

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: My objection to SZC&D at Sizewell beach next to SZB.
Date: 12 October 2021 12:21:47

I have been most concerned at the cavalier attitude taken by EDF & partner CGN in proposing NNB Generating Company Ltd submit to the Planning Inspectorate for planning approval to construct two as yet unproven non working EPR (European pressure Reactors) on the Sizewell beach with its proven Problems:

1 The actual site is confirmed as being too small, we are given to understand. Already only 32 acres when a minimum of over 50 acres would be required per Nuc reactor/turbine. The site is an AONB and not suitable at all for the proposals as it already contains very rare habitats.

2, EDF & partners CGN now have to face the reality that there is not enough water for their requirements, having been warned by local pressure groups of this for the last ten years. East Anglia is the driest area in Britain. EDF/CGN have proposals for introducing 'desalination plants!' These have been totally rejected as the discharge is far too toxic to the marine environment in the extreme. Flushing chemicals and brine concentrates to the sea in large amounts.

3. Sea level rises are inevitable and no account has been made for this other than to 'TRY' to keep the water out and away from the site by constructing high concrete perimeter walls to a minimum of three metres high initially, adding to the cost with no guarantees for a long term solution.

4. If ever the project were to commence it is considered it would take an estimated 10 to 15 years and many consider with the difficulty of minor road access and isolation, longer. Taking into account also millions of tonnes of aggregates would need to be transported across Britain from the Mendip hills as none suitable is available locally. This also is a late realisation by EDF/CGN. The whole concept would take far longer to build than the time now available being less than 10 years for this country and in fact the world to address the global rising temperatures, as the carbon generated while building would reach far beyond the time needed to compensate carbon payback.

5 Many workers would be imported to the area as a main workforce, as many as 8000 we are informed. Bearing in mind the population in Leiston is but 5500. The requirements however would attract some local workers also for the high pay, thus taking from the existing balanced full employment. Skills of the area would be depleted and this would collapse the local economy. Overwhelming the tourism and recreational attractions of this area would decline and in my view become industrialised as many would prefer destroying the current success and its profound beauty. All of this would simply dwindle away.

6. Nuclear power is constantly placed in the 'Green Energy' category as 'low carbon' This is a misguided myth. Immense amounts of carbon are required to mine uranium from around the world. This uranium has then to be enriched and therefore more dangerous to make it suitable for nuclear fuel, lasting for only short periods. Outages are then required to change the fuel for more enriched fuel every eighteen months where the removed fuel is placed into underwater containers then to sealed containers for centuries at Sizewell which shortly to be an island

and very dangerous for the generations who will follow us having to care for this mess we leave them to try to clear up following our greed..

These are just some of my reasons I, as an observer of events has noticed EDF/CGN pursue in an attempt to launch this still unreliable EPR (Series one) nuclear reactor.

Bob Hoggar