Clive Tickner.
[redacted]

The Planning Inspectorate, [PINS],
Temple Quay House,
Temple Quay,
Bristol,
BS1 6PN

2nd October 2020

Dear Sir / /Madam,

I am writing to voice a complaint against the erroneous contents the recent Sizewell C pamphlet, "What it means for you", that came through my door recently.
This disingenuous document, forwarded by Ms Julia Pike, the Nuclear Development Director for Sizewell C, is, to put it politely, both inaccurate and misleading.
The "KEY FACTS" are clearly designed to convince the public that the EDF plans for this additional nuclear power station for Suffolk are completely safe and, in every way, acceptable.

Below I list (in red) the claims and assurances listed in the orange-boxed squares of page three, against which I offer the true facts, which conflict with her claims.

" Nuclear power has been generated safely on this part of the Suffolk coast for over half a century. Sizewell A started in 1966. It is a stable and secure section of the Suffolk coast."

It is disingenuous to claim a nuclear safety record just by considering *one* power plant in Suffolk.
Globally, between 1952 and 2009, there were 99 recorded nuclear power plant accidents totaling US$20.5 billion in property damages.
Before Three Mile Island (1979), the list of serious nuclear accidents was;
Canada 5, France 12, Germany 4, India 6, Japan 11, Pakistan 1, Ukraine 1, UK 3, USA 46.
Since then we have had the incredibly serious melt-downs at Chernobyl 1986; and Fukushima, 2011.
As to being a stable and secure project, the constructor and managing company, EDF, (which is 85% state-owned), has already had to borrow

billions just to pay dividends to its state shareholder. This was to stem an earlier fear that EDF was going into administration.

"The design of the station- the UK EPR- will be a replica of one we are already building at Hinkley Point C in Somerset. The design has been approved by the UK's nuclear regulator, the Office for Nuclear regulation (ONR). This means it satisfies Britain's high and robust standards for nuclear safety."

On November 4th 2009, the nuclear power regulatory authorities in France, Finland and the United Kingdom, complained that the EPR design, (the model for Sizewell C and Hinckley C), *doesn't* comply with the 'independence principle' for safety.
A quarter of the welds inspected in the secondary containment steel liner at EDF's EPR project being built in Flamanville (France) were *not* in accordance with norms, and that cracks had been found in the concrete base.
Further to this, in August 2010 the regulator, ASN, reported further welding problems on the secondary containment steel liner also. Where were the 'high and robust standards' then?

"The design of the station is proven to work. The building of Hinkley Point C, our sister station in Somerset, is on schedule."

Hinkley Point received approval in September 2016 and is expected to be completed around 2026. However the two similar EPR units in Finland and France are both facing costly delays.
The Flamanville reactor was originally expected to start commercial operation in 2013 and to cost 3.3 billion Euros. However, with delays and cost increases it now stands at 12.4 billion Euros, with a start date being the end of 2022. These, therefore, have *not yet* been "proven to work".

"Together the reactors will generate 3.2 GW of electricity. This is enough to power 6 million homes"

Wind power, the by-far cheaper option to build, plus providing a far cheaper cost per electrical unit. contributed 20% of UK electricity generation in 2019. making up 54% of electricity generation from renewable sources. These *are* "proven to work."

"Britain needs Sizewell C to help replace coal, gas and nuclear power stations that are closing down, so we do not have to rely on foreign imports or, like Germany, burn more fossil fuels and make the climate emergency worse."

In 2017, 15% of the UK's entire electricity was generated from wind power, enough to power 12.7 million homes across the country. A whole program of wind farm building will "prevent our lights going out" *long before* the time planned for Sizewell C's completion.

Ms Pike does not address the topic of escalating costs;

Hinckley Point's initial budget, was estimated at £18 billion pounds. EDF now admit that the construction cost for Hinkley Point had climbed to between £21.5 billion pounds and £22.5 billion pounds.
The unavoidable clear-up and decommissioning costs, an awesome millstone for our children's and grandchildren's generations, have yet to be included in the final total.

"It will take 9-12 years to build Sizewell C. A construction project will always have some impact on the surrounding area, but we are working to minimise this."

