

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Sizewell C
Date: 26 November 2020 11:27:54

Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you so much for your notice of EDF's revised plans.

Below is my letter to Dr Coffey with comments on the vulnerability of the site and the surrounding coastline (coming from someone who experienced the 1953 Surge).

Any works to defend the site itself will inevitably have knock-on effects on the surrounding coastline with probable serious implications for further erosion at Thorpeness and elsewhere.

With my thanks and best wishes,

John Walton

From: John Walton [REDACTED] >
Sent: 25 November 2020 16:29
To: 'therese.coffey.mp@parliament.uk' <therese.coffey.mp@parliament.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sizewell C

Dear Therese Coffey,

This email is from John Walton, [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email warning me of a revised application by EDF.

I am conscious that I have written to you before on this subject but, as the weeks go by and the evidence builds an overwhelming case against this project, I am curious as to the reasons why you broadly support it ?

1. It is clear that by the early 2020s the cost of renewables will be a THIRD OR LESS of the (subsidised) cost for nuclear, thereby delivering a huge gain for the British Economy.
2. Sizewell C will have a NEGATIVE impact on the climate crisis until at least 2040, well beyond the point many climate scientists think will be a "tipping point".
3. It is argued by the nuclear lobby that we need additional nuclear for grey, wind-less days. This may have had validity in the past, but no longer.

Just today, Belgium, which is phasing out nuclear by 2025, has announced transformative plans for storage of renewable power which will deal securely with that very problem. According to the most substantial figure in the US renewables industry, the costs I have mentioned above INCLUDE storage.

4. The environmental impact on a considerable part of your constituency will be immense. The site is vulnerable and would never have been chosen in the first place if we had known then what we know now about the likely impending impacts of climate change. EDF may spend to mitigate the flood risk to the site itself, but who knows what this will mean for the surrounding coast?

As to work possibilities, surely energy storage projects in the North would fit better with the priorities of this Government?

I should be grateful if you would let me know why you support a scheme which would badly compromise the reputation of a Government which sets great store by its claims to economic competence.

With my best wishes,

John Walton