	Saxmundham Town Council	The two town councillors who have contributed most to the Sizewell C consultations will both be heavily involved in the county council elections. It will put a huge burden on them to contribute to the meetings as well as county council election work and town council business. In addition, one councillor is also involved in his career work. If the preliminary meetings were to be postponed until after the elections have taken place then they would be able to contribute much more fully. Additionally, as previously stated, many people in Saxmundham and the surrounding area have a poor broadband service which will limit their ability to participate.
51	David Mears		Poor timing seems to cast a shadow over this Preliminary Meeting. The scheduled local elections in May render the process of submitting Representations difficult and clearly almost impossible in an effective

			manner. Instead, the effectiveness and validity of this process requires 'face to face' meetings as soon as possible
52	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once Sizwell C construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.
53	Susan Osben		PLEASE consider delaying the preliminary meetings, or at least extend the period between parts 1 and 2 to allow for the possibility of meetings to be held in person rather than virtually (in the hope of lockdown being eased/ending in June.) This will allow people who are unable to engage with the virtual platforms to have their say. Also to take account of the fact that there is another DCO running for SPR at the same time as this one, and that the local Council elections mean that our local County Council representatives will be in purdah until early May which may prevent them from representing our interests in the best way they can.
54	William R J Turnbull		The preliminary meetings are due to take place at the same time as Covid lockdown, local elections, the DCO application for Scottish Power Renewables, and the holiday season. Surely it would be better to postpone the process until all these events have passed, so that representations can be made in the proper and democratic way - in person.
55	Greg Walsh		Preliminary Meetings are coincident with County Council purdah - no new County Council until 7 May, therefore representation compromised. Scottish Power DCO runs until 6 April - officers and interested parties could be overloaded. The Examination runs throughout the summer, during which time many people will be on holiday provided Covid restrictions are lifted. As soon as Covid regulations allow, in-person meetings must be implemented. Open Floor Hearings are required to accommodate those who wish to speak. The Examining Authority must delay Preliminary Meetings, or insert a time of six weeks or more between Part 1 and Part 2, to address the above points.
56	John and Amanda Sutherell		Several factors are adversely affecting the Preliminary Meetings: 1) On line meetings, however well organised, are less 'user friendly' for the community than Open Floor meetings. 2) Scottish Power Renewables DCO is still running until 6 April; this overlap is a burden on Council officers, NGO's and

			<p>individuals. 3) County Council officers are in "purdah" for the local elections from 24 March to 6 May. This will seriously affect representation. PROPOSAL: If the Preliminary Meeting as a whole cannot be delayed to beyond 7 May, at least extend the gap between Part 1 and Part 2 and push the latter to the end of May or such time as the County Council has reformed and COVID restrictions have been raised sufficiently to allow Open Floor meetings</p>
57	Jackum Brown		<p>This is much too soon for the preliminary meetings/examination to start because: Purdah means our County, Town and Parish councils won't be able to fully participate, or participate at all which is highly undemocratic. The Scottish Power DCO is still running and surely SZC deserves everyone's full attention. We have all been under severe restrictions for a year, worse for us who live alone. With these hearings going on all summer and autumn, with all the work that entails, how is anyone going to be able to take a (really badly needed) break? This all has been, and will apparently continue to be, extremely damaging to our mental health. Local internet is often very poor, people have trouble getting on, people frequently freeze, People's audio goes. Hopeless for virtual meetings of such importance.</p> <p>I ask PINS to delay the start of these meetings by 2/3 months, or at the very least massively extend the time between parts 1 and 2 so we can all, individuals and organisations, have enough time to properly respond. If that happened we could have in person meetings and open floor hearings throughout. It is EDF that is rushing it and they've had 8/9 years to get ready whereas we have not. If the new proposals are accepted we'll have just about 5 weeks to understand reams of new documents and more incomprehensible maps and respond fully. This is not a level playing field, just unfair and undemocratic.</p>
58	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	<p>TASC feel it would be preferable for the final PM to be delayed until after we know whether PINs are going to accept the Applicant's new proposals and to allow sufficient time for full scrutiny of those proposals in order to complete Written Representations by a later date than currently planned. Reasons why TASC believe a delay would be preferable include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it could give the Applicant more time to provide its final proposals and their impacts, before the Examination starts - it would enable bodies such as the Environment agency and MMO to fully address the Applicant's proposed changes - there is likely to be insufficient time to prepare Written Representations, between PINS decision to accept or decline the Applicant's suggested changes and the final date for submission of the Written Representations (currently 26th May)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Scottish Power DCO runs to 6th April 2021 so is an extra burden on NGOs, Councils and individuals up to that date - Suffolk County Council are holding elections in May so will be in purdah from 24th March - 6th May, reducing the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the DCO process. - the Examination, as currently planned, runs through the summer at a time when, after extended periods of lockdown and travel restrictions, families will be wanting to make use of greater freedoms such as going on holiday. - the earlier the Examination starts, the greater the amount of the Examination process happening while there are still likely to be Covid-19 restrictions in place. - as much of the Examination as possible should be conducted by way of open floor in-person meetings so the later the Examination process starts the more likely this can be facilitated
59	Gwen Erskine-Hill		<p>Suffolk county council is a major stakeholder in this DCO and their elections are to be held on Thursday May 6th. I believe that the date of the preliminary meeting part 2 should be moved to some days after the elections. Firstly because all councillors will be going into purdah between March 24th and May 6th and therefore will be unable to participate in this process until May 7th and secondly to allow any new incumbents time to get up to speed on the process and issues.</p> <p>In addition the Scottish Power DCO should complete before the Sizewell C one starts. Allowing interested parties a breather between the two DCOs.</p>
60	Rachel Fulcher	Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth	<p>We are not happy about the proposed timetable on account of the multiple changes and lateness of crucial documents. We would like to request more time for Written Representations.</p>
61	Frances Crowe		<p>The final preliminary meeting is currently set for 14th April. This should be delayed for a number of critical reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suffolk county council goes into purdah from 24th March until 6th May and their full participation in the process will therefore be unacceptably curtailed. - it is very concerning that the 6 month examination process would start from the day after the final preliminary meeting. The uncertainty regarding whether the applicant's revised proposals will be accepted means in effect a reduction in the time given to interested parties to prepare their written statements by the current deadline of 25th May. The process should be delayed to give people more time. - The process will overlap with the Scottish Power DCO which will place an unacceptable burden on councils, NGOs, statutory bodies and individuals.

			<p>- It would be hugely beneficial for as much of the examination as possible to take place in open floor public meetings, rather than virtually.</p> <p>- I am very concerned that the process (and in particular) the May deadlines for written representations coincide with the relaxing of lockdown when so many people (myself included) will be desperately wanting to take time to see their families and friends for the first time in months and to take long awaited and delayed holidays. These are unprecedented times and I strongly believe that participation in the process will be greatly affected by this timing. Public engagement is likely to be significantly reduced and the examination process for this reason alone should be delayed for the short period until hearings can be heard in person and people have had the chance to pick up the pieces of their hugely disrupted lives.</p> <p>- I personally feel quite distressed at the thought of having to choose between responding to and participating fully in this examination, which is so important to me, and being able at last to spend time with my widely dispersed family and friends. The timing could not be more difficult. I know a number of people who simply do feel able to engage with this process because they feel so emotionally and physically depleted already by the pandemic.</p>
62	Arthur Stansfield		<p>The end of the preliminary examination should be deferred so that interested parties have sufficient time to prepare for the examination. Also with the impact of vaccination on Covid and lockdown a more standard form of examination could be followed. That would allow better consultation.</p> <p>Further EDF's DCO submission was self-evidently premature as within months they submitted changes.</p>
63	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	<p>We wish to participate in the discussion and agreement of the timetable.</p>
64	Mrs Marilyn Checkley		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timing of preliminary hearings: these could stretch into June/July, when many people, including us on 17/07, are going on holiday. Please avoid summer holidays. 2. The Scottish Power DCO continues until 06/04. 3. Council elections are from 24/03 - 06/05. Councillors who may want to contribute to the preliminary hearings will be excluded. <p>Between them these account for 6 months when the hearing will be adversely impacted. Please can you either delay the first hearing, or extend the time between the first and second preliminary hearings by at least 6 weeks?</p>
65	Dr Stuart Checkley		<p>The Council Elections from March 24 to April 6 will clash and Councillors will be unable to attend</p> <p>The Scottish Power DO continues until April 6</p> <p>Many people will take holidays in July</p> <p>Please could you either delay the first hearing or extend the time between the first and second hearings</p>

