

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Sizewell c
Date: 10 October 2021 11:26:12

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I would like to take this final opportunity to express my very strong objections to the proposals for Sizewell C, for the following reasons.

- THE DESIGN ISN'T GOING TO HELP THE URGENT NEED TO CUT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. It's too slow and will only add to emissions in this next, crucial decade.
- WE SHOULDN'T BE BUILDING BIG NUCLEAR WITH LONG TERM NUCLEAR WASTE ON A COASTLINE SO VULNERABLE TO SEA LEVEL RISE. The coast there is always changing anyway; Thorpeness is only 2 miles away and has a problem now. The proposed sea defenses are not only extremely unsightly, they will only protect the site on one side; if the sea level rises as is expected (on our current trajectory) it'll merely flood in from other directions.
- THERE ISN'T ENOUGH WATER TO SUPPLY THE SITE....This has been known for years, but somehow has only been recognised as a problem recently. The idea of driving water across the country to the Sizewell is ridiculous at the very time when we're supposed to reduce emissions. As for the desalination plant, where is the evidence of its impact, not least to the environment?
- RE. ENVIRONMENT: WE SHOULD BE PROTECTING THE ECO SYSTEM IN AND AROUND MINSMERE. We know that the UK is among the 10% poorest countries in the world for protecting Biodiversity. Minsmere is one of the few havens for the nature and Sizewell will degrade it, with changes to the water table, sound and light pollution and numerous other ways. EDF proposals to mitigate habitat loss show a complete lack of in-depth understanding of the issues involved and are inadequate.
- THE LOCAL ECONOMY WILL BE DEVASTATED BY HAVING A MASSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT. Our thriving tourist industry on which so many local businesses depend will be hit very hard. Even if visitors can't see the site itself, they will be put off by the volume of traffic, noise, air pollution and traffic jams caused by Sizewell vehicles competing for the very limited road space with farm and other traffic. It can be bad now, so the huge number of extra vehicles proposed will be sheer hell. Local businesses are already finding it hard to recruit workers too, so having to compete with Sizewell C will probably mean that local service providers can no longer function adequately enough to serve local people....our whole infrastructure will be broken. There are also really concerns about the extra burden on health and other services, which are already struggling.
- SIZEWELL C IS NOW AN OUTDATED DESIGN. 10 YEARS AGO IT MIGHT HAVE HAD BETTER EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT IT, BUT THERE ARE NOW MORE PERSUASIVE ALTERNATIVES. If government believes we need new nuclear energy, there are now designs that could come on stream fast, like the small modular reactors. We can also accelerate development of renewables, improvements to the grid, energy storage capacity, insulating buildings and carbon capture by various means.
- FUNDING FOR SIZEWELL C IS STILL A PROBLEM. Foreign investors can be

problematic, it's a hugely risky investment anyway, given that big nuclear tends to cost more and take too long, then have costly problems, like that which caused the long outage at Sizewell B this summer, the problems in China and France, with the same design as Sizewell C. Our government hope that we will all pay the costs through a levy on our utility bills, but that's a big problem since energy and building costs are soaring and overruns are very likely, so that that money would be much better invested elsewhere.

Regards,
Sarah Barrett ([REDACTED])