From: [redacted]
To: SizewellC
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Opposition to Sizewell C
Date: 20 September 2021 17:29:22

Philip Smith

[redacted]

The Planning Inspector
sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

cc.
Therese Coffey
Matthew Hicks
Craig Rivett
[redacted]

20th September 2021

Dear Sir,

Opposition to proposals for the Construction of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station

I am writing to express my opposition to the planning application for the construction of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station, because the many flaws, drawbacks, and serious disadvantages, which appear in the proposals are so detrimental to the people of Suffolk and the people of Britain,that they outweigh any possible benefits. I set some of these out below:-

- It is an environmental catastrophe in every sense:-
    - It will have a disastrous impact on the natural environment in a unique part of the British coast. The proposals to ameliorate this are completely inadequate.
    - The long drawn-out construction process will be a blight on the lives of the people living in the immediate

vicinity and along the many access corridors leading to the construction site.
    - Apart from the colossal size of the actual power station, the proposals require the construction of number of large ancillary buildings and access roads which will be a blight on the countryside for many years.
    - The proposals for the demolition and removal of the numerous ancillary buildings, roads and support structures, and return of the sites to their original condition are inadequate and unrealistic.
    - There are still no realistic proposals for decommissioning a nuclear power station. Sizewell A and Sizewell B are being left in situ so what will happen with Sizewell C at the end of its life?

- The construction process will consume huge quantities of potable water competing with the needs of the general public and with the needs of agriculture. This will be detrimental to the economy of the county and to individual quality of life. The proposed diesel powered desalination plant lacks capacity and is polluting. It is not clear from the published information whether the demand for potable water will continue when the power station is operational.

- The consequences of anything going wrong are disastrous:
    - Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima have shown how easy it is for a disaster to occur and the huge cost to the environment and danger to human and animal life.
    - Sizewell A and Sizewell B are extremely close to an unstable coastline at a time when it is known that sea levels are rising. It is foolish to construct another similar power station in the same place.

- It is badly conceived and not necessary:-
    - Research by independent and respected organisations like Good Energy and National Grid show that Britain's foreseeable energy requirements and commitments to decarbonisation can be met without the construction of a new nuclear power station.

- Large nuclear power stations are not a credible way forward at the present time because:-
  - Based on the experience of last 60 years and a proper examination of the costs, nuclear energy has proved to be more expensive than any other form of energy generation.
  - Predictions made by the industry and EDF in particular, are over optimistic and inaccurate.
  - By committing to a costly and rigid project of this nature, Britain restricts its ability to conceive and adopt a flexible energy policy that is 'fit for purpose' in the 21st century.

- It is not environmentally friendly or 'green': -
  - if looked at in the whole, the environmental benefits are overstated particularly if account is taken of the long-term environmental damage caused by ionising radiation, and the cost and technical difficulty of de-commissioning a large nuclear power station.
  - The carbon cost of construction is enormous.

- It is not British:-
  - Britain needs to have ownership of the intellectual property and the physical assets of vital infrastructure in order to properly protect British interests.
  - A large proportion of the workforce will not be British and the opportunity for Britain to develop its own expertise in this field will be lost
  - Because the profits will go to a foreign company and the workforce will largely be based abroad, it will not provide sufficient long term benefit for the British economy.

- It is 20th century technology:-
  - EPR reactors have a history of cost overruns, delaysand operational unreliability.
  - New nuclear technologies, now in the course ofdevelopment, offer cheaper quicker and safer alternatives.
  - Britain will miss out badly if it is not in a position to take advantage of new developments, having committed itself to out of date technology.

- The Financial model is wrong
    - Most of the cost and the risk will be passed on to the public resulting in excessive energy bills for many years to come. This will not only effect households but the future competitiveness of British industry.
    - There is too much reliance on foreign partners
    - It will increase the size of Britain's indebtedness which is already at unsustainable levels.

- It will take too long to build and commission and may well be redundant before it even comes on stream.

Please acknowledge receipt and confirm my objections will be noted.

Yours sincerely,

Philip Smith