66	Marilyn Hands		The preliminary meetings coincide with the start of pre-election purdah for the county council. I am concerned that this will affect representation - particularly by our local county councillor who has strong views on the proposed development. Moreover, with the Scottish Power DCO still running, officials from the district and county councils and various NGOs will have their work cut out to respond properly at the preliminary hearings
67	Simon Ilett		The Examining Authority should delay the start of preliminary meetings or at least extend between part 1 and 2 for the following reasons As lockdown eases, many people will be keen to take holidays this summer and may not be able to fully engage with the process County Council elections mean that Councillors will be unable to take part in the process during the elections and with Scottish Power Renewables DCO coinciding with this process are already stretched A delay in the timings will ensure the EA will be able to facilitate in person meetings as lockdown measures ease and this will ensure those without the ability to engage electronically are not disadvantaged.
68	SIMON ILETT	ST PETER'S CHURCH THEBERTON	With Council elections and Scottish Power renewables DCO putting pressure on Councils and Councillors this process should be delayed to allow the full council to be available after May 7th so that no one is unable to represent views of those that are going to be severely impacted. A delay would also allow for face to face meeting once restrictions ease ensuring that everyone can participate and our congregations who do not have access to or uncomfortable with technology have the opportunity to be heard
69	Lisa Chandler	East Suffolk Council	The time scheduled for Issue Specific Hearings is noted and welcomed. However, given the large number of potential issues for discussion identified in Annex C, we welcome the setting out of Issue Specific Hearing dates and additional dates (if required) at this stage. Given the complexity of the proposal, keeping to the examination timetable will be very important. In addition to the considerable amount of documentation that the Council is likely to have to consider in order to make informed contributions throughout the examination, it should also be noted that the Examination is scheduled across the period during which Covid-19 restrictions are expected to be relaxed. There are a great number of Council staff who have been working under considerable pressure for the last twelve months and are entitled to and hoping for a break. It is hoped that gaps will continue to be maintained in the Examination timetable devoid of deadlines that could be utilised by those staff requiring a break.

70	Charles Croydon		<p>I request to speak on Item 6 to seek delay of the start of the</p> <p>6-month Examination process as the earlier the Examination starts, will result in a greater amount of the Examination process happening while there are still likely to be Covid-19 restrictions in place.</p> <p>I would also ask the inspectors to visit Coronation Wood so I can point out particular features that you think they should see. This is because it provides insight into how EDF operate.</p>
71	SALLY ILETT		<p>As Covid restrictions ease there is an opportunity for the EA to delay the process for a few weeks to allow people to attend meetings in person rather than online which some may be intimidated by and feel unable to get involved.</p> <p>Council elections mean that we would not be represented for several weeks until May 7th.</p>
72	Luella Williamson	Marine Management Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MMO requests the Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) hearings are organised into marine (below Mean High Water Springs) and terrestrial matters. - ISH hearings to discuss marine matters are grouped together on consecutive days. - Agendas for Issue Specific Hearings should be sent as far in advance of the hearing as possible to ensure preparedness. - Agendas should be detailed - MMO prefers virtual hearings - MMO would support gaps in the Examination timetable devoid of deadlines that could be utilised by those staff requiring a break.
73	Louise Staples	National Farmers' Union	Formats of hearings
74	David Gordon		Need meeing not online. Timetable to start after scottish power hearings finished
75	Bill Parker		<p>I am concerned that the conclusion of the preliminary meeting currently scheduled for the 14th April which will be in the middle of Suffolk County Council election purdah. In view of many of the outstanding queries being the responsibility of the County Council, the lack of a County Councillor and access to County Council advice this is potentially an issue. I would urge the Examining Authority to reschedule the Part 2 of the meeting until the relevant Council representatives are both elected and the Cabinet and JLAG members are in post at the end of May.</p> <p>In addition the DCO process for Scottish Power Renewables will still be running until 6th April causing</p>

			<p>significant congestion and excessive demands on the people of the area, the councils and relevant consenting authorities.</p> <p>The ExA should also facilitate site visits to both Thorpeness and Sizewell beach to review some of the coastal issues.</p>
76	Anthony Ingram		<p>The day after the final PM (currently scheduled for 14th April), PINs have a legal obligation to start the legally binding 6-month Examination process. The process must be postponed until after PINS decides whether it is going to accept EDF's new documents with its Significant Changes.</p> <p>Given these significant changes and their impact, there is insufficient time to prepare final submissions, between PINS decision to accept/decline EDF's suggested changes and the final date for submission of the Written Representations (currently 26th May)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the concurrent Scottish Power DCO which runs to 6th April 2021 so is an extra burden on NGOs, Councils, and individuals. - Suffolk County Council are holding elections in May so will be in purdah from 24th March - 6th May, reducing the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the DCO process. -the concurrent effects of COVID 19
77	Patricia Dowding		<p>With Purdah commencing on 24th March many of those who would wish to make Representations throughout the Examination will be unable to do so until after the County and Local Elections. The dates also overlaps with the SPR DCO.</p> <p>Given above and current COVID restrictions and likely dates for each stage of the opening up of the economy and social behaviour, it seems ludicrous to me that your examination stages are scheduled for March and April 2021. This should wait until all participants who wish to comment can do so in a meaningful way.</p>
78	Neil Poole		<p>The Preliminary Meetings should be delayed in order to avoid clashing with the County Council election purdah period. It is vital that the process enables interested parties to participate fully and to be represented.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy has said that "The onus is on the company developing the project to bring as many people as possible with them." By the same token, the examination process should give "as many people as possible" the fullest opportunity to be heard. The current timetable places constraints on participation and representation. The ExA has the opportunity</p>

			<p>here to mitigate those constraints.</p> <p>Delaying the Preliminary Meetings will also ease the burden on Council officers and others involved in the Scottish Power Renewables DCO which runs until 6 April.</p> <p>Delaying the Preliminary Meetings will increase the likelihood that Covid restrictions will have been eased, enable the ExA to use in-person, Open Floor Hearings and make best use of the 6 month period allowed for the main examination.</p> <p>For all the above reasons, I urge the ExA to delay the Preliminary Meetings.</p>
79	Michael Moll	Suffolk County Council	See Suffolk County Council's Written Submission sent to the Sizewell C Case Team on 10 March 2021.
80	Brigitte D'Angelo		<p>The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council Elections. Pre-election "purdah" (24 March – 6 May) There will be no new County Council until 7 May. This will affect County councillors from making representations.</p> <p>The SPR DCO application for Substations at Friston is running until 6 April. This overlap puts a burden on Council officers, Parish councillors and individuals.</p> <p>I strongly believe the Examining Authority should use in-person meetings as soon as covid restrictions permit.</p> <p>Many people do not engage with virtual hearings either through lack of knowledge/confidence or poor broadband connection.</p> <p>The Examining Authority should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the process, based on need.</p> <p>Since the Preliminary Meetings do not have to adhere to a strict timeframe (while the main examination MUST by law end 6 months after the close of the Preliminary Meetings) I ask that the Examining Authority delay the Preliminary Meetings, or the extend the period between Parts 1 and 2 to be at least 6 weeks, to address the concerns above.</p>
81	Mrs Annabel Ward		<p>1/ It is not appropriate that a development of this magnitude should be examined in virtual consultation</p> <p>2/ The council will be in pre election purdah at the same time as the preliminary meetings, so the timing is totally inappropriate</p> <p>3/ The local Scottish Power Renewables DCO is still running until 6th April, therefore the Council is in danger of being overwhelmed.</p>

