

The online format of the "consultation" has not worked. The technology has been unsatisfactory, and in any event, affected parties have been unnecessarily disenfranchised. There is no time urgency here. In order to protect the integrity of the process, once Government regulations permit, oral hearings must be arranged in person.

Over the past five years, any notion of "consultation" with the applicant has been a sham. It has refused to engage on issues raised, and it has attempted to "game the system" with the illegal and (thus far) unnecessary destruction of Coronation Wood, and more recently, the (deliberately) "last minute" submission of 15 untested "remedies" which seek to secure approval under a false premise. Even the (conflicted) Government Minister who sits as our local MP acknowledges that a delay is required to the process to investigate these (sham) proposals.

The applicant now seeks approval based on a previously "impossible" transport solution, allegedly involving train and sea options. However, this proposal is fake, and non-binding. It has not been investigated with the railways, it is not capable of being delivered, and so does not present a current basis for consideration. It is a "Trojan horse" to secure approval for what will be an overwhelmingly road-based proposal, by pretending it is something different. It must be rejected on this basis.

Moreover, Sizewell C cannot be sensibly considered in isolation to the other proposed "energy projects" in the area which would impose an unacceptable burden on the area's inadequate road infrastructure.

As a separate point, IF this scheme were to be considered with a rail-based solution, (which in reality is not currently the case), the opportunity should be taken to provide some relief to local residents and roads by restoring the train passenger service from Saxmundham to Leiston.

The impact of this development would be disastrous for the important tourist industry of the area which provides critical employment opportunities (especially for younger people).

The proposed site for the worker accommodation is entirely inappropriate. It would destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, and is of an unmanageable scale.

Aside from all local considerations, this scheme should be rejected on economic grounds. Even ignoring the fact that the proposed technology has not (thus far) been successfully deployed anywhere on earth, the projected costs make the projected power generation far too costly. The proposal is economically bankrupt, and the proposal to pay for it with a regressive "tax"/levy on electricity bills is irrational.

Finally, the entire premise for consideration of this proposal are false. You do not know who the "financial backer" is intended to be. The applicant is unable to underwrite any of the "undertakings" it purports to offer. As such, they should be ignored, because they are worthless.

Please reject this absurd proposal.