

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Additional submission from the Southwold and Reydon Society  
**Date:** 10 March 2021 10:04:27  
**Attachments:** [Sizewell Nov 2020email.doc](#)

---

The Southwold and Reydon Society has not altered the views expressed in the previous submission by email sent on 8th November 2020 (copy attached). However, we are now increasingly concerned by the stubborn failure of EDF, in the interim, to respond to numerous calls for greater clarity on the financing of the project and on any lessons learned from the spiralling costs and technical complexities affecting the Hinkley Point development.

Is EDF asking us to assume that sufficient Government and institutional support will be made available for a project who's end costs are far from certain? Is there still a dependence on overseas investment and if so, how far is this assured?

Are we confident that a construction programme with no start date or completion timetable will not be overtaken by the emergence of alternative and competitive forms of generation?

Ridley Burnett  
Chairman  
Southwold and Reydon Society

**From:** Ridley Burnett [REDACTED]  
**To:** sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 8 November 2020, 08:58:50 GMT  
**Subject:** Representation from the Southwold and Reydon Society

We have made a previous submission. We would now like to add to this (if permitted) as follows:

Sizewell C

The Southwold and Reydon Society has always supported the principle of renewable energy and carbon reduction. Our reservations about the Sizewell C development have, historically, centred on the likely and undesirable effects of construction on local residents & the local environment and on the intrusion of the completed scheme on the Suffolk landscape and the AONB.

In the light of continuing lack of clarity from EDF, concerns over finance, cost & time overruns at Hinckley Point, technical difficulties surrounding the reactor model and the growing possibility of other energy sources, we have canvassed our members. Their responses persuade us to review our position. We now feel that the project should be opposed as unnecessary.

*Were* it to proceed then our reservations lodged during the Consultation process still stand and we share the concerns of many other local organisations in that the Society remains unconvinced by the currently proposed mitigations on the effects of the construction period and the completed project upon the AONB and residents.

The area is heavily dependent upon year-round tourism, which will be adversely affected by the inevitable clogging of the road system for the delivery of goods and personnel. In this connection the Society supports the pressing need for a four-village bypass and remains convinced that the opportunity still exists for heavier use of rail and sea as prime resources.

Ridley Burnett, Chairman.