82	Brigitte D'Angelo	Rendham Parish Council	<p>The entire exercise coincides with our County Council elections. “purdah” being 24 March – 6 May. There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representations. Scottish Power's DCO for substations at Friston (also very close to our Parish) is running until 6 April. This overlap will put a burden on Council officers, Parish councils and individuals</p> <p>We believe the Examining Authority should use in-person meetings as soon as covid restrictions permit. Many people may wish to speak who are not able to access virtual meetings either through lack of technology, confidence and broadband issues.</p> <p>The Examining Authority should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the process, based on need.</p> <p>As the Preliminary Meetings do not adhere to a strict timeframe (while the main examination MUST by law end 6 months after the close of the Preliminary Meetings) we ask that the Examining Authority delay the Preliminary Meetings, or the extend the period between Parts 1 and 2 to be at least 6 weeks, to address the concerns above.</p>
83	James Lawson	East of England Ambulance NHS Trust	<p>- EEAST is currently working on an ‘Activity Impact Model’ (yet to be submitted as a representation) with a target submission date by 12/5/21;</p> <p>- EEAST would not therefore be able to meet ExA ‘Deadline 1’ of 12/5/21 for the submission of summaries of all representations or initial SoCG, incorporating an appropriate draft Sec 106 Head of Term of Agreement addressing EEAST service impact mitigation, & would work closely with the applicant to target Deadline 4 for the SoCG being 23/7/21;</p>
84	Henry Franklin		<p>so it would be preferable for this to be delayed until after we know if PINs are going to accept EDF’s new documents. Hopefully, if as many people as possible mention (in your own words) a request for a deferral of the closing PM, PINs might take notice. Reasons why a delay would be preferable include: -</p> <p>The deadline for the final planning meeting of 14 April is too soon for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there is insufficient time to prepare final submissions since these will be predicated on knowledge of what EDF's accepted changes are (if any) and for final written reps on 26 May 2 Scottish Power DCO is running until April 2021 and this is adding to the burden on over-stretched NGOs, Councils and individuals at a time of a national pandemic 3 in addition, local elections are coterminous in May, so Council unable to respond properly, again heightened by pandemic; 4 having endured more than a year of lock down and restrictions on personal liberties, families are going to be travelling or working flat out to repair household finances. as a result, there is likely to be less

			<p>community engagement than otherwise in a normal year. equally, many people will be less informed than they would have otherwise have been if there had been no pandemic and lockdown as they would have been able to attend meetings, heard others views at normal community gatherings (pubs, restaurants, schools, churches etc). holding the Examination so soon after lifting (or not) of restrictions feels undemocratic where those who would wish to object rely on good communication and community engagement compared to a large corporate which can employ the best advisers and staff and so have their case disproportionately heard.</p> <p>5. this is so critical to the local area that the Examination should only be conducted once gatherings of more than 100 are allowed thereby allowing the local community to debate and contribute to the debate. whatever the decision it needs to be seen to have been properly aired and debated. the current timetable and process looks and feels like it has been conducted in the shadows and this does discredit to all involved.</p>
85	Clive Lovelock		X
86	Joanne Peters	Sudbourne Parish Council	The Parish Council notes that the conclusion of the preliminary meeting currently scheduled for the 14th April which will be in the middle of Suffolk County Council election purdah. In view of many of the outstanding queries being the responsibility of the County Council, the lack of a County Councillor to advise the Parish Council on these matters may be an issue. Therefore the date for Part 2 of the meeting should revised until after the election on 6th May.
87	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
88	Stephen Brett	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	We feel the second preliminary meeting should be pushed back between 6-8 weeks so that purdah for the county elections will have finished and it would enable the first open floor hearings to be in person, also Scottish Power EA1N and EA2 hearings do not finish until 6th April so it would be helpful if the preliminary meeting did not start till after that date.
89	LJ Dowley		<p>The new County Council will not take office until 7th May. How will they represent us until then at the Preliminary Meeting Part 2?</p> <p>It seems quite wrong that the hearings take place before Covid regulations allow face to face</p>

			participation. Many participants are daunted by the idea of Zoom meetings and will therefore not contribute.
90	Viv Mason		insufficient time to carry out a full health impact assessment
91	Emma Dowley		<p>1. There is a DCO process currently ongoing with respect to SSE's proposal for a substation at Friston, which runs until 6th April. This should be concluded before the SZC process starts so that those from local government bodies, NGOs and other interested parties needing to attend both can do so. It is also important that the cumulative impact of these two projects and other local every projects come under scrutiny.</p> <p>2. Suffolk County Council will be in purdah from 24th March until 6th May in advance of local elections, potentially affecting its officers' ability to attend SZC DCO hearings, Hearings should be delayed until SCC can be represented.</p> <p>3. All hearings should take in person once lockdown restrictions have been relaxed so that all are equally represented - a mix of virtual and in person hearings has the potential to discriminate between participants.</p>
92	LJ Dowley		The timings of the hearings, deadlines etc are confused by their proximity to the DCO process for the Friston sub station and to the local council elections in early May. This DCO process should be delayed until both of those items are clarified, not least so that the cumulative deleterious effects on the local community, tourism, transport/traffic etc can be properly considered.
93	Sarah Morgan	FERN Farnham Environment Residents & Neighbours	<p>1 FERN request the ExA to revise its programme for DCO hearings to allow for the Bypass for Farnham and Stratford St Andrew (2VB) to be treated as a discrete subject, examined as a Topic in its own right and not have the issues relating to the alignment spread across a number of Topics. The Parish Councils of Farnham with Stratford St Andrew and also of Marlesford support this, [REDACTED]. It is not contested that our two villages should be bypassed, but so should Little Glemham and Marlesford. Judging by a recent conference with the PC of Farnham with Stratford St Andrew, EDF now seem to be saying that the alignment in the DCO was one pushed upon them by Suffolk County Council (SCC) and East Suffolk Council (ESC). EDF's argument against the alternative route to the east of Foxburrow Wood are weak and partially incorrect. With respect to the ExA, it would not be possible to do adequate justice to the issues without it being treated as a Topic in its own right, nor would be fair on those affected by the alignment not to do so.</p> <p>2 Most of those affected are lay people; it is prejudicial to natural justice they should be denied having the discrete subject addressed comprehensively by the ExA, rather than EDF as promoter being favoured</p>

