

From: [Kathleen Robertshaw](#)
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Formal objections to proposed SizewellC
Date: 12 October 2021 15:52:47

I wish to record my objection to SizewellC.

If the government go ahead with this project it will create a huge stain on their legacy. Their mantra of 'Build Build Build' could be even more aptly changed to 'Destroy, Destroy Destroy'.

You will already have had plenty of detailed information about the strong and valid reasons for not allowing this build to go ahead, but here is a list, in no particular order of importance:

- *It is too expensive (at 20 billion +), the original funding partnership is breaking down, and there are proposals to make the taxpayer fund it via the RAB model. Relations with France (ie EDF) re power are currently at a worrying low. Why would any sane government be tempted to proceed with a plan for such large and potentially dangerous infrastructure?

- * It would be slow to build, - not generating any power until 2034 - and, like Hinkley, would probably meet plenty of obstacles along the way (if Hinkley is ever completed).

- *The type of reactor (EPR) proposed by EDF is dangerous, outdated, and builds in France and Finland are well over budget and running a decade late.

- * Building this NPS in Suffolk would in no way contribute to 'levelling up'. There are sites in the north and west, in economically deprived areas, which would welcome a new nuclear power station. Proposals for nuclear waste storage, as at Sellafield, for example, would tie in with a new NPStation build in the area. There is much local support for this, including from local Tory MPs.

- * There is no assured long-term water supply for Sizewell C. EDF have had years to come up with a solution but have failed to do so. If they can't be trusted to sort out such a basic part of the plan how can they be trusted to build and operate a nuclear power station?

- *Nuclear energy is not renewable, nor is it green.

- *The huge amount of proposed spend should be invested in renewables. This would be much more efficient, and would actually contribute towards a reduction in CO2 emissions - and are quickly.

- *Toxic nuclear waste will need to stay on site for well over 100 years

- *The claim of thousands of jobs for locals is nonsense. EDF have admitted that they want to bring in almost 6000 workers from Hinkley, and have tweaked other figures to make them seem more favourable. The proposal to house them adjacent to tiny hamlets is, frankly, obscenely dismissive of local lives.

- *The strong local tourism industry would be badly affected, losing up to 400 jobs and £40 million pounds a year (independent research).

- *Local business leaders, who once favoured the build, have now changed their minds and are speaking out against it.

- *This is still a Tory held seat, but the impact of the build, and on a wide surrounding area, will likely mean that this seat, and others nearby, will be lost.

- *There would be about 12,000 extra vehicles a day on the A12, with multiple incursions on to the minor country road which weave through this area and its hinterland. Anyone who thinks that this is acceptable should take themselves down to Suffolk to drive the routes in person.

- *The site is on an eroding coastline. Check out the history!

- * It is in an AONB.

- *It is adjacent to Sizewell Marshes Site of Scientific Interest, which supports internationally rare species.

- * It will impact hugely on the adjoining internationally important RSPB Minsmere.

- * EDF have already destroyed local wildlife sites before planning permission has been granted. The impact of this build on the local, internationally important ecosystem, and consequently on the wellbeing of locals, will be vast. EDFs mitigation proposals are, frankly, laughable, and show no understanding of how these systems work.

Thank you
Kathleen Robertshaw

