

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C DCO. Comments regarding Preliminary Meeting Part 2  
**Date:** 06 April 2021 17:05:02

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing on behalf of my family [REDACTED], just 450m from the proposed Sizewell C construction site. We do not propose to speak in person at the Preliminary Meeting Part 2 but Stop Sizewell C will speak on our behalf.

It is important that you know that people are struggling with this process in the current circumstances. It potentially creates a misleading situation if the Planning Inspectorate is lulled into thinking everyone is fine! This is especially true if people are struggling with the technology. Microsoft Teams is difficult to use for people with limited or no experience. These people will be disadvantaged throughout the examination. The Planning Inspectorate needs to address this situation immediately and to make the process completely accessible to all people with a desire to offer their representations. It is critical that the Inspectorate returns to face to face meetings as quickly as possible; and if this means delaying to process then the Inspectorate should urgently do so. We have the following more detailed points to make:

### **1. Timing of the examination.**

We remain very concerned that the Planning Inspectorate will not decide whether to accept the developer's application until the examination has started. Given the "*unusually large and complex application*" (the words of the developer's counsel) every day lost will disadvantage those with limited resources. We urge the Inspectorate to delay the start of the examination until after this decision is taken. This could be done by convening a Part 3 of the Preliminary Meeting or by any other means at its disposal.

The Applicant's claim of urgency is not valid. There is no funding model for the development in place, nor likely to be for some months after the end of the examination.

Suffolk County Council's elections and delay until Cabinet appointments are made mean there will be no Sizewell C lead to represent the County Council from 14 April until the end of May.

The volume of people wishing to take part in the process means there should be flexibility to allow sufficient Open Floor Hearings.

### **2. Principle Issues.**

Coastal Defences (see also 4 below). This is a critical issue for the future of East Suffolk. We are concerned that the developer is seeking to push this critical issue off the examination and onto the Office of Nuclear Regulation's site licensing process. EDF's coastal defence plans are incomplete, and late submission of applications for site licenses means that complete plans may not be available in the examination, potentially subverting the process. EDF is relying on a "Rochdale envelope" approach (defining a range rather than exact calculations) but it is our

understanding that the Applicant must not use this approach extensively or over-rely on it, so we consider it very important that coastal defences are examined in public.

We will also argue that the following issues should be included in the decision making process:

- Sizewell C's life cycle assessment of CO2 emissions/contribution to net zero
- Financing, not just for compulsory acquisition
- Under Policy & Need the Applicant's consideration of alternative sites
- Under Policy & Need the review of the National Policy Statements
- Under Marine Ecology the removal of the Acoustic Fish Deterrent
- Under Air Quality, impacts of borrow pits and spoil management on local communities.

### **3. EDF's new proposals**

- See above for comments on timing of the Examining Authority's decision.
- If the new proposals are accepted, all documentation needs to be fully integrated as they are currently very difficult to manage.

### **4. The tone of the first Preliminary Meeting**

Following the first meeting we express the following concerns:

- At times it was very unclear which agenda item we were on.
- Concern about EDF Counsel's use of the expression "important interested parties". Who are unimportant interested parties?
- Some speakers were interrupted from making valid comments on Day 2.
- The Inspectors allowed EDF's counsel to provide an explanation about use of the 'Rochdale Envelope' from EDF's perspective, which was inappropriate given that the Planning Inspectorate has its own guidance on the use and limits of this approach.

NB. we recommend deferring suggestions on site visits until Deadline 1, 12 May. The developer needs to submit proposals by 7 April - but you may want to think about itinerary, times of day, directions to look etc. The Examining Authority should not visit the Hinkley Point C development without other accompaniment besides the developer and its representatives.

Kind regards,

Robert, Helen and Colin Flindall