			<p>by having the benefit of the subject being dealt with piecemeal, with the risk of inadequate consideration and indeed that major issues are ignored or not addressed fully (as for hydrological impact from the cutting). This is not an issue with broad transport implications but direct and specific concerns related to a single topic; is the EDF alignment acceptable at all? We will contend that it is so harmful to the built and natural environment that it is simply unacceptable, cannot be justified as to the public good and that the balance of planning assessment clearly leads to it having to be rejected.</p> <p>3. There is no argument about the principle of the 2VB; it is the route selection which is wrong. There is the further issue that, in reality, the construction of EDF's proposed alignment will most probably preclude the villages of Marlesford and Little Glemham being ever bypassed, whereas the alternative route to the east of Foxburrow Wood provides a better opportunity for re-design to allow for a future extension. Even if the ExA concludes that it is in the public interest that the DCO be approved without bypass relief for Marlesford and Little Glemham, SCC has accepted the continued need for bypassing these other two villages and has retained that in its forward programme, so it is very short-sighted planning to prejudice delivery of a solution to an accepted need, even if EDF will not pay for it.</p> <p>4 It is consistent with EDF's very poor approach to consultations with Parish Councils generally and local residents that it has been so cavalier over route selection. EDF have paid scant attention to heritage, tourism or ecological impacts, redacting information on hydrology and providing evidence in the DCO that is flawed, incorrect or misleading. Its purported reasons for not considering properly the alternative just do not stand up. EDF has clearly not factored into its thinking the very high cost in compensation terms of its proposed alignment nor the saving that would accrue from the alternative route being largely at grade, rather than EDF's alignment in deep cutting.</p> <p>5 Again with respect to the ExA, there is such a range of issues to be addressed on the appropriate alignment for the 2VB that they simply cannot be addressed properly without it being a single Topic and time made available for examination of is comprehensively as a discrete Topic. It is simply unfair on those directly effected, nor pays much regard to the position of the Parish Council for similar reasons. EDF's justification for its proposed alignment cannot be properly examined without considering all relevant issues together.</p>
94	Alison Andrews	The Alde and Ore Association	Suffolk County Council local elections mean that it cannot do anything but caretaking in the period 24 March until 7 May: Councillors and Council Staff may not be able to participate fully and effectively, particularly if any new aspects come forward. Please can the Examination be delayed.

			As a very important economic sector in this area is tourism, the carrying out of the Examination during the summer months may preclude businesses from being able to participate: this is particularly the case in 2021 because businesses will all be having to work extra hard to make up for being unable to earn anything except in very limited periods in the whole of the last year.
95	Joanne Peters	Wickham Market Parish Council	WMPC request detail and clarity regarding the timetable and deadlines, as some of the terminology is confusing.
96	David Peter Napier GRANT		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SPR Friston DCO is still in progress and has material influence on potential shared transport infrastructure 2. County Council in pre-election 'purdah' until 6th May - their input and views are essential 3. The first few months following Covid19 lockdown are essential for local people to travel to see remote family 4. The period between Parts 1 and 2 could and should be extended to allow 1,2 and 3 above to happen and will allow open floor hearings
97	Michael Gower		As an ex County and District councillor I am well aware of the Suffolk's LA's strict interpretation of the purdah rules. This will make it v tough for current councillors to fully participate. We may no agree with them but they need to have time to be fully involved. Many of my neighbours want to be involved in the hearings but are put off by the virtual space
98	Emma Dowley		The DCO process for SSE's proposed substation is still ongoing and that for SCZ should not overlap, ensuring that those who need to participate in both can do so without fear of having to choose between one and the other. Suffolk County Council elections are also due shortly and the SZC DCO process should be delayed until the period of purdah for these elections is over and SCC participation can be ensured. This should mean that all those who should participate can do so and the numerous harms to the local community, environment, tourism, transport etc of the the SZC and SSE projects can be properly considered, both standing alone and cumulatively.
99	Cameron Sked	Environment Agency	<p>We note in the examination timetable that the ExA may intend to publish the report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) on 09 September 2021.</p> <p>Three Environmental Permit applications for the operation of the power station have been submitted to the EA: · * a bespoke Water Discharge Activity permit - required for the proposed discharges of cooling water and liquid process effluents into the marine environment, during operation of the power station ·</p> <p>* a Combustion Activity permit - required for the proposed operation of diesel generators, to be used</p>

			<p>to provide back-up electrical supply at the site, and ·</p> <p>* a Radioactive Substances Regulations permit - necessary for the proposed disposal of operational radioactive waste emissions to air, and water, and by transfer</p> <p>There are complex overlapping Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs that fall across these permit decisions and the DCO decision, especially where there are project-wide in combination impacts on the marine environment. Despite our repeated advice, and that in PINS Advice Note 11 (Annex D), the applicant has chosen to not submit their applications for these environmental permits well in advance of the DCO Application. We are a competent authority and must undertake an HRA as part of our determination process. It is currently our projection that our permit decisions - and associated HRA conclusions - will not be available within the Examination timescale, due to the submission strategy adopted by the applicant. We consider that our permit determination HRA conclusion should have assisted with the within project in combination HRA for the DCO application and its absence could result in challenges to the HRA process – at a DCO decision level.</p> <p>We note that the ExA is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of six months beginning with the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting. As we have highlighted in Agenda items 4 and 5, there are a number of Principal Issues, or proposed changes to the DCO application, where key information remains unavailable, or the issues are particularly complex. These include Coastal Processes, Water Supply, Marine Ecology (including WFD compliance) and Flood Risk.</p> <p>As already suggested, we maintain that either further time be given in the pre-Examination period to consider this information, upon its provision. Or that these issues are programmed towards the end of the Examination, by when it is hoped that we can have fully and properly reviewed the awaited information, prepared our position and so be able to more meaningfully participate in the examination of these issues.</p> <p>The Examination is scheduled across the very period during which Coronavirus lockdown restrictions are hoped to be relaxed. We would like to point out that there are a great number of EA staff who have been working under considerable pressure for the last twelve months, which has included emergency response to flooding incidents, and who have done so without having had the opportunity to take leave</p>
--	--	--	---

			in the usual way. These people are long overdue, and are indeed entitled to, a break. It is hoped that there will therefore be some gaps planned into the Examination timetable - devoid of deadlines - that could be utilised by those staff requiring a break, where convenient. If those gaps could be highlighted for all parties at an early stage then that would be welcomed by the EA, and would help our people plan.
100	Rosie Sutherland	The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (the RSPB) and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT)	Please see the RSPB and SWT's Rule 6 Response letter
101	Simon Barlow	Environment Agency	<p>We note in the examination timetable that the ExA may intend to publish the report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) on 09 September 2021.</p> <p>Three Environmental Permit applications for the operation of the power station have been submitted to the EA: · * a bespoke Water Discharge Activity permit - required for the proposed discharges of cooling water and liquid process effluents into the marine environment, during operation of the power station ·</p> <p>* a Combustion Activity permit - required for the proposed operation of diesel generators, to be used to provide back-up electrical supply at the site, and ·</p> <p>* a Radioactive Substances Regulations permit - necessary for the proposed disposal of operational radioactive waste emissions to air, and water, and by transfer</p> <p>There are complex overlapping Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs that fall across these permit decisions and the DCO decision, especially where there are project-wide in combination impacts on the marine environment. Despite our repeated advice, and that in PINS Advice Note 11 (Annex D), the applicant has chosen to not submit their applications for these environmental permits well in advance of the DCO Application. We are a competent authority and must undertake an HRA as part of our determination process. It is currently our projection that our permit decisions - and associated HRA conclusions - will not be available within the Examination timescale, due to the submission strategy adopted by the applicant. We consider that our permit determination HRA conclusion should have assisted with the within project in combination HRA for the DCO application and its absence could result</p>

