

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Marilyn Hands 20026108
Date: 12 October 2021 18:39:22

Dear Sir

Having listened to the various discussions on Sizewell C over the last few months as the hearing progressed, I am even more convinced that the proposals is totally the wrong scheme in the wrong place. The cost will be huge and by the time it is completed it will be obsolete. It is not a 'green' solution to our current and future energy needs. I am therefore writing to summarise my objections to EDF's proposed development at Sizewell.

First and fundamentally, one could hardly find a worse location in environmental and ecological terms - despite the Government saying some time ago that Sizewell is a potentially suitable site for a nuclear plant. The construction site will sever the AONB and is right next to Minsmere. EDF has offered no convincing evidence that the reserve and the adjoining areas will not be irreparably damaged. The site is remote with no good road or rail access to bring in workers or construction materials. The company has abandoned any thoughts of bringing in most construction materials by sea. The single thing going for Sizewell is that the local population are inured to the principle of a nuclear power station on its doorstep.

Secondly, on the issue of cost and timing, of the three similar schemes under construction, two - one in France (Flamanville) and one in Finland (Olkiluoto) - are more than ten years behind schedule and more than three times over budget. Hinkley is a mere 25% over budget and two and a half years late. It will be at least 12 years before it is finished and, if the plants in Finland and France are anything to go by, perhaps 25 years or more. SZC is not going to solve our current energy crisis. By the time it comes on line the technology will be obsolete and there will be much better 'green' solutions. It promises to be a very expensive white elephant.

Thirdly, there are big questions over EDF's competence to build and run such a development. EDF tells us that the reason for the problems with the reactors under construction in France and Finland is because, and I quote, the "*projects experienced delays as a result of incomplete designs.*" It beggars belief that anyone would start to build a nuclear power station with "*incomplete designs*".

The end product is a long way from being tried and tested. How any investor – let alone a government – would contemplate putting any money into a project with such a disastrous track record is beyond me. EDF's involvement with the two operational plants in Taishan adds another twist to the story. It is not totally clear what is happening with these plants as China plays its cards close to its chest, but we do know that one has been unexpectedly closed for "maintenance"

and it still not operational.

Even if EDF has bottomed the design of the power station per se, it is a long way from finalising the infrastructure to support the construction of the project and the delivery of building materials. EDF doesn't know whether the rail-led strategy is achievable. It doesn't know what exactly will be brought in by sea. And despite being warned ten years ago about the availability of potable water, it has only just come up with a plan for a desalination plant during the last stages of the planning hearing. The company is basically designing the project on the hoof.

Fourthly, the consultation process has been laughable and EDF has treated the local population with contempt. The number of changes as the consultation has progressed has been exhausting and difficult for the general public to keep up with. The link road has been a sore point. It is not sustainable. It has no legacy value. It will sever farms and the little lanes that the locals rely on. And it should be removed and the land reinstated on completion of the development, if it goes ahead.

Last, but not least, are the fallacies regarding economic benefits locally. Although EDF intends to transfer most of its workforce from Hinkley to build Sizewell, it has made much of the jobs it will create – mainly during the construction process. Most of these jobs will be comparatively low paid positions in cleaning and catering etc. But come what may, we do not need EDF's jobs. Our small, tight local labour market is already overheated. Hospitality businesses and care homes are really struggling to find staff. And it is now virtually impossible to find anyone in the construction industry or building trade to undertake work any time soon.

EDF tells us of the lasting economic benefits that the development will bring to the area. The district council say it is a once in a lifetime opportunity. It isn't. SZA and SZB were both built in my lifetime – and I'm not that old. Neither the council nor the company tell us why SZC will be any different from two previous developments, which left Leiston as just about the poorest small town in the county.

In conclusion, this is the wrong scheme in the wrong place. It will wreak enormous environmental, ecological and economic damage on the local area. The construction process and infrastructure have not been thought through - as evidenced by the number of late changes brought forward by EDF. As a chartered surveyor specialising in economic development and land and property management, I can recall no major public project being brought forward which has been so ill-prepared. It will not solve our energy crisis. It may not even work. The application must be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Marilyn Hands