

From: [REDACTED]
To: SizewellC
Subject: WRITTEN SUBMISSION TO BE HEARD ORALLY AT PRELIMINARY MEETING PART 2 14 APRIL 2021
Date: 06 April 2021 07:45:38

Dear Ms McKay,

In the light of the Part 1 Meeting **I would like to submit a request to be heard orally at the Preliminary Meeting Part 2.** The following points arose out of that meeting and I would like the opportunity to speak, although I will only 'raise my hand' in the event that my points are not covered by others.

The Conduct of the Part 1 Meeting.

Firstly, I would like to thank all the PINS team for their patience and courtesy in the way they conducted the meeting. A particular thank you to Michelle Gregory and her supporters who conducted the very helpful 'Teams Rehearsal' on 15 March and then organized us to join the main meeting. I appreciate that the numbers of interested parties was a significant challenge and put pressure on the members of the team, which became more apparent on day 2 which was managed less well.

Secondly, while I personally was comfortable with working on Teams, it was clear that the meeting was conducted at the limits of the technology, as much for the PINS team, where speakers periodically 'froze' or voices blurred, as those joining as interested parties, where there were more than a few examples of technical problems for individuals and impacts on health through flickering screens and stress. In this **the public is at a serious disadvantage** compared to the Applicant (EDF) who are very well resourced for this activity in terms of technology, facilities and the individuals sitting off screen to support the principal. The experience of on-line meetings is causing individuals to drop out or be deterred from contributing. This is to the advantage of the applicant, the disadvantage of those expressing concerns and is essentially unfair.

Thirdly, I noted on day 2 the way the Applicant was not so much responding to issues raised but simply re-stating their position, with which we are familiar. I was perturbed that on one occasion the Lead Member asked the Applicant to explain the way the 'Rochdale envelope' worked and should be applied rather than having PINS give an objective view. This was a key point because the Applicant appears to be using this formula to excuse the serious lack of detail on so many parts of the project, a characteristic that the applicant has shown through all 5 phases of the consultation.

The Timing of the Examination

As Mr Phillpot QC for the Applicant himself stressed this is an "Unusually large and complex project". He also stressed "the vast scale of what is proposed". What he did not say was that this is a project with high risk – technical, financial, environmental and political- and which will, as soon as it commences, notwithstanding the assertions of the Applicant, have a devastating effect on the people and environment of East Suffolk. The Applicant is desperate to gain quick approval for the project as a continuation of Hinckley C and gives the appearance of not only exploiting the circumstances of the COVID-19 crisis to minimize opposition and democratic accountability but of 'gaming' the planning system – for example: the introduction of new proposals just after the completion of the consultation on the DCO; using a local planning submission by Sizewell B to start ground preparation for Sizewell C by felling Coronation Wood; pushing for the examination to commence before the Office of Nuclear Regulation completes its licensing process; the possible over use of the 'Rochdale envelope' to avoid detailed scrutiny of their planning assertions; driving to commence the formal examination before the new proposals have been properly assessed and, if agreed, formally incorporated in the submission in a

coherent way . **It is only in the interests of the Applicant for PINS to commence their formal, time limited, examination;** it is against the interests of not only the community of East Suffolk but also the wider country and the reputation of PINS to be 'bounced' by the Applicant into a premature examination.

I am grateful for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely

John Sutherell