

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Submission regarding Preliminary Meeting Part 1
Date: 05 April 2021 14:22:24

Good afternoon,

Preliminary Meeting Part 1:

Firstly I want to fully endorse the views expressed by TASC and Stop Sizewell C. TASC will be representing my views at PM Part 2 which I wish to attend but not to speak at.

In my opinion, Sizewell C is such a vast and enormously complicated project that it is not credible to think it can be properly examined in a mere 6 months under any circumstances, and particularly not given the restrictions the country is currently under. This comment applies to the ExA, stakeholders, NGOs and IPs alike.

PM 1:

The technology used, as I experienced it across the two days, was shockingly bad. I have no option but to use an iPad and much of the time the speakers, including the Inspectors themselves, were either frozen or transformed into compressed, elongated aliens on my screen. The sound was equally poor: many of the words being spoken simply dropped out, rendering the points being made utterly incomprehensible. This combination made the experience gruelling and the headache that began halfway through Day 1 grew worse as time went on, continuing for 36 hours after the end of Day 2, meaning I lost an entire extra day. At the end of Day 2 my iPad died, the battery was completely drained despite having been on charge the whole time, and it did not come back to life for nearly 5 hours. This is bad for iPads and panicked me as I thought it had broken down. I was also completely drained myself. The prospect of going through months of this ordeal is extremely worrying and I'm sure many people will be incapable physically and mentally of coping with the strain, which obviously favours the applicant.

On Day 2 I felt that while the ExA were solicitous towards QCs and Stakeholders, they were off-hand and/or dismissive with the IPs to the extent of cutting people off mid-flow. This was quite intimidating to people like myself. On this basis I repeat what I wrote in my submission to attend and speak at PM 1: the current arrangements put all IPs at a huge disadvantage, which I find deeply unfair and undemocratic. I hope the ExA ensure that face to face, in person meetings are arranged as soon as possible.

My second concern relates to the timing of the whole examination. I understand that an extension has been granted to the Scottish Power DCO examination. As SZC is much larger, much more complex and has much bigger ramifications for Suffolk in every way, I trust the Inspectorate will afford us the same consideration or more. If so, it will enable us all to respond properly to EDF's new proposals - at present we do not even know whether or not they will be accepted, again putting IPs at a deep disadvantage. Then there are the upcoming elections and the purdah period. According to my understanding Suffolk County Council will not have reorganised itself until the end of May, thus leaving us with many weeks during which we have no assistance or advice from them or from our local Town and Parish councillors. Again we are deeply disadvantaged.

I also do not agree with the urgency constantly being pushed by EDF. There is obviously no rush - the only difference a few extra months makes is to enable their project to be properly and fully examined. So far their project at Flamanville is running 11 years late, billions of Euros over budget and still not working. Hinkley Point C is also running late with rising costs. SZC does not even have funding yet, Chinese financial involvement is being seriously questioned and more and more financial institutions are moving away from investing in new nuclear for reasons of good sense. So EDF, a French company mired in debt, are hoping the finance will come from the British public via RAB or other hidden taxation measures. What makes this all so disgraceful is that we do not now and will not need electricity generated by SZC, which will not become available for about 20 years in any case. Yet EDF have chosen this moment to advertise a super cheap electricity tariff for residents of Leiston - an extraordinary and shocking move under the circumstances.

While I think it very wise for the Inspectors to visit Hinkley Point C, I sincerely hope part of their visit will be unaccompanied by EDF employees, that they explore the hinterland including Bridgwater and speak with local groups and individuals who are suffering from terrible traffic congestion, noise, light and air pollution. Some

friends and I went to see for ourselves two years ago. Bridgwater, far from looking prosperous, looked shabby, depressed and poor. We saw empty, boarded up shops in the centre of town, along with pubs offering multiple drinks at very cheap prices and a man of working age sitting on the sidewalk begging. Pity poor Leiston.

I did not understand why some people were called 'important Interested Parties' - where does that leave people like me? I also didn't understand why it was given to EDF's barrister to explain the Rochdale Envelope rather than the ExA. I would think the ExAs explanation would have been rather different in emphasis. In fact I do not know what the Rochdale Envelope has got to do with how this examination is to be run, which I understood was the reason for these preliminary meetings.

In conclusion, I ask the Planning Inspectorate to be fair to those of us who oppose this project.

Jackum Brown



Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad