

From: [Sigi Mermagen](#)
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Register opposition to Sizewell c - Planning Inspectorate
Date: 12 October 2021 11:29:09

12/10/21

Dr & Mrs JA Malpass



To the Planning Inspectorate - Sizewell C

We write to register with our opposition to the proposed development of Sizewell C during the examination period.

The main issues we have are:

- **Lack of a secured long term water supply** in the driest region in the country and concern about the **impacts of a water desalination** plant during construction:
 - Building 28km of water mains will not be completed by 2026 and provision of a water desalination plant as an “alternative” is not a viable, acceptable solution, especially considering EDF rejected this proposed solution previously due to power consumption, sustainability, cost, and wastewater discharge.
 - The transport of water by tanker prior to completion of a desalination plant as it is likely to exceed the HGV cap. This makes it not viable.
 - The use of diesel generators until onsite power is available will contribute to significant emissions of CO2 and Nitrogen Oxide. This is not acceptable on any level.
 - The brine discharged will be 1.6 times more concentrated than natural seawater, may exceed screening thresholds for zinc and chromium and who knows the impacts on marine life. This is irresponsible

and not acceptable.

- It is not acceptable that this all still needs to be overcome, costed, funded and agreed at such a late stage of the examination period.
- **Unsuitable location** on the Suffolk Heritage Coast:
 - Due to the ongoing **erosion of coast**, rising sea levels and uncertainty about coastal defences.
 - **Proximity** to RSPB Minsmere and the negative, destructive impact it would have on AONB.
 - **Nuclear waste** would be required to be stored on site along this coastline for 100 years, for future generations to sort out, posing risk to health along with the low-level radiation and its attendant risks to human health.

- **Unsuitable size and scale**

Sizewell C is a vast nuclear project which carries a **huge negative impact**:

- On the specific area chosen to build it on in terms of the **destroying the environment, wildlife, fish and marine life and tourism**.
- On the **local economy**, especially with regards to **lack of permanent employment, disruption, traffic infrastructure and congestion**. There would be around 12,000 extra vehicles a day on the A12, including 700 HGVs and the associated emissions.
- **Cost:**
 - The cost is likely to greatly exceed £20billion.
 - **EDF cannot afford the cost** of Sizewell C and this begs the question of **how it will be financed**, which is still **unanswered**.
 - Other EDR reactors under construction are **over budget, running a decade late**, have been **closed** or

the construction companies have pulled out from such expensive projects as they are just **too risky**.

- **What grounds is this to proceed?**

- **Future Green Energy** and its impact on the environment:
 - **This has to be green and renewable.**
 - Sizewell C will be two huge nuclear reactors. It is **not green**, its waste remains radioactive and as uranium is a depleting resource, it is **not renewable**.
 - It will create a **huge upfront carbon footprint** during construction and beyond so goes completely **against the government's climate policy** and plan to decarbonise the UK electricity system by 2035.
 - It is quite simply **not the correct option for future energy**.
 - Green power is the future with a focus on renewables, energy storage, clean heat and energy efficiency.

Ultimately, it will be built too late, due for completion in 2034 if on schedule, by which time it will have been superseded by other forms of renewable power, which are faster to build and cheaper. It is just not necessary to build it and at such huge costs, which will have been wasted and could have been invested into renewables in the first place.

We respectfully urge you to call a halt to the Sizewell C (SZC) planning process immediately, review the UK's energy policy and remove the nuclear component. Nuclear is too expensive, a security risk and leaves a legacy of radioactive waste.

Yours sincerely

Dr Jon & Mrs Sigi Malpass