From:
To:
SizewellC

Subject: Deadline B 14th April Meeting
Date: 07 April 2021 21:41:40

Dear PINS.

Cc:

I am writing to raise new concerns about the DCO process for Sizewell C which I would like to raise during the 14th April meeting.

My specific concerns are:

During the 23rd and 24th March meetings it became clear that the online format is proving to be a barrier to clear communication, is reducing access to the DCO process for those to those who have little or no access to technology and due to the nature if having to be at a screen for two days is impacting the health of some who would wish to participate or discriminating against them as the current online environment blocks their participation.

In person meetings must commence as quickly as possible and if this cannot be done within the existing time frame the DCO process must pause entirely until this can be done. The current situation significantly disadvantages local communities. Precedent has now been set for this with the Scottish Power Renewable DCO being extended for 3 months in recognition of the impact of the pandemic on people's ability to respond, and the extensive amount of new information.

The start of the DCO examination must be delayed until a decision has been made as to whether to accept EDF's changes, this could be done through a part 3 preliminary meeting.

It was very clear in the March meetings that the volume of people wishing to take part means there should be flexibility to allow sufficient Open Floor Hearings.

The parallel timelines for SZC and Scottish Power are placing a significant burden on local communities for whom the cumulative impact of these projects will be significant. This again shows that proceedings need to be delayed to support community engagement.

It was very concerning during the March meetings that when asked to clarify a procedure of the DCO process the examining team deferred to EDF's QC to respond rather than clarifying the process themselves. This raises questions about the examing team, their knowledge of the process and their willingness to defer to the applicant. This sadly does not give me confidence that this process is independent and that the decks are not stacked against local communities.

In terms of principal issues I believe the appropriate terms for use of the Rochdale Envelope concept must be addressed and defined clearly.

It was unusual in the March meeting that an agenda with a list if speakers had been prepared but that this order was not kept to, instead participants could raise their hand and speak as and when called on by the examining team.

Kind regards Mrs Anne-Marie Robb

