

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Re: Response to PINs Meeting 23/24March2021 AND REQUEST TO BE AT ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING ROAD AND TRANSPORT
Date: 01 April 2021 15:37:22

Dear Sir

As an interested party I would like to raise the following items arising out of the Examining Authorities Meeting 23/24 March 2021 for your deadline seventh of April 2021

1. Feedback and technical issues of EA meeting 23 and 24 March 2021.

The meetings over the two days were extremely difficult to access. I live in rural Suffolk and our broadband signal is extremely poor, the broadband experience that I had at these meetings resulted in freezing and flickering. Which I found caused me real problems with my eyes. I was not always able to access speakers when they spoke. It is quite clear that the planning examining authority had not planned for the numbers who turned up and your own technology was on occasion very poor. This does not bode well for virtual meetings going forward I so would ask that all meetings now be face-to-face or even a combination of face-to-face and virtual. The use of Technology makes it difficult for many members of the public to participate and you are discriminating in favour of those who are IT literate and or have good IT reception.

The structure of the meetings was poor and sometimes the public did not know which agenda item we were working with. We had filled in forms for areas we wish to speak on but these were not used which seems to me to have been a pointless waste of time.

I noted that some interested parties were more 'important interested parties' than others and given priority on being called. Why and who are these important interested parties and what ruling in the need for fairness allow this to happen.

It became increasingly clear by the afternoon of day 2 that there was an impatience from the PINs chairman and he was very dismissive of the general public in favour of the lawyers when the public wished to speak.

It was evident the public were not as important as the lawyers in these two days of meetings.

The principle surely is that meetings for those two days should be shown to and conducted fairly. On several occasions the chair deferred to EDF's QC for an answer to a question. One example was the Rochdale envelope when PINs quite clearly have their own definition of the Rochdale envelope instead the chairman deferred to their QC for an

explanation. I felt the QC Mr Philpott ran some of the meeting to his own agenda, and because he was a lawyer you allowed this to happen.

This process has to be fair and has to be fair to all parties and I am very disappointed that you did not look after the every day joe public well over these two days.

Heading timing of examinations

I wish it to be noted that I am really quite concerned that an application decision will not be known until after the examining authority has started their examination.

EDF are extremely pushy for an early decision when things like cost and how this is to be paid for, has not even been decided. There is no need for this urgency. This is an extremely large and complex application and it's not possible for those of us who do not yet have access to technical advice to view it in detail. I would ask that you convene a part three of the preliminary meeting in order that we have more time to make a judgement.

You are already aware of the Suffolk county council elections and the delay of cabinet and loss of ward representation for us as the public. The election means nothing will be able to be discussed from the 14th of April to the end of May and this results in a democratic void and very unfair to the volume of people wishing to take part in the discussion on this application. This is not the planning application for the building of a garage.

PINs KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION

At the outset of the two day meeting, we were introduced to all members of the panel, and their backgrounds declared, who would be making the ultimate decision on the DCO application. Can you tell me whether you are taking independent advice on the nuclear industry to supplement your lack of knowledge and skills within the panel?

It seems to me imperative that you are able to refer to independent expert witnesses for your own shortfalls in this area.

PRINCIPLE ISSUES. And ..Issue Specific

1. Road and Transport .. I understand from the two day meeting this is to be a principal issue and now to be discussed .

PLEASE NOTE I request to be included in the issue specific of road and transport discussion. I wish in particular to discuss the area around the B 1122 and the Sizewell link road. My expertise is that I am a resident of this area, I've lived here for a number of years and I'm well aware of the situations and the problems that local people have to endure.

2.FINANCING AND COST I would like a PI to be raised on financing

For both

A/the compulsory purchase acquisitions of land and the manner in which an open interest on residents homes are being left open and in place and not followed through to formal compulsory purchase.

B/ the full financing model and how payment for the build is to be achieved. The international and EU financing model should be reviewed particularly of the French and Chinese involvement.

The displacements of EN1 and EN2.

Mitigation and compensation and which body will hold the funds

3 COASTAL DEFENCE . & BLF

We are concerned that EDF is pushing this critical issue of coastal defence off the examination agenda and onto the office of nuclear regulators site licensing process. EDF coastal defence plans are incomplete and with very little detail and late submission for the application for site licenses means that complex plans may not be available for the examination potentially subverting the process.

EDF is relying on a Rochdale envelope approach defining a range rather than exact calculations . Is it acceptable that EDF has used this approach extensively on many parts of the DCO ? I consider it important that coastal defences are examined in public particularly in view of local coastal erosion and the risk of future flooding.

4. PROGRAMME BUILD TIMES ,IMPLICATIONS AND ENFORCEABLE CONSEQUENCES

Historically and evidentially EDF is behind time wise on all its major nuclear projects from Hinkley ,their plants in France and Finland. They are all over budget. Please review their projected build time s and the legal financial consequences that can be applied for failure to meet deadlines which put the local communities at unknown timelines of additional stress.

5 DECOMMISSIONING . Review is required of what plans will EDF be putting in place for the decommissioning of C and potentially D based on the fact, that, these will be The last nuclear power stations of this particular design that will be ever built.

6. Rochdale Envelope ..review the use and limits of the Rochdale envelope against the application put in by EDF to see if it is in accordance with your own guidelines .

Please include The following items for inclusion in ISSUES SPECIFIC

1. CARBON EMISSIONS ..please review EDF calculations and their accuracy for their carbon emission assessments

2 POLICY & NEED the applicants consideration of alternative sites and also the review of the national policy statements and emerging debate on nuclear . The justification for choosing this site .

3MARINE ECOLOGY please will you include the removal of the acoustic fish deterrent.

4. AIR QUALITY impacts of the borrow pits ,quarries and the spoil heaps on local villages

5 NOISE & VIBRATION It is evidenced at Hinkley point that residents local to the site have been issued with high powered ear defenders to protect them from the noise when they are in their gardens ,please review if the residents local to SizewellC are to be issued with ear defenders because the noise is so injurious to health.

Yours faithfully

June Holmes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]