			<p>in challenges to the HRA process – at a DCO decision level.</p> <p>We note that the ExA is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of six months beginning with the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting. As we have highlighted in Agenda items 4 and 5, there are a number of Principal Issues, or proposed changes to the DCO application, where key information remains unavailable, or the issues are particularly complex. These include Coastal Processes, Water Supply, Marine Ecology (including WFD compliance) and Flood Risk.</p> <p>As already suggested, we maintain that either further time be given in the pre-Examination period to consider this information, upon its provision. Or that these issues are programmed towards the end of the Examination, by when it is hoped that we can have fully and properly reviewed the awaited information, prepared our position and so be able to more meaningfully participate in the examination of these issues.</p> <p>The Examination is scheduled across the very period during which Coronavirus lockdown restrictions are hoped to be relaxed. We would like to point out that there are a great number of EA staff who have been working under considerable pressure for the last twelve months, which has included emergency response to flooding incidents, and who have done so without having had the opportunity to take leave in the usual way. These people are long overdue, and are indeed entitled to, a break. It is hoped that there will therefore be some gaps planned into the Examination timetable - devoid of deadlines - that could be utilised by those staff requiring a break, where convenient. If those gaps could be highlighted for all parties at an early stage then that would be welcomed by the EA, and would help our people plan.</p>
102	Carol Bolt	Environment Agency	<p>We note in the examination timetable that the ExA may intend to publish the report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) on 09 September 2021.</p> <p>Three Environmental Permit applications for the operation of the power station have been submitted to the EA: · * a bespoke Water Discharge Activity permit - required for the proposed discharges of cooling water and liquid process effluents into the marine environment, during operation of the power station ·</p> <p>* a Combustion Activity permit - required for the proposed operation of diesel generators, to be used to provide back-up electrical supply at the site, and ·</p>

		<p>* a Radioactive Substances Regulations permit - necessary for the proposed disposal of operational radioactive waste emissions to air, and water, and by transfer</p> <p>There are complex overlapping Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs that fall across these permit decisions and the DCO decision, especially where there are project-wide in combination impacts on the marine environment. Despite our repeated advice, and that in PINS Advice Note 11 (Annex D), the applicant has chosen to not submit their applications for these environmental permits well in advance of the DCO Application. We are a competent authority and must undertake an HRA as part of our determination process. It is currently our projection that our permit decisions - and associated HRA conclusions - will not be available within the Examination timescale, due to the submission strategy adopted by the applicant. We consider that our permit determination HRA conclusion should have assisted with the within project in combination HRA for the DCO application and its absence could result in challenges to the HRA process – at a DCO decision level.</p> <p>We note that the ExA is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of six months beginning with the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting. As we have highlighted in Agenda items 4 and 5, there are a number of Principal Issues, or proposed changes to the DCO application, where key information remains unavailable, or the issues are particularly complex. These include Coastal Processes, Water Supply, Marine Ecology (including WFD compliance) and Flood Risk.</p> <p>As already suggested, we maintain that either further time be given in the pre-Examination period to consider this information, upon its provision. Or that these issues are programmed towards the end of the Examination, by when it is hoped that we can have fully and properly reviewed the awaited information, prepared our position and so be able to more meaningfully participate in the examination of these issues.</p> <p>The Examination is scheduled across the very period during which Coronavirus lockdown restrictions are hoped to be relaxed. We would like to point out that there are a great number of EA staff who have been working under considerable pressure for the last twelve months, which has included emergency response to flooding incidents, and who have done so without having had the opportunity to take leave in the usual way. These people are long overdue, and are indeed entitled to, a break. It is hoped that there will therefore be some gaps planned into the Examination timetable - devoid of deadlines - that</p>
--	--	---

			could be utilised by those staff requiring a break, where convenient. If those gaps could be highlighted for all parties at an early stage then that would be welcomed by the EA, and would help our people plan.
103	Jennifer Kirtley		<p>There is great concern as to the timings of the Preliminary Meetings with County Council elections taking place. I have spoken to a Councillor who hoped to fully engage in the Planning Process but will also be campaigning to get re-elected and was not sure how he could do both during 'purdah'. We also have the Scottish Power Renewables DCO running until the 6th of April and many local folks are also involved with the project.</p> <p>With the examination running throughout the summer, it will also be difficult for people to arrange holidays around the project. We have all suffered over the last year with the stresses and strains caused by the pandemic and this can only make it worse.</p> <p>I would imagine many people will want to speak on this highly complex case and the many issues it will bring to the area, so I would urge the EA to allow face to face meetings and Open Floor Hearings as much as possible, if and when Covid-19 restrictions allow.</p> <p>As the Preliminary Meetings don't have to adhere to a strict time frame, I would ask the EA to delay the Preliminary Meetings or extend the period between Part 1 and Part 2 to at least 8 weeks but preferably 3 months to allow the concerned local public, whether individuals or NGO's to participate fully in a project that will in no doubt affect all our lives.</p>
104	Paul Clarke		<p>The clash with purdah for county council elections is concerning and may affect full representation. With restrictions planned to end in June, it would be better to delay so that appearances can take place face to face.</p>
105	Jennifer Wilson		<p>I feel it is unfair that examination dates have been set when we are still in the dark as to whether PINS will accept the applicant's proposed changes. If the changes are accepted, then interested parties should have the same length of time that PINS have had to assess the changes before having to submit their written representations.</p> <p>I think PINS should be aware of the mental stress that has been placed on Suffolk residents with numerous large projects running concurrently, especially during the covid restrictions. Therefore, the plan for the Sizewell C examination to run through the summer, when people should be enjoying a much needed break, is a totally unreasonable burden to place on Suffolk residents.</p>
106	Fiona Judge		<p>I would like further detail and clarity regarding the timetable and deadlines, as some of the terminology is confusing.</p>
107	Carina Wentzel	The Heveningham Hall Estate	<p>Issue Specific Hearings (ISHs):</p> <p>The HHE requests that the following topics are subject to ISHs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The temporary Northern Park and Ride with sub-topics including: ecology data and assessment; light

