

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Planning Consent for Sizewell C
Date: 09 June 2021 19:29:16

Dear Sirs and Madam

Although I have spoken at the Open Floor Hearings and sent a written copy of this to you, I wish to add something to that statement.

I have always known that the Sizewell C EPR Twin Reactor would be big, but not until I saw the documentary “Building Britain’s Biggest Nuclear Power Station” (BBC 2 last week and tonight) about Hinkley Point C, did I realise *how* big. As the cameras panned the acres of concrete and steel, so big that it made the lorries within it look quite small, a voice told us proudly that it is the size of a small town, or 125 football pitches! The thought of this coming here, with its attendant traffic on roads, rail and sea, made me feel quite sick.

What I would like to ask you is this: If Sizewell A and B had never been built, would you consider giving permission for a small town the size of 125 football pitches to be built there? I put it to you that there would be not just local, but national outrage at the idea, here on this unique bio diverse stretch of coast, on top of RSPB Minsmere and Sizewell Marshes, a landscape unique in this country and home to 8,000 species of wildlife – *in fact all the things we are told we must preserve at all costs*. When you have seen what is involved, EDF’s claims to be preserving and even helping the wildlife seem quite outrageous.

The fact that Sizewell A and B are there already, is not a justification for something so much worse to be added. This on its own should be enough to decide against it, before you consider the many other impacts, some of which I will now list.

Roads: I have heard concern from NHS Paramedics, the Police and Care Workers, about reaching people because of the congestion on roads during construction. The documentary at Hinkley showed the effects on the small roads there, blocked by huge vehicles. And a local town, where a shopkeeper told us traffic jams caused by HGVs and white buses carrying workers, has driven local people away and the shops are suffering. How much worse will it be here, where unlike Hinkley with the M5, we have only the often-single lane A12, which is already congested at times?

Water: We live in the driest county in England and concrete is the greediest user of water. We are already committed to building 19,000 new homes in Suffolk. If the government wants all of this, could it tell us where the water is to come from? Water supply problems were also mentioned in the Hinkley documentary. Another aspect to be considered are the water levels on the Sizewell marshes, which I know have to be just right to be sustainable, can this be guaranteed?

Sea defences: we cannot predict the future of things like rising sea levels,

movement of sand banks and gravel, or future storms and floods. The large defences needed could end up flooding Aldeburgh, Thorpeness and Dunwich.

Jobs: I know that providing jobs is considered to be a strong reason to have it. But really? Is it worth it for that? A plan to create that number of jobs in a far more useful and forward looking way, could be done tomorrow, *if there was the will to do it*. If you read the story in my Open Floor hearings presentation, you will know that when Sizewell B was built, a survey showed there was no need for another power station - if every house and building in Suffolk was properly insulated. Well, we could employ people to do that and supply solar panels, invest in wave-power and more offshore Wind. So, supplying jobs is not a viable reason for granting planning permission either.

Another difference between here and Hinkley is that it is not a tourist destination, and this is. It is also a cultural centre with Snape Maltings, where concerts run all year, as well as the Aldeburgh Festival, and Latitude Festival, with its long queues on the A12, each drawing crowds from around the country and abroad. These will suffer, as will the jobs associated with them. It is what we are famous for, as well as our wildlife.

Finally, there is the time factor: EDF says it will take ten to twelve years to build, EDF also says it will create 5.4 tons of CO2 and offsetting this will take another six years, bringing us to 2038-40. So, it is not realistic to say it will meet the govts target to be carbon neutral by 2035. Long before then it will have been overtaken by renewables, science being on the brink now, of solving storage and other problems associated with that. *The argument of need is therefore not a justification either.*

In spite of all these reasons, which I am sure you are well aware of, there is always the "Mastermind" "I've started so I'll finish!" temptation. Please do not say "yes" because EDF are so far down the line and have spent so much time and money already. Please listen to the real issues at stake here, and to the needs of future generations, and say a resounding "No" to Sizewell C.

Caroline Weatherby

