

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Objections to Sizewell C
Date: 12 October 2021 16:31:01

To the Planning Inspectorate

I wanted to take this last opportunity to reiterate my earlier objections to the plans for Sizewell C, and to add one or two more that have emerged since I last made a submission. The objections have been well rehearsed, and many of them have not been adequately answered by the Applicant. I am particularly concerned about the environmental impact, both the short-term impact of the construction itself, and the long term consequences of siting Sizewell C in the proposed location. In the short term, there will be degradation and destruction of rare habitats, as well as deterioration in environmental conditions for local neighbourhoods, agriculture and businesses, including tourism. In the longer term (and the Applicant has not done enough research into the very long term), there are potentially dangerous consequences to the already eroding coastline, changes to tidal and other patterns, and concerns about the disposal of waste. In the years that have elapsed since the original decision to build this type of reactor in this place, considerable advances in scientific knowledge—in climate research, nuclear technology and the understanding of ecosystems—have shown the proposal to be deeply unsound. The (few) EPR reactors that exist are beset with construction and running problems, including safety problems, and are already out of date at a point well before construction would commence. Better scientific understanding suggests that Sizewell, with its unstable coastal position, is not a good location for another nuclear power station.

I shall pass over the destructive consequences the construction will have on the local economy, as it is well established, as is the impact of the huge increase in lorry traffic, new roads, railway lines, and coastal infrastructure. All these matters have been eloquently placed before you in the course of the hearings. And local residents might be persuaded to accept this if the outcome was to be a better, greener, future-oriented energy supply—but this is not what will happen. By the time the reactor comes on stream, if it ever does, it will be outdated, and will not be able to be carbon neutral until 2040.

Another worrying thing is the recently emerged problem with water supply, and the possibility of needing a desalination plant, with its malign consequences for the marine environment. Whether water comes via a pipeline eventually, or is driven in in tankers, it will be depleting water reserves elsewhere, and as we have seen, river levels and water tables are dropping: water is becoming a crucial element in ecological planning, and I can't see that Sizewell C's needs would be welcome in that context.

In very many areas, the Applicant's plans run counter to Government plans, targets and regulation: wildlife, marine life, bird life, habitat, the natural and recreational environment, climate policy, and many other areas, including jobs, will suffer. For all the reasons above, and for the many others that others have presented, and for which ample evidence has been adduced, I do most strongly object to the Application.

(Dr.) Ian Patterson

