

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Cc:** ["Stop Sizewell C"](#)  
**Subject:** Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project  
**Date:** 05 April 2021 15:33:31

---

Dear Sir / Madam

There are a number of issues that I want PINS to take into account in connection with Part 2 of the Preliminary Meeting.

I shall of course watch the live stream of that Meeting but I am content not to speak as Stop Sizewell C will do so on my behalf.

That in no way diminishes my conviction about the issues I am raising with you now.

1 I am still convinced that conducting the Preliminary Meetings, and proposing to proceed with the examination, through a series of on-line meetings is entirely unsatisfactory and my experience of Part 1 of the Preliminary Meeting provided ample evidence to justify my view. The chairing of the meeting and the formal introductions and statements by the Panel were beset by freezes and judders to both sound and vision and consequently did little to set a professional and robust tone and structure for the two days.

Likewise there were clearly technical problems faced by many of the speakers and the net effect was to drain the process of clarity and dynamism. Remote chairing cannot, or did not, overcome these problems and at times it was unclear what point had been reached on the agenda. Likewise there were times when speakers were cut short in ways that would not happen in a professionally-run meeting.

If this procedure is continued the result will be that the examination will be weakened, will lack credibility and will exclude the participation of many small organisations and individuals who don't have the technical resources to overcome the problems inherent in this way of doing things. The examination must be paused until in-person meetings are possible. If the Government can sanction the holding of, amongst other things, large scale concerts and other major social events in the near future it is untenable for PINS to rush ahead with this virtual approach.

2 PINS should not allow the beginning of the examination until it has been decided whether or not to accept EDF's *"unusually large and complex application"* (the words of EDF's counsel). To proceed with the examination without full clarity around the scope and scale of the application would be nonsensical and would greatly disadvantage those with limited resources who would have reduced time and opportunity to prepare their detailed submissions. Until the status of the new proposals is clarified and, if appropriate, all documents are fully integrated, any examination process is bound to be opaque.

The Applicant's claim of urgency is in any case not valid since no funding package is agreed for the project (nor is close to being agreed) and will not be for many months after the end of the examination. Also, a modest delay to the start would take us through to the other side of Suffolk County Council's elections and the subsequent appointments of Cabinet and Portfolio Holders without which, in place, there will be no Sizewell C lead between mid-April and the end of May or later.

It was also clear to me from Part 1 of the Preliminary Meeting that, given the number of people wishing to take part in the examination, time and appropriate settings need to be allowed and planned for a series of Open Floor Hearings which would need to be held in person.

3 Following Part 1 of the Preliminary meeting I remain concerned over the way in which a number of key issues might fail to be addressed by the examination. For example, EDF's: coastal defence plans are incomplete and so cannot currently be examined; life cycle assessment of CO2 emissions appears spurious; and funding position, and finance proposals for SZC, are highly uncertain.

4 Site visit proposals were raised in Part 1 of the Preliminary Meeting. These should not take place until it is clear exactly what proposals for SZC are accepted and certainly not before Deadline 1 on 12 May. Careful thought will need to be given by PINS regarding any visits to Hinkley Point to ensure that a balanced view is obtained of the impact of that development on the environment and local communities at all times and all seasons since these will obviously not be evenly spread. The Examining Authority should include local Suffolk partners in any visits to Hinkley Point.

Kind regards

Nick Burfield

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]