

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Written Representation re. Sizewell C
Date: 26 May 2021 11:31:00
Attachments: [Sizewell C Written Representation 250521.docx](#)
Importance: High

Sir

As a past Chairman of Great Bealings Parish Council and a resident of Great Bealings for over 40 years I will be affected by the proposed development of Sizewell C (SZC). I attach my written representation accordingly.

Yours faithfully

Charles Barrington

[REDACTED]

Sizewell C – Written Representation

1. Economic
 - a. Cost/benefit analysis
No full cost/benefit analysis has been carried out to show whether the whole life cost of the proposed development compares favourably with alternatives or not.
 - b. EDF
 - i. Subsidy. We are no longer in the EU. It is a fraud on the British taxpayer that we are being asked to pay for this development in such a way as to subsidise EDF, a bankrupt French company, whose challenge over the next 25 years is to upgrade and/or decommission their own fleet of nuclear power stations. Developments in the UK are only of value to them if they produce a cash flow to subsidise their French operations.
 - ii. Since we are no longer in the EU, we cannot rely on EDF giving priority to its UK operations other than by way of cash extraction as in (i) above. Look at Jersey.
 - c. Jobs. There is no comparison with Hinckley, which is close to a motorway and to the Bristol conurbation. EDF have already admitted that the majority of high skill jobs at Sizewell C (SZC) will have to be filled from elsewhere. Employment in East Anglia depends on offshore industries such as windfarms and on tourism and agriculture. Tourism will suffer as a direct result of SZC.
 - d. Investment in Sizewell will not come from the institutions. It is far too risky and does not fit their ESG criteria. Therefore the funding must come from those who pay for their electricity, domestic or commercial. Why should those people subsidise a bankrupt French company?
2. Carbon impact. This case has been grossly overstated for the following reasons:
 - a. Delay. No risk-based allowance has been made for further delay. Hinckley, Flammanville, and Finland have all been delayed, in some cases by years. SZC will not be on stream until the late 2030's, far too late to contribute to the Government's carbon neutral target.
 - b. Up front construction. No satisfactory analysis has been offered on the up front excess carbon impact of the construction process from concrete use, steel manufacturing processes, ground disturbance, traffic, and loss of habitat.
 - c. Decommissioning. Similarly no allowance has been made for the decommissioning process. When added together and set against the predicted operational life of SZC, these impacts suggest that the net carbon benefit will be *de minimis* at best. Since SZC will be delayed and since it is already out of date by way of design, the likely result is that it will be closed down early for safety reasons and because cheaper alternatives will become available much

sooner than predicted. In such circumstances its overall carbon impact could easily be negative.

3. Environmental

- a. Siting. The siting choice as set out in earlier Government analyses dated several years ago predates much of current environmental law and policy. This site would not pass any reasonable current test.
- b. Minsmere. It is an outrage that SZC is being proposed so close to this leading wildlife site. The construction process, the extraction of water, and the ongoing pollution caused by noise and light will impact Minsmere in ways that cannot be assessed with any safety. Alternative sites do not replace Minsmere. As is typical with such developments, alternatives have been proposed to deal with specific individual species or habitats. The wider impact on the local environment as a whole cannot be mitigated.
- c. Light pollution will be a major issue, especially during construction. While we are encouraged to develop areas of 'dark skies', this development runs utterly contrary to this objective.
- d. Water table. At a time when we have advanced climate change we cannot predict the wider impact on the water table of future weather patterns. To extract so much water for this project in this notoriously dry region is environmental suicide.
- e. Materials from different regions will be brought onto the site. No assessment has been carried out to determine the level of risk to local species from this activity.

4. Alternatives.

It is madness to go ahead with SZC when so many alternatives are available:

- a. 'Mini nukes'. These are secure, flexible, based on proven technology, faster to commission, cheaper, and can be located close to areas of high need. They offer a far more manageable basis for delivering base load where it is needed.
- b. Wind. Offshore wind – a huge feature of the East Anglian economy – offers faster, cheaper, and safer power than nuclear. A modernised grid structure would deliver power from Scotland when there is no wind in the south and vice versa.
- c. Solar. Solar farms are low tech, quick to install, easy to maintain, and low risk.
- d. Gas plus CCS. There are now major plans to install carbon capture and storage facilities in disused North Sea oil facilities. Gas is flexible and plentiful. Gas plus CCS is a far more manageable base load strategy.

5. Traffic and Transport. Hinckley is close to the M5. SZC is served by country lanes. The Ipswich Northern Relief Road has been withdrawn for good environmental and social reasons. Suffolk County Council has no countywide road strategy and the A12 remains unfit for purpose. SZC will

require 750 HGV movements per day across this wholly inadequate road system. The workforce and the services required to support it will generate many thousands of extra car and van movements. The project creates a traffic nightmare the impact of which will be borne entirely by the local population.

6. Security.

It is widely acknowledged that interference with critical infrastructure will be an increasing geo-political threat in the future. It seems remarkably shortsighted to entrust such a major strategic facility to Chinese management. France's approach to the UK post Brexit is a further issue. For both these reasons a wholly UK sourced and financed solution would be far preferable.

Charles Barrington

