



s.coastalfoe@yahoo.co.uk

7 April 2021

To: Infrastructure Planning Inspectorate

By email

Dear PINS

Re: The Sizewell C Project, EN010012: Preliminary Meeting Part 2. Request to speak. Procedural Deadline B.

Our IP ID: 20025904

I would like to register to speak on behalf of our members at Part 2 of the Preliminary Meeting on 14 April.

We may wish to comment on written submissions by Interested Parties provided by Deadline B.

We would also like to pick up on a point made in Part 1 Agenda Item 5, concerning the proposed Pakenham Fen Meadow creation and the amount of land involved.

Additionally, we would like to comment under Agenda Item 6 of Part 1 about the amount of time needed by the Environment Agency, as a statutory consultee, to provide full and proper advice.

With thanks

Yours sincerely

Rachel Fulcher, Coordinator



s.coastalfoe@yahoo.co.uk

7 April 2021

To: Infrastructure Planning Inspectorate
By email.

Dear PINS

**Re: The Sizewell C Project, EN010012. Written submission by Deadline B.
IP ID: 20025904.**

I am writing on behalf of our members. We would like to raise the following concerns.

Problems with the virtual Preliminary Meeting Part 1

Those of us who took part in this meeting, or attempted to follow it onstream, found it most unsatisfactory in a number of respects.

It was very difficult to hear Wendy McKay in part due to the softness of her voice, but also because her microphone seemed to be poorly adjusted. We missed a considerable proportion of what she was saying.

Sometimes the picture froze or became blurred.

RSPB solicitor, [REDACTED], had great difficulty in joining the meeting. When she finally did, we couldn't always hear what she was saying.

The agenda was unclear. Some of us didn't know where we were. Numbered sub-headings would help.

A considerable amount of time was lost in coping with the technicalities, e.g. asking people to switch off microphones etc. The whole process felt very clumsy. It was also impersonal and made it difficult for people to express themselves. We request again that in-person meetings are instigated as soon as possible.

Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (PM Part 1, agenda item 4)

Under 'Alternatives', please include 'the lack of any alternatives put forward by the applicant'.

Under 'Biodiversity and Ecology' we would like to see 'County Wildlife Sites' added. The reason for this is that one is of National Importance, and this, plus one other CWS are at very high risk from the Sizewell C proposals.

While habitats are emphasised, it is not entirely clear how or where the various species would be included, e.g. mammals, reptiles, amphibians, plants and fungi etc. We would like to see these itemised.

Materiality of EDF's Changes to the DCO (PM Part 1, agenda item 5)

Our members consider that the changes are substantial and material because they will lead to other and different Likely Significant Effects from the original application. For example, the new proposals for the Beach Landing Facilities are likely to affect both coastal processes and the terrestrial and marine ecology differently; and the changed crossing over Sizewell Marshes SSSI has a narrower culvert which would lead to other ecological effects.

Problems with the timetable (PM Part 1, agenda item 6)

We refer to our response to the Rule 6 Letter, in which we outlined the problems we are having with the Written Representations. We feel it is very unfair that we are having to pay our experts double to assess the original application as well as EDF's changes, because there is insufficient time between the making of the decision over the changes and the deadline for submission of the Written Representations.

Although we are fully licensed to national Friends of the Earth, we are obliged to raise our own funds. If we cannot raise the extra funds within the given time, then that will seriously compromise our ability to submit detailed expert reports. We are therefore being put at a disadvantage.

We request that the Examination must not begin until all the models, plans and detailed information concerning the changes are available. There must then be sufficient time to scrutinise all the new documents and complete the Written Representations between the making of the decision regarding the changes and the deadline for their submission. We would like to support the National Trust in its request for an absolute minimum of 8 weeks within this interval.

Alternatively, a Part 3 of the Preliminary Meeting, as suggested by other groups and individuals, would give extra pre-examination time. This would be an advantage. We would be glad to support this.

Yours sincerely

Rachel Fulcher, Coordinator