


From: 
To: [Sizewell C](#)
Subject: Preliminary Meeting 23rd March Sizewell C - Deadline B submission
Date: 06 April 2021 08:45:56

My reference 20026090

Dear Examining Authority

This is my written submission in connection with Item 6 on the agenda of the Preliminary Meeting held on 24th March 2021.

For everyone the past year has been incredibly challenging and for many of the residents in East Suffolk, it has been made an even more worrying time due to the Scottish Power Renewable wind farm application and hearings. If we all thought that application was complex and difficult to get our heads around then, as I think many of us have already come to appreciate, Sizewell C will be an even more complex project to understand and challenge.

Due to Covid restrictions, it is a fact that many people whose lives will be materially affected by Sizewell C have not had a reasonable opportunity to fully discuss and share their concerns in public or with other people. Indeed it is perfectly clear that there is still considerable misunderstanding and confusion between SPR's proposals and those of EDF for Sizewell C and most importantly, a complete lack of awareness around their cumulative knock-on impact on our region.

Many second home owners and visitors have not been able to come to Suffolk in the past year and hence not been made aware of the impact that the construction of Sizewell C might have on their visitor experience during the long construction phase. Indeed many people have no idea that this planning hearing has even commenced.

Taken altogether, I think we have to conclude that the Sizewell C application has been submitted at a most unfortunate and indeed unfair time, to put it mildly, to ensure an open, transparent and fair hearing for such a major project. This country's planning system has been built on the principle of giving people an opportunity to consult, discuss and share their views and whilst the covid restrictions have quite rightly limited our opportunity to hold public gatherings, I think the question we have to now ask is whether it is fair and correct that we are denied the opportunity to hold public meetings on this, what would be Europe's largest construction project.

It is such an important part of any robust planning process to hear from people who may be both for or against the project and to challenge the developer in an open forum on their plans to ensure that everyone understands what is proposed and what the impact on them would be.


I would point out that the last public meeting for people to express their views to our MP Therese Coffey was on Friday 28th June 2019, that's an incredible 21 months ago and this is simply unacceptable when we are talking about a project of this complexity and far reaching impact.

To date, people's requests that the original application and then this Planning Hearing be deferred have all been rejected and therefore I do not think it unreasonable to ask the Examining Authority to hold a delayed third meeting to give sufficient time for open public debate on this application to take place and on the revised application should a decision be made to accept it.

Also I ask that you should allow for Open Floor Hearings to continue throughout the examination so that people who might not find out about these Hearings until a later date due to the reasons I have outlined, will be given an opportunity to express their views.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett

From: 
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Feed back on the first Preliminary Meeting 23rd March Sizewell C - Deadline B
Date: 06 April 2021 08:45:16

My reference 20026090

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to provide some views on the timing of the Preliminary Meetings in respect of Sizewell C.


First, I fail to understand why the meetings have been commenced when it not yet known whether the ExA is going to accept the revised application by EDF. This is a complex scheme for members of the public to get their heads around and it is vital that everyone knows what the details of the application are so that no time is wasted on unnecessary work. Furthermore, out of respect for affected and interested parties, it is important that sufficient time is given for everyone to consider the proposals and conduct face to face discussions to formulate accurate opinions.

Second, with the Suffolk County Council elections due to take place, the fact that there is no representation by the Council is again not acceptable and therefore means the meetings should be delay at least until the end of May.

Finally, now that the Scottish Power Renewables East Anglia One North Offshore Wind Farm Project – EN010077 and East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farm Project – EN010078 examination has been extended, it is becoming all too clear that to run two such incredibly important hearings at the same time is placing an unacceptable burden and level of stress on local people. Out of respect for everyone involved in both schemes, the start of the Sizewell C hearing timetable must be stopped until the Wind Farm hearings have been finished.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett

From: 
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Feed back on procedural aspects of the first Preliminary Meeting 23rd March Sizewell C - Deadline B
Date: 06 April 2021 08:44:25

My reference 20026090

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to provide some feedback on the procedural aspects of the virtual Preliminary Meeting held on 23rd/24th March and in particular on the format and content of those meetings.

I have already written to you regarding the poor quality audio which made the meeting very difficult to follow at times. Confusion was compounded by the fact that very often I found it difficult to understand which agenda item we were on and this was particularly the case during the second day when I was wishing to speak on Item 6 but didn't realise the meeting had moved on before I had a chance to put my hand up. My understanding was that by filling in the initial form, we were going to be called to speak - instead it ended up as a free for all with people speaking on different issues. This was quite understandable given the poor management of the meeting.


If these meetings are to be robust, democratic and open, members of the public must be given a fair chance to speak and be guided by the ExA as to the appropriate time to do so otherwise people will be too afraid to speak and therefore the Inspectors will not get a real feel for people's views.

I must also say that I found it quite unacceptable that at one stage the ExA allowed the applicant's counsel to comment on a matter of procedure ie that relating to the Rochdale envelope. I would have expected this explanation to have come from the Inspectors not the applicant.

It is vital that people get to speak so can I also urge you to allow Open floor hearings to continue throughout the period of the examination.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett

From: 
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Feed back on the format of the first Preliminary Meeting 23rd March Sizewell C - Deadline B
Date: 06 April 2021 08:42:53

My reference 20026090

Dear Examining Authority

I would like to provide some feedback on the virtual Preliminary Meeting held on 23rd March.

During the early part of the meeting I spoke briefly to make an observation about the sound quality of the Examining team's audio and in particular about that of the Lead Examiner's. The visual quality was very poor and the sound very echoey, to the point that at times I found it very difficult to understand what was being said. The quality did not improve sufficiently over the whole two day hearing.

Having spent the whole two days on the computer (and I have a top quality computer so the sound quality is usually excellent) listening and participating, I have to conclude that this means of conducting the hearing is totally unacceptable, particularly for a scheme as complex as this one will be. It is simply not acceptable to not be able to hear or follow the proceedings effectively and therefore I must ask the ExA to delay further hearings until face to face meetings can be resumed.

I know this view is shared by many people whose internet service was not able to cope with the demands upon it and I must also say that to have to spend such a long period of time looking so closely at people's facial features is hardly a professional way to conduct such an important meeting.

Please respect the wish of many people and delay the hearings until face to face meetings can take place.

Yours faithfully

Alan Collett