

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Deadline B submission
Date: 05 April 2021 12:54:51

My ID. 20026292

This is my submission ahead of the preliminary meeting, part 2, due to be held on 14 April.

Please note that I am not available to speak on 14 April and I therefore nominate Alison Downes of Stop Sizewell C to represent my views as required.

I attended part 1 of the preliminary meeting and the following matters arose in that meeting that I believe require further consideration.

1. Principal Issues hearings

I think it important that sufficient time is allotted for each hearing so that all who wish to speak can speak. A very large number of local people registered to speak at part 1 and it can be anticipated that similar numbers will apply throughout. Statutory authorities and the applicants have their QCs to represent them but it is local people whose lives and livelihoods will be severely impacted should this project be permitted. The time scheduled must enable every local person who wishes to put their views to be given the time to speak.

2. Online or 'proper meetings'

Numerous technical problems were encountered during the part 1 meeting that broke up the smooth running of the meeting and also prevented some participants from fully expressing their views. While of course some local residents will not have the necessary technical skills to participate at all. I think it important to delay the examination process until face to face meetings can resume under covid regulations.

3. The applicant's application for changes made on 11 January

The EA has yet to make a decision as to whether or not to accept these changes, or some of them.

Having read through the proposed changes, I think it will be very difficult for the EA to take a decision at this point as many of the changes are expressed purely as 'hopes'. For example, the proposal to bring more material to site by rail depends upon rail capacity that has not been agreed with Network Rail while doubts were expressed at part 1 as to the viability of the proposal.

So if this change was accepted, the examination would look at a lower impact of road traffic. If it subsequently transpired that the additional rail option was not viable then the road impact would need to be looked at all over again.

It seems to me therefore that an additional meeting, or series of meetings, needs to be inserted into the timetable between part 2 and the commencement of the examination so that the EA can assess the viability of each of the proposed changes and then take an informed decision as to whether or not to accept each proposed change.

The examination would then commence on a much firmer foundation.

4. Timetable generally

Issues were discussed at part 1 regarding the impact of council elections etc. But since the meeting a further problem has arisen with the 3 month extension given to the Scottish Power hearings for their proposed facility at Friston. This examination will now not finish until 6 July

The Suffolk coast is the subject of several applications and forthcoming applications for power projects. It is the same local residents who are having to fight these threats and it is simply not reasonable to expect them to participate in the Scottish power hearings and the Sizewell C hearings at the same time.

I would therefore ask that consideration be given to delaying the start of the Sizewell examination for three months. Such a delay would of course also assist the points I have made in items 2 and 3 above.

5. Is the project viable?

Delay would also help assessment of other issues raised in part 1 that are fundamental to the examination proper.

For example, it is incredible that the applicant is not able to say how the project will be financed. My understanding is that EDF are not able to finance the project themselves and that Government is currently considering a request for taxpayer finance. I think it is vital to know the answer to this question. An examination of an EDF project is, I would suggest, different to an examination of a project that is effectively a Government project if the taxpayer is funding it. How can EDF give commitments for, for example, mitigation payments if it is Government who would need to pay the bill. Surely Government would need to give evidence and participate in the examination?

6. Minsmere

I think this should be heard as a separate principal issue.

Listening to the discussion on the Pakenham 'mitigation site', I am not sure that EDF have taken on board how Minsmere works as a natural environment. Much was said about marsh harriers. But you cannot say to a marsh harrier 'sorry, we have destroyed your territory, please fly to Pakenham instead' !!

The biodiversity crisis brings to attention the importance of Minsmere not just for its wildlife but for human beings. Is damaging this site and its wildlife a reasonable price to pay for generating some rather expensive electricity?

Thank you for your consideration of these six points

David Gordon

Sent from my iPad