			<p>pollution and other effects on ecosystems and residential amenity; mitigation measures (including landscaping and screening); site selection, justification and alternatives; scale and form; safety concerns given the level crossing at Darsham; management of the Northern Park and Ride, including hours of construction/use and security measures;</p> <p>2.The Yoxford Roundabout including: modelling; design (including attenuation lake); ecological data and assessment; light pollution and other effects on ecosystems and residential amenity; mitigation measures (including landscaping and screening); effect on listed Cockfield Hall.</p> <p>The HHE anticipates that the ExA will schedule ISHs in relation to the following key topics (among others), which it supports: Air Quality; Alternatives; Biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine (particularly the Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment and mitigation/compensation); Cumulative impact; Draft Development Consent Order (particularly the s.106 agreement, the adequacy of draft DCO Requirements and whether any additional Requirements are necessary); Historic environment; Landscape impact, visual effects and design (particularly the effects of temporary and permanent lighting); Traffic and Transport (particularly the suitability of proposed associated development and modelling approaches).</p> <p>Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and Local Impact Reports (LIRs): The current timetable requires the submission of written representations by 26 May 2021 – only two weeks after Deadline 1, which includes the submission of initial SoCG and LIRs. A number of these statements and reports will be of particular relevance to Interested Parties (IPs), yet the current timetable affords IPs limited time to review the same (once published) and revise their draft written representations as necessary. We therefore request that the deadline for submitting the initial SoCG and LIRs is separated and brought forward by a week to 5 May 2021 , so to provide IPs with more time to consider their contents before Deadline 2.</p> <p>Number and timings of hearings: Given the evident interest in the Application, we consider the number of dates currently allocated for Open Floor Hearings (OFHs) and ISHs to be very low i.e. 19 days in total comprised of 3 days for OFHs, 8 days for ISHs, with 8 days allocated to OFHs, ISHs, Compulsory Purchase Hearings and Accompanied Site Inspections, if required. In particular, we think additional dates should be designated for OFHs.</p> <p>We also recommend that the OFHs and ISHs are re-scheduled to take place: (a) 3 to 4 weeks after the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>submission of written representations to provide IPs with an opportunity to consider representations made by others; and, (b) earlier in the Examination.</p> <p>Currently, the OFHs are scheduled for 3 days in May – before the submission of IPs' written representations – with additional hearing dates potentially available in late August and mid-September. Firstly, we do not see the benefit of scheduling OFHs before the submission of written representations. Secondly, the risk of scheduling the majority of these hearing towards the latter half of the Examination is that IPs have fewer opportunities to comment on pertinent information arising from the hearings. Scheduling a number of potential hearings towards the end of the Examination also restricts the time the Applicant has to adapt the DCO or the s.106 agreement in response to points raised.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that that the OFHs and ISHs are scheduled to start around 16 June until at least 2 July 2021 (totalling 11 days of hearings), before resuming after a break given the School holidays.</p>
108	Nathaniel Bacon	N J Bacon Farms	<p>Concern regarding the time schedule due to clashing with councils going into purdah the day after the first preliminary hearing. Also as the Scottish Power DCO will run concurrently with the SZC DCO and the strain that this puts on everyone who may have an interest or concerns regarding both local schemes. This highlights the start of the cumulative impact that this small part of Britain is going be experiencing over the next 15 years should both scheme go ahead.</p>
109	Anne-Marie Robb		<p>County Council election purdah will impact ability for appropriate representations to be given. Overlap with Scottish Power dco with really stretch local communities abilities to represent effectively In person hearings must resume as soon as possible. Many community members will struggle with virtual hearings.</p> <p>The gap between part 1 and 2 if the hearings must be extended to a minimum of 6 weeks.</p>
110	Bridget Chadwick		<p>The Preliminary Meeting should be delayed until after we know if new documents from EDF are accepted or not as there is not enough time to prepare submissions. We are also responding to the ScottishPower DCO, as are the Councils and other bodies and SCC will be in purdah due to May elections also reducing their time to engage with this DCO</p>
111	Peter Chadwick		<p>The day after the final PM (currently scheduled for 14th April), PINs have a legal obligation to start the legally binding 6-month Examination process, so it would be preferable for this to be delayed until after we know if PINs are going to accept EDF's new documents – there will be not enough time, to prepare final submissions, between PINS decision to accept/decline EDF's suggested changes and the final date for submission of the Written Representations (currently 26th May)</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the Scottish Power DCO runs until 6th April 2021 so is an extra burden on NGOs, Councils, and individuals. – Suffolk County Council are holding elections in May so will be in purdah from 24th March – 6th May, reducing the effectiveness of the Council’s involvement in the DCO process. – the Examination, as currently planned, runs through the summer at a time when, after extended periods of lockdown and travel restrictions, families will be wanting to make use of greater freedoms such as going on holiday. – the earlier the Examination starts, will result in a greater amount of the Examination process happening while there are still likely to be Covid-19 restrictions in place. – Open floor in-person meetings should be used for as much of the Examination as possible so the later the Examination process starts the more likely this can be facilitated.
112	India Bacon	Ward Farming Ltd	<p>Many of the concerns associated with this difficult decision arise from the enormous scale of the project and the huge capital cost. The project would see the highest capital cost per installed capacity of any of the alternatives currently being considered.</p> <p>The technology is not proven – there are currently two first generation EPRs running - Taishan 1(2018)¹ and Taishan 2 (2019)², but detail relating to current operational and safety criteria status is hard to clarify.</p> <p>EDF’s current project under construction at Hinkley Point (HPC) is already £2.9bn over budget and projected to be more than 15 months late in delivery³.</p> <p>What is going to be the impact of this project on the consumer? The UK Gov’t is already locked into an index-linked output price guarantee on Hinkley C – currently 60% higher than the cost of renewables. It seems a great shame to tie up such significant government funds in projects such as SZC, which guarantee nothing but expensive electricity for consumers in the long term. This will be at the expense of other technologies which will almost certainly be more competitive by the time large scale nuclear generating stations are on line, whilst at the same time not being dependent on French and Chinese interests.</p>

			<p>Are EDF suitable to / capable of delivering such a project? Financially they are not, and practically we have grave concerns about it having experienced first hand their lack of engagement in detail and their unwillingness to take on board matter that directly relate to their project from local people.</p> <p>How can the base load generation challenge be met without another Large Scale Nuclear Development?</p> <p>On the face of it one could consider that it is necessary to commit now to another gigawatt scale nuclear development, but this will almost certainly become the wrong decision before another plant is even commissioned.</p> <p>If Hinkley C is successfully completed and commissioned, Sizewell B is kept on line for a further 20 years beyond 2035 in line with EDF's proposals and perhaps some of Rolls Royce's SMR's are commissioned, can the gap not be successfully bridged?</p> <p>Storage of electricity is increasingly viable; currently battery farms are being commissioned in many parts of the world, on time, on budget with well defined capacity (Tesla in Australia). Small scale battery capacity storage is already available in the UK market (currently 30 kWh costs approx. £15k installed) costs can plummet with volume installation.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The negative impacts on the Suffolk Coast and Heath's environment, thriving local tourist industry and the area's transport infrastructure will be avoided should this project not go ahead and the people of Suffolk will breathe an enormous sigh of relief!</p>
113	Peter Chadwick	Save Our Sandlings (as Chairman of SOS)	<p>The day after the final PM (currently scheduled for 14th April), PINs have a legal obligation to start the legally binding 6-month Examination process, so it would be preferable for this to be delayed until after we know if PINs are going to accept EDF's new documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – there will be not enough time, to prepare final submissions, between PINS decision to accept/decline EDF's suggested changes and the final date for submission of the Written Representations (currently 26th May) – the Scottish Power DCO runs until 6th April 2021 so is an extra burden on NGOs, Councils, and individuals. – Suffolk County Council are holding elections in May so will be in purdah from 24th March – 6th May, reducing the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the DCO process.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the Examination, as currently planned, runs through the summer at a time when, after extended periods of lockdown and travel restrictions, families will be wanting to make use of greater freedoms such as going on holiday. – the earlier the Examination starts, will result in a greater amount of the Examination process happening while there are still likely to be Covid-19 restrictions in place. – Open floor in-person meetings should be used for as much of the Examination as possible so the later the Examination process starts the more likely this can be facilitated.
114	Nicola Pilkington	<p>The proposed timescale leaves much to be desired and the pressure will be considerable. The day of the final proposed meeting scheduled for the 14th of April should be delayed due East Anglia1 and 2 Virtual meetings running to the 6th of April. Many people in the area are involved in both DCO'S including East Suffolk Council employees and Parish and Town Councils. Many East Suffolk employees have been homeschooling due to COVID as well as working on National Infrastructure Plans and will have no break as you envisage the Examination period continuing throughout the summer. The whole of the UK needs to have space during the summer to come out of Lockdown and recover from the trauma and stress that most of us have been experiencing since March 2020. As a country we need the summer to get back to some sense of normality.</p> <p>[REDACTED] I struggle to understand and engage with the complexities of the pages and pages that EDF have submitted for examination and find myself feeling angry and frustrated at being denied a summer free from the many concerns I have about the DCO. I am not just a lone voice as I know many people in Suffolk feel the same about the many challenges that COVID has presented us with. It is important not to also forget that there will be Local Elections happening in May and due to purdah starting in March Suffolk County Councillors won't be able to engage in many of the initial activities.</p> <p>With East Suffolk being a prime tourist area and places like Snape Maltings swinging into creative action it will be difficult to find public spaces large enough to accommodate much desired face to face Examinations. These are all arguments for posponing the April meeting for as long as possible. The DCO deserves that everyone involved should be at their best and most of us are not feeling our best. A window of time in the summer could make up for that and positively impact on the success of this DCO in the minds of everyone engaging including PINS itself. I want to feel I am engaging at my best and doing that intelligently so my voice will have a better chance of being heard. It would be far better if the Examinations started later on in the year.</p>

