

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Preliminary Meeting
Date: 23 March 2021 19:41:48

Dear PINS,

I remain at a loss to know why this process is continuing having attended today.

It is clear to me that the Applicant has failed to produce sufficient evidence and cogent plans especially concerning coastal geomorphology and transport issues.

How can serious examination of such a major, complex, impactful project be undertaken given the process is taking place in exceptional circumstances, a years COVID lockdown, Offshore wind farm applications, local government elections, council members purdah, schools returning and the Easter break ?

This is an expensive, impactful project ,needing time for all the cumulative implications of the process to be made clear and properly understood .

Without clear plans from the Applicant this is impossible.

The process needs to be halted now .

Please include these remarks .

Thank you ,

Julia Brown
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Preliminary Meeting comments
Date: 02 April 2021 15:26:40

Dear Planning Inspectorate team,

I wish to make the following observations on the process of the Preliminary Meetings.

I attended both days.

1. Technical Issues.

My own were addressed through the training offered. Thank you.

However, issues of ear splitting random screeching, screen freezing, maintaining connections and sudden silences all contributed to a hard to follow and stay focused experience. As I was operating off an iPad it became near impossible at times, particularly on day two.

Concentrating on a small screen absorbing detailed information was particularly trying and tiring.

This experience served to stress how vital it is to return to inperson hearings as soon as possible as I felt distinctly disadvantaged the longer the meeting went on because of the zoom stress.

2. Examination Timing

EDFs advocate referred to the vast scale of development proposed and the highly unusual and large scale application so I remain perplexed that the decision to accept the application will not be taken until after the examination starts.

I have limited resources to participate in this examination as it stands.

I do not know what resources PINS have but convening a part three of the Preliminary Meetings might then allow this decision to be made and people like myself able to comment more effectively.

I struggle accessing the documentation as it stands.

If new proposals are added then all relevant documentation needs to be integrated in a logical easy to follow manner.

The Applicant stated there was an urgency for the application to go ahead as soon as possible but given there is no established funding for the project I fail to see that this is a valid claim.

I also note that because of the local elections we are without council from the 14 th April until the end of May.

3.Principle Issues

I am deeply concerned that plans for the coastal defences remain incomplete and may not be presented for this examination process.

I question Sizewell C s life cycle assessment of co2 emissions and the contribution to net zero.

I support all the other issues raised by Stop Sizewell.

4. General Meeting comments

On day two, when communication was more erratic I found it hard to know which agenda item we were on.

I am interested to know who the “important parties” are, referred to by Hereward Philpot and by inference who the “unimportant parties “ are. This was not acceptable.

I note that PINS has its own guidance on the limits and use of what I understand is the Rochdale envelope. Why was EDFs explanation of the Rochdale envelope allowed to be given?

Whilst I accept it is valid that the PINS team visit the Hinckley site this must be undertaken with people who share other views in the interest of balance and fairness.

I support all comments made by the Stop Sizewell campaign team and have asked them to represent at the next meeting.

Julia Brown

[REDACTED]