

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Comments on Examination Procedure and Timetable for Sizewell C
Date: 07 April 2021 22:51:10

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Please consider the following points in regard to the Sizewell C examination procedure and timetable:

1. Timing of the Examination:

I urge you to delay accepting EDF's application until after they have submitted their new proposals and integrated them into the existing application. This will allow for comparison between the two documents, so that it can be seen whether the new proposal is essentially the same, or a new and different one. * (see below)

In order to give both parties an equal, democratic voice, please defer the Examination until after Suffolk County Council's elections, as democratic representation from SCC will be removed between April 14th and the end of May.

And please provide sufficient Open Floor Hearings to cater for the large numbers of people wishing to take part.

This could be done by convening a Preliminary Meeting Part 3 or by some other means.

2. Maintaining a fair balance between the Applicant and Interested Parties

See my comments above re Timing: please disregard the Applicant's claims of urgency. The issues need to be examined properly. EDF has no funding model in place, and is not likely to for some time, so claims of urgency are spurious. Interested Parties have fewer resources and will need longer to research the issues raised.

I was not alone in feeling at times during the last meeting that EDF sought to create a divisive hierarchy by i) using exclusive language ("Important Interested Parties") and ii) using technical language that they took it upon themselves to define, rather than allowing PINS to do so ("Rochdale Envelope"). In fact in the latter case their counsel made the sweeping assumption that they would use the Rochdale Envelope, whereas this has not yet been agreed.

3. Principle Issues

a) In particular, please do not allow EDF to put their inadequate research on **Coastal Defences** into a Rochdale Envelope. Diverting this important issue to the Office for Nuclear Regulations' Site Licensing process effectively removes it from scrutiny by PINS and the public. To do so would be to contravene PINS' own guidance on the Rochdale Envelope: (see below **)

b) Please include an examination of emissions of CO₂ over the life cycle of the project and assessment of the project's contribution to net zero.

c) Under Air Quality: Borrow Pits and Spoil Heaps near Eastbridge and Theberton

d) The Applicant's consideration of alternative sites

e) EDF's expectations of financing - not just for compulsory acquisition

f) Implications for Fish and Eels of proposed removal of the Acoustic Fish Deterrent

I would also like to request that Interested Parties be represented on all visits to Hinkley Point.

Finally, I would like to say that I have asked Stop Sizewell C to represent my views at the forthcoming Preliminary Examination.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs) Marilyn Checkley

*(see above under Timing) 6.3 ● that there is a consistent approach to the description of the development addressing the uncertainty and necessary flexibility across all relevant application documents.

** 6.3 The challenge for applicants is to ensure that where uncertainty exists and flexibility is sought the following is achieved:

- that the statutory consultation and publication requirements under the PA2008 (sections 42, 47 and 48) have been complied with;
- **that the likely significant environmental effects from the Proposed Development have been properly assessed and presented in the ES;**