

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: 20025839 20025840 Paul & Julie Tillcock
Date: 07 April 2021 13:27:25

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am not absolutely sure what you are expecting at this deadline and thought it better to respond and if the items I raise are duplicated or not appropriate at this stage I accept that they will be discounted, however I do think in a matter of such complexity and size that as a layperson I should at least try and give you my thoughts.

1. Right from the very start I could not work out why EDF were so reluctant at every request to give out specific and full information on many of the issues raised by local residents, I brought this subject up at the preliminary meetings and was told that EDF use the Rochdale Envelope approach and therefore "only" need to give the outline to us concerned parties. Is that correct?? as I have briefly read up and it definitely states this approach should not be overused or used extensively and certainly not abused. Does the Inspectorate agree with this approach or can you take a different view to get EDF to properly explain in detail their approach to specific matters such as: Coastal defences, Nuclear Waste, life cycle CO2 emissions.

Also I find it incredulous that there is no explanation on how EDF are going to fund this project let alone buy the land etc etc

2. I am concerned that EDF are trying to rush this through without allowing Suffolk County Council and east Suffolk Coastal and all other concerned parties enough time to prepare for the meetings up and coming, due to Covid, local Elections, other Energy DCOs being extended

3. Accepting or declining the latest/new changes whilst running the full examination seems counter intuitive and due to the complexities doesn't seem fair

4. If the examination is delayed and face to face meetings were allowed, that I believe would be a help all the local residents that find it hard to communicate via Zoom, email or online, which I think is a very important point. Also I think it imperative that local people can join together to show their support or opposition to this project in their "backyard" and not online.

5. Will the inspectorate also look into

- 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 (quarries) and spoil heaps on local communities.

As these items were new aspects to consider I believe.

Thank you once again for your help in getting to the real information of this project, and allowing it into the public domain, I trust you will take my/our concerns on board.

Yours faithfully

Paul & Julie Tillcock