

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Response to matters raised at the part 1 Preliminary meeting
Date: 06 April 2021 14:58:41

Good Afternoon,

I am responding to matters arising from the preliminary meeting in relation to EDF's planning application to build twin nuclear reactors at Sizewell. I welcomed the opportunity to participate in the meeting, however it has raised a number of concerns which I wish the planning inspectorate to take into consideration.

Holding the meetings remotely.

As you are aware there are a large number of people who have registered as interested parties and expressed a wish to be involved in the examination process. Many of these people have spent several years examining the proposals and trying to make informed decisions in relation to the viability, safety and impacts of the project on local communities and the environment, the current pandemic has only served to make this more difficult.

I understand that the government intend planning applications to proceed during the pandemic which is why the recent two day meeting was held remotely. While this did allow people to make contributions you will also be aware that during the meetings a number of people including the planning inspectors had technical issues, screens freezing, flashing screens loss of sound. I am not confident that these issues will be addressed successfully which means that some people will be disadvantaged in their ability to participate fully in the process. I ask that due to the huge implications this project will have on local communities and the environment consideration be given to delaying the process until such a time as face to face meetings can resume and that time is available for sufficient open floor hearings.

Timing of the examination.

EDF have been working on this planning application for the past ten years, produced 4 consultation documents and then submitted an application for 17 changes to their most recent plans. In the words of their own council this is "**an unusually large and complex application**" Surely this should be taken into consideration when considering the timetable for the examination.

It would seem grossly unfair on local communities for the examination process to proceed without the planning inspectorate deciding in advance if the changes to original planning application are accepted or not.

Although EDF are pushing for the decision to be "made at pace" their councils words, it is unclear why (although their current financial difficulties could be placing them under pressure). There is no current funding model and it is unlikely that one will be agreed in the near future, without funding then the project will not go ahead so a delay in planning process will be of little if any consequence to EDF but could impact on local communities. Local people and businesses have been living with uncertainty of this development for many years and are fearful that preliminary work may start only for the project to be abandoned due to lack of finance. Leaving behind fractured communities broken businesses and environmental damage.

I am concerned that due to the pressures of the pandemic on local services including the

ambulance service the work they need to do with EDF as part of the planning process may not be as detailed as in ordinary times and that this may place services and communities at a disadvantage now and in the future.

Principal Issues

Coastal Defences.

EDF have yet to produce detailed and complete plans in relation to the coastal defences and late submission for site licences may mean that plans in relation to coastal defences are not be available for examination prior to the DCO deadline.

The Suffolk coastline is an eroding coastline which is likely to be further impacted by climate change and any defences built to protect the twin nuclear reactors will have implications on other parts of the coastline. It is inconceivable that permission could be granted to build twin nuclear reactors without EDF being required to produce these plans for careful examination by the planning inspectorate.

It has been suggested that EDF may wish to use the "Rochdale envelope" approach in relation to coastal defences this would be wrong and undermine public trust in both EDF and the planning process. If EDF have safe reliable defences systems in place they should be confident in having these examined during the planning process. I was concerned that the planning inspectorate chose to ask EDF council to explain the Rochdale envelope approach as this allowed EDF council to give their interpretation of the rules PINS has its own guidance on the use and limitations of the Rochdale envelope and these are what should be applied.

I would respectfully ask that the planning inspectorate ensure that the voices of local people and groups are heard in the planning process and I hope we fall into the group of "important interested parties " referred to by EDF council.

As I said when I spoke at the meeting I have spent the last ten years reading consultation documents attending meetings and trying to access the information I need to make informed decisions in relation to the project. EDF have not been open and transparent in their dealings and our MP accused them of failing to engage with local communities. EDF do not make vital information available or answer questions fully as born out by their failure to ensure that their complete coastal defence plans are available for scrutiny. Given the size complexity and cost of this huge project and the current exceptional circumstances I request that PINS delay the start of the examination until EDF produce full coastal defence plans and a decision is made in relation to 17 changes proposed by EDF. If the new proposals are accepted then all of the documentation needs to be updated and integrated to ensure that it is accessible to important and interested parties which I believe is everyone.

Yours

Susan Morrice

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]