

From: [Emma Gray](#)
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: SIZEWELL C
Date: 12 October 2021 13:45:03

Dear Members of the Planning Inspectorate for Sizewell C,
I am writing to express my deep and strong objection to the building of Sizewell C, on the Suffolk Coast in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

At the forefront of all consideration on this matter and at every turn of any debate is the moral question, why would we leave the unfathomable problem of devastatingly toxic waste to our children, our grandchildren and future generations for thousands of years? Paying attention to this moral conundrum, the Finns at Onkalo are facing up to, amongst the extreme issues around underground construction to contain such waste, the human one of how to communicate to peoples who may not speak any language familiar to us now just how dangerous it would be to open up such a site, causing worldwide devastation. This problem already exists and is a supremely troubling one. Why would we add to this? What sort of ancestors would that make you and I?

If you wish to glance over this matter, then there are many other practical matters to be considered:-

- The model proposed for this site has a terrible track record. Initial costs inflated, time taken to build extended and the only one working, in China, was closed due to safety issues.
- The RAB tax model proposed to fund this 'project' is unjust and the huge, eye-watering costs required would be more efficiently spent on renewables, which could be in use well before Sizewell C is even projected to be in service.
- There is an estimated loss of 40 million a year, in tourism for the local area, the workers will be brought in from Hinkley, so this 'project' will not provide employment locally. The imported workforce would live on a campus near to the tiny, peaceful village of Eastbridge and too close to RSPB Minsmere.
- There would be no power from this site until, at the very earliest, 2034. Renewable energy generation is operational already with capacity growing.
- EDF have admitted that the carbon emitted in the making of this site will not be offset for at least 10 years after completion.
- There is a lack of secure long-term water supply.
- The projected impact of a water desalination plant is not good.
- As if all of this wasn't enough it is very much the wrong project, in the wrong place.
- The Suffolk coast has been eroding for centuries. In the 14th Century Leiston Abbey was deconstructed and moved further inland, for this very reason. Dunwich, once a thriving and important port is now mostly under water. You only have to visit and walk the coastline, which I thoroughly recommend, to see the erosion for yourself. Sea defences do not exist and building any for such a site is unrealistic.
- Construction of this site would cause a devastating loss of wildlife, of SSI.

-The very nature of this coastline in eroding flux is conducive to rare and necessary life. Do we really, really have to even consider the loss of this - knowing where we are with the loss of life across the globe? We do now know unequivocally that biodiversity and an

abundance of it, as opposed to a paucity of it, underlies all existence, ours included.

- The costs, on every level, of this proposal are unviable.

Thank you for reading this and I do hope you will consider at this point in time, (a time when our children are up in arms and quite rightly so, at the devastation we have wrought), the real long lasting issues at stake. Nuclear power is not environmentally sustainable.

Emma Beardmore-Gray