115	Sonya Exton		<p>There are too many NSIPs being applied for at the same time affecting the same people who are also following strict lockdown regulations and therefore have limited opportunity to seek advice and provide the necessary time required to fully undertake the response required.</p> <p>I request that this application be delayed until such time that it can be addressed properly.</p>
116	John Baker		<p>Directly after 23 April Preliminary Meeting the 6 month examination will begin. This means it will be mainly virtual, and up until 21 June we will still be under Covid-19 restrictions after which everyone will want to go out and about and on holiday. Therefore it would be better to delay the Examination until the autumn or even next year when the whole examination can take place face to face and locally (we hope – for Sizewell B it was held at Snape Concert Hall).</p>
117	Robert Hoggar		<p>Concern with the county council elections and councillors in Purdah and not able to participate in the planning process either for or against . Scottish power DCO running until 6th April 2021. It would be better for open floor hearing especially where people can speak there views on all matters, environmental decimation of AONB and SSSI areas at this globally sensitive time. Please do extend the time needed to consider such an important issue.</p>
118	Audrey West		<p>The Examination will be running through a period of turmoil in everyones lives. Covid 19 restrictions will still be in force making it very difficult to engage properly without face to face meetings. Local elections will be taking place so many councillors will be in purdah. The DCO for Scottish Power Renewables will be running alongside the Sizewell Examination and this is just too much for local people to engage with. This is such an enormous and far reaching construction project that I feel it would be better to rearrange the timings of the Preliminary Examinations to fully accommodate all people that wish to participate.</p>
Agenda Item 7: Procedural Decisions taken by the ExA			
1	Regan Scott		<p>Might the RIES be brought forward by placing the HRA issues early ? We note that this is how the SoGCs are timetabled.</p>
2	Julian Cusack		<p>I wish to reserve my right to speak on this item</p>
3	June Holmes		<p>You should also extend the right of representation from all parish councils in the vicinity of the EDF proposals to explain the local views of the community and how villages are affected</p>
4	Alan Hatt		<p>Unfortunately the organizations and companies listed and their depositions will be materially changed by the new consultation document Nov-Dec. This applies to other organizations or companies not included who may want to join your list.</p>

5	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
6	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter
7	Catherine Bacon		<p>I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal.</p> <p>The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete.</p> <p>I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.</p>
8	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	We wish to reserve the right to comment on the procedural decisions as these are discussed and as our understanding increases as we research the documentation further. We are currently fully engaged in the DCO for SPR EA1N and EA2 so it is somewhat difficult to fully predict the points we will wish to make for this DCO.
9	Lisa Chandler	East Suffolk Council	<p>It is noted that it is proposed that agendas for Issue Specific Hearings will be issued five working days in advance of each Hearing. Given that some of the Hearings may require attendance in person, there may need to be travel and hotel arrangements made for consultants working on behalf of the Council. This area of Suffolk is very popular with tourists and hotel accommodation is likely to be fully booked in the summer periods. Early advance knowledge of the subject areas to be discussed at each Issue Specific Hearing would enable proper planning of attendance to take place by the Council.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the proposal for initial Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 1 and finalised Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 8. The Council requests that no further interim Statements of Common Ground be added to the schedule as experience has proved that this can be very time and resource intensive for the Council, with limited benefit.</p> <p>It is ESC's intention to be party to a Statement of Common Ground joint with Suffolk County Council and the Applicant.</p> <p>ESC has reviewed Annex E and note's the list of potential Statement of Common Grounds proposed and</p>

			<p>note that the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation is not included in that list. It is suggested that the ExA would benefit from a Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation.</p> <p>It is ESC's intention to submit a Local Impact Report written jointly with Suffolk County Council at Deadline 1.</p> <p>ESC will comment on the Applicant's submitted draft Accompanied Site Inspection schedule by Deadline 1. In doing so, we will refer to the need to comply with Covid-19 safety requirements and restrictions in place at the time.</p> <p>With reference to the ongoing Covid-19 situation, ESC welcomes that the start of the Examination is to be held via virtual meetings. We note that it may be possible at the later stages of the Examination timetable for meetings and hearings to be held in person. Should that be determined appropriate, the Council asks that the ability to participate virtually for all Interested Parties should they choose to do so for safety or practical reasons be maintained throughout the whole Examination period.</p>
10	Michael Moll	Suffolk County Council	See Suffolk County Council's Written Submission sent to the Sizewell C Case Team on 10 March 2021.
11	Clive Lovelock		X
12	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
13	LJ Dowley		It is not fair on all participants to conduct these hearings remotely.
14	Emma Dowley		The hearing should be delayed until all participants can appear in person, thereby not disadvantaging those who might have to participate remotely.
15	Cameron Sked	Environment Agency	<p>We welcome the proposal for an initial Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 1 and a finalised Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 8. We request that no further interim Statement of Common Ground deadlines be added to the schedule as this can be very time and resource intensive, and is likely to derive limited benefit.</p> <p>We note that it is proposed that Agendas for Issue Specific Hearings will be issued five working days in advance of each Hearing. Given that some of the Hearings may require attendance in person (if Coronavirus rules allow this), there may need to be travel and hotel arrangements made for EA staff.</p>

			Early advance knowledge of which subject areas are to be discussed at each Issue Specific Hearing would enable proper planning of attendance and most efficient use of our resources.
16	Rosie Sutherland	The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (the RSPB) and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT)	Please see the RSPB and SWT's Rule 6 Response letter
17	Simon Barlow	Environment Agency	<p>We welcome the proposal for an initial Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 1 and a finalised Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 8. We request that no further interim Statement of Common Ground deadlines be added to the schedule as this can be very time and resource intensive, and is likely to derive limited benefit.</p> <p>We note that it is proposed that Agendas for Issue Specific Hearings will be issued five working days in advance of each Hearing. Given that some of the Hearings may require attendance in person (if Coronavirus rules allow this), there may need to be travel and hotel arrangements made for EA staff. Early advance knowledge of which subject areas are to be discussed at each Issue Specific Hearing would enable proper planning of attendance and most efficient use of our resources.</p>
18	Carol Bolt	Environment Agency	<p>We welcome the proposal for an initial Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 1 and a finalised Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 8. We request that no further interim Statement of Common Ground deadlines be added to the schedule as this can be very time and resource intensive, and is likely to derive limited benefit.</p> <p>We note that it is proposed that Agendas for Issue Specific Hearings will be issued five working days in advance of each Hearing. Given that some of the Hearings may require attendance in person (if Coronavirus rules allow this), there may need to be travel and hotel arrangements made for EA staff. Early advance knowledge of which subject areas are to be discussed at each Issue Specific Hearing would enable proper planning of attendance and most efficient use of our resources.</p>
19	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?

20	William Kendall		Unless previously discussed, concern about decisions taken about procedure
21	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	20. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
22	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
23	Gregory Jones QC	India Bacon	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
24	Gregory Jones QC	Nat Bacon	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
25	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley Esq. (Personal)	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
26	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley – (Registered Suffolk Business)	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
27	Gregory Jones QC	EL Dowley (Personal)	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
28	Gregory Jones QC	EIDowling (registered business from Suffolk)	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?
29	Gregory Jones QC	David Grant Esq	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground
30	Gregory Jones QC	Belinda Grant	ITEM 7 18. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground.
31	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	ITEM 7 19. Question: where changes to the DCO are proposed or sought by non statutory third parties can or must they proceed by way of statement of common ground?