EDF's time scale record leaves the first part of this paragraph to be taken with a pinch of salt.
Next, I suggest that internet images are viewed to see the formidable, sad, landscape-damage that has taken place with the, still incomplete, building of Hinkley Point. Even EDF's own website pictures demonstrate that the word "minimise" cannot, in any way, be applied to the images of the impact that Hinkley's construction has had on this massive area of land.
See; https://www.edfenergy.com/media-centre/news-releases/update-on-hinkley-point-c-project

"25,000 job opportunities will be created during construction. At least a third of the workforce will be local."

At the moment we cannot invite more than 15 people to a wedding, but EDF wishes to bring 25 thousand people into a narrow area in Suffolk. We currently do not have the hospital places to cope with the affects of a pandemic hitting the project.
The areas of land which will have to be concreted over, to accommodate housing for all these workers, will be even larger than the power station's plot.
With the burgeoning of wind-farm and photovoltaic industries, thousands of workers will still find work, therefore it is erroneous to maintain that Sizewell C's cancellation will be a problem for local employment.

"At least 40% of the construction material will be delivered to site by sea or rail."

That's 60% of construction material coming by trucks, over a 12 year period. From our main artery, the A12, the roads towards to proposed construction site are largely, currently, too small for this kind of traffic. Even EDF's own plans account for a serious truck transport requirement, demanding vast extensions to existing roads and the massive widening of others. "Supply by rail" appears to ignore the fact that rail-borne goods will still have to be loaded onto trucks for the final part of their journey.

"A net increase in land for wildlife will be created to compensate for the land used during construction. We are not building on land owned by RSPB Minsmere. Sizewell C will benefit the environment by reducing harmful emissions."

Surely, if there *are* any harmful emissions presently "needing reducing" they can only come from the existing Sizewell nuclear power station.
But how is this "net increase" to be achieved? There is only a finite amount of land in Suffolk. Unless land is to be reclaimed from the sea there is no way that *existing* land can provide any net increase. "The Independent" of May 2020 headlines; " New nuclear power plant planned for Suffolk coast 'would be devastating' for wildlife," as the Sizewell C plan will actually decimate thousands of acres of the AONB, SPA and SSSI environment. It *will* mean the loss of an Heritage Path in Minsmere, with the whole site seriously affecting the biodiversity of existing wildlife
The National Trust, Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the RSPB have all claimed that EDF have failed to provide evidence that their plans would *not* threaten the area's rare animal species and protected habitats. These bodies maintain that such a construction may well increase erosion and disrupt water levels also, in the neighbouring Minsmere nature reserve, even if the nuclear site does not actually *occupy* that protected area. "This would be potentially catastrophic for species including bitterns, water voles, and otters".
"The build must not go ahead, given its anticipated impacts on the environment."

"The government will decide how Sizewell C is funded. If it agrees with our suggested approach it could mean that Sizewell C would be funded mainly by British Investors.

Right from the project's inception the EDF, planned a partnership with the state-owned 'China General Nuclear Power Group' to build nuclear reactors in the UK,
In 2015, Theresa May's political adviser Nick Timothy wrote an article to oppose the People's Republic of China's involvement in such sensitive sectors. But under a deal agreed in October 2015, CGN took a 33.5% stake in EDF Energy's project to construct Hinkley Point.
The China General Nuclear Power Group, has been blacklisted by the United States Department of Commerce for attempting to acquire advanced US nuclear technology and material for diversion to military use.
Today, even more unease is being felt about any financial agreements with the Chinese.

"Once built Sizewell C will generate low carbon electricity for at least 60 years and will employ 900 people. The carbon emissions during construction will be offset within 6 to 8 months of Sizewell's operation, (assuming it replaces a gas plant)".

Why assume (wrongly) that Sizewell C will "replace a gas plant"?
As it doesn't, the claim above is without foundation.
Regardless of this error, the assertion that nuclear power is a low-carbon method of generating electricity, ignores the hugely negative affect of the waste-product storage; an awesome millstone for our children's and grandchildren's generations, the monies for which have yet to be apportioned.

The carbon emissions in the building of an EPR are vast next to those emissions resulting from the construction of alternative technology apparatus.

As the general public have been invited to comment on EDF's plans for Sizewell C, I feel it to be disingenuous for them to provide one-sided, or incomplete, information to make the project seem appealing. Whether by accident or by design, to ignore all the many relevant, accompanying, counter-productive issues is, again politely said, "unfair".

Thank you,

Clive Tickner.