

**From:** [Stephanie Bunn](#)  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell Planning  
**Date:** 12 October 2021 19:29:52

---

Dr SJ Bunn



Dear Planning Inspectorate

I am writing to express my concern about the application for planning permission for a new power station at Sizewell C. There are multiple reasons why this is not a good plan to support.

Firstly, coastal erosion is more extreme in this area than almost anywhere else in Europe, let alone in the UK. Only last Friday (8th October), the East Anglian Daily Times wrote: 'A study in 2019 revealed that Thorpeness was among the fastest eroding [coastlines] in Europe, with Pakefield and Bawdsey also threatened.' These communities are on either side of Sizewell. Historically, we already know that north of Sizewell, what was one of England's most significant ports in the Middle Ages (Dunwich) has lain beneath the sea for centuries, and that this coastline is currently part of the system of 'managed retreat'. While south of Sizewell, the Orford Ness Lighthouse, a significant local monument, has recently been demolished because it is being undermined. However strong any sea defences put in place, given the unpredictable and increasingly severe weather of global warming, there are no guarantees that they can hold back the sea from the site.

Secondly, Sizewell C cannot resolve the immediate energy crisis. It would take a minimum of 12 years for any power to be available. (Especially unlikely if current road communication problems continue). At the same time, increasingly efficient renewable technology systems are being developed which could provide better, cleaner and more secure energy supplies in the future. There are also other, credible, affordable energy models being developed, such as Imperial, and others by the National Grid and the Climate Change Committee which do not rely on Sizewell C.

Thirdly, the estimated £20 billion cost is very likely to increase. The public are reaching a point where they are not willing to pay for such undertakings, or to support a government that keeps flying in the face of reason and less expensive options.

A further significant problem with the Sizewell C proposals is a sustainable water supply. Again, as the East Anglian Daily Times informs us (Thursday 7th October), "The proposed nuclear plant will need up to 2.8 million litres a day when operating." Essex and Suffolk Water have long said there is not enough water in the area, and alternative plans to pump water from the River Waveney have recently been turned down because of pressure on the river.

Fifthly, the regional devastation will be enormous. The impact on Minsmere, a national RSPB bird reserve will be devastating, affecting bird migration routes. Light and noise pollution will have a huge impact, excavation for the reactor foundations, will lower the local water table, and the nearby environment of marshland and lake for migrating water birds will be damaged significantly. This at one of the region's iconic natural sites.

Sixthly, the traffic generated will not be sustainable in the region. The local roads are already at capacity, there are road stoppages everyday, and the additional traffic caused by constructing Sizewell will damage local communications and also find itself a victim of them.

Finally, the EPR reactor is still an unproven technology. There are only two completed reactors in the world, at Taishan in China, and one is shut down because of fuel failure, with very little information emerging as to the cause, or the implications for Sizewell C.

All in all, to allow planning to go ahead for Sizewell would be very foolhardy, and would be to go against all rational reasons for advising against it. I do hope you will take these views into consideration.

Yours sincerely  
Dr S.J. Bunn