32	Carina Wentzel	The Heveningham Hall Estate	Please see above comments regarding initial SoCG.
33	Nicola Pilkington		I will be submitting answers to Agenda Item 7 by email on the 11th March
Agenda Item 8: Any other matters			
1	Susan Margaret Morrice		I am not sure at the moment .
2	Regan Scott		It would help to know what part the Developer can/will play. Can questions be put though the ExA Panel to developer representatives ?
3	Julian Cusack		I wish to reserve my right to speak under this heading
4	Robin Sanders	Woodbridge Town Council	In virtual hearings will the ExA have immediate online searchable access to Applicant's evidence files so that reference to Books, Parts and pages can be searched and examined as IPs give their evidence or, in the alternative, can Powerpoint be shared by speakers to the ExA to show such pages so that points can be more easily displayed.
5	Paul Tillcock		If the examing instectorate allow EDF changes shouldn't there be an additional relevant representation allowed on the changes ??
6	Carly Vince	SZC Co. (the Applicant)	We wish to respond to any points necessary where it would support the Examining Authority and/or the examination process.
7	Catherine Howard	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	May wish to speak in support of the representations to be made on behalf of the Applicant by Harry Phillpot QC, should this be helpful on any particular matter
8	Richard Atkinson		TBC
9	Catherine Bacon		I don't believe that Nuclear is the best option; I would prefer to see wind or tidal. The main point is the method of access for creating the power station and the destruction of good farmland (and ruining the remaining area of dissected fields). Plus the increased traffic and impact on the roads. The additional building of other features such as potential p&r that would not have a huge benefit once sizwell c construction complete. I also wish to raise the point that the meeting is being held once the council has gone into merger and

			cannot have any recommendations - the date should be changed so they can have a right to comment. Also, date needs changing in order for people to attend in person rather than over the internet/phone.
10	Mr Chris Wilson	Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)	No specific points but would like the chance to comment if thought appropriate
11	Cllr Marianne Fellowes	Aldeburgh Town Council	At the discretion of the Examining Authority we respectfully request to reserve the right to speak on Any Other Matters that may be raised by the Ex Authority, the Applicant or other Interested Parties, or to raise any matters that need urgent consideration. Thank you.
12	Clive Lovelock		X
13	Hereward Phillpot QC	NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited	See letter from Carly Vince on behalf of the Applicant dated 10 March 2021.
14	David Peter Napier GRANT		I cannot see any assessment of the efficacy of the technology proposed in the Scheme. EDF have similar EPR projects in Finland, France and Hinkley Point - none have been completed either on time or on budget. Are PINS wasting their resources examining a flawed and unproven Scheme?
15	Gregory Jones QC	AW Bacon Will Trust	1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road ("SLR") should be treated as an additional "Issue specific hearing" pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS. 2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election "purdah" (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.
16	William Kendall		TBC
17	Gregory Jones QC	N J Bacon Farms	1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road ("SLR") should be treated as an additional "Issue specific hearing" pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS. 2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election "purdah" (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.
18	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road ("SLR") should be treated as an additional "Issue specific hearing" pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS. 2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election "purdah" (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.
19	Gregory Jones QC	India Bacon	ITEM 8 20 1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road ("SLR") should be treated as an additional "Issue

			<p>specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.</p>
20	Gregory Jones QC	Nat Bacon	<p>ITEM 8 20</p> <p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.</p>
21	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley Esq. (Personal)	<p>ITEM 8 20</p> <p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will affect representation.</p>
22	Gregory Jones QC	LJDowley – (Registered Suffolk Business)	<p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of representation.</p>
23	Gregory Jones QC	EL Dowley (Personal)	<p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of representations.</p>
24	Gregory Jones QC	EIDowling (registered business from Suffolk)	<p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of the representations.</p>
25	Gregory Jones QC	David Grant Esq	<p>ITEM 8 20</p> <p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6</p>

			May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of the representations.
26	Gregory Jones QC	Belinda Grant	<p>ITEM 8 20</p> <p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of the representations.</p> <p>3. The hearing should not be hybrid. As a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner.</p>
27	Gregory Jones QC	Ward Farming	<p>ITEM 8 21</p> <p>1. We also request that the proposed Sizewell Link Road (“SLR”) should be treated as an additional “Issue specific hearing” pursuant to Annex B of the Rule 6 letter from PINS.</p> <p>2. The Preliminary Meetings coincide the County Council going into pre-election “purdah” (24 March - 6 May). There will be no new County Council until 7 May. We are concerned this will impact upon the quality of the representations.</p> <p>3.The hearing should not be hybrid. As a matter fairness all parties should be able to present their cases on all arguments in the same manner.</p>
28	Nathaniel Bacon	N J Bacon Farms	<p>Sizewell C – a nuclear white elephant...</p> <p>Many of the concerns associated with this difficult decision arise from the enormous scale of the project and the huge capital cost. The project would see the highest capital cost per installed capacity of any of the alternatives currently being considered. If the project offered absolute certainty, perhaps one could be forgiven for accepting the huge cost implications, but previous gigawatt nuclear installations are renowned for being over budget and delivered well beyond original project timescales.</p> <p>The technology is not proven – there are currently two first generation EPRs running - Taishan 1(2018)1 and Taishan 2 (2019)2, but detail relating to current operational and safety criteria status is hard to clarify.</p> <p>EDF’s current project under construction at Hinkley Point (HPC) is already £2.9bn over budget and projected to be more than 15 months late in delivery3. In Finland, Olkiluoto (1,600MWe) was originally budgeted to cost €3.7bn with completion due in 2009 - in 2019 costs were predicted to be €8.5bn and completion is now estimated to be in February 20224. In France, Flamanville 3 has slipped from a planned completion in 2012 to a current revised completion date of 2023, whilst being some €15.8bn</p>

		<p>over original budget costs⁵.</p> <p>How can it possibly be sensible to place so much faith in a large-scale nuclear development, particularly when there has been such a consistent track record of massive overspend and untimely project delivery? EDF are already promoting a 'new' design for any future projects thus proving their reservations on EPR. The risk is that a decision is made now to invest in this technology because it currently looks like the surest option, but in fact, that this decision is quickly regretted. What is more, it seems that, although it had previously been stated that new nuclear projects in the UK would be developer led, according to the BBC, UK Government are considering taking an ownership stake. This is a very different proposal to the original concept of French / Chinese ownership and puts UK Government at risk to the costs of inevitable budget overruns. The UK Gov't is already locked into an index-linked output price guarantee on Hinkley C – currently 60% higher than the cost of renewables. It seems a great shame to tie up such significant government funds in projects such as SZC, which guarantee nothing but expensive electricity for consumers in the long term. This will be at the expense of other technologies which will almost certainly be more competitive by the time large scale nuclear generating stations are on line, whilst at the same time not being dependent on international interests.</p> <p>How can the base load generation challenge be met without another Large Scale Nuclear Development?</p> <p>On the face of it one could consider that it is necessary to commit now to another gigawatt scale nuclear development, but this will almost certainly become the wrong decision before another plant is even commissioned.</p> <p>If Hinkley C is successfully completed and commissioned, Sizewell B is kept on line for a further 20 years beyond 2035 in line with EDF's proposals and perhaps some of Rolls Royce's SMR's are commissioned, can the gap not be successfully bridged?</p> <p>Storage of electricity is increasingly viable; currently battery farms are being commissioned in many parts of the world, on time, on budget with well defined capacity (Tesla in Australia). Small scale battery capacity storage is already available in the UK market (currently 30 kWh costs approx. £15k installed) costs can plummet with volume installation.</p> <p>Surely this will bring not only financial savings to energy users, but remove the need for massive investment and financial risk.</p> <p>The negative impacts on the Suffolk Coast and Heath's environment, thriving local tourist industry and the area's transport infrastructure will be avoided and the people of Suffolk will breathe an enormous sigh of relief!</p>
--	--	--

29	Robin Sanders		I would wish to comment on the need for the ExA to seek the Applicant to provide a more detailed design and outline specification for the coastal defence earth structures including foundations.
30	Nicola Pilkington		I will be submitting answers to Agenda Item 8 by email on the 11th of March