

From: [Janet Pearce](#)
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Re: I want to make the following protest
Date: 13 October 2021 15:12:04

To whom it may concern

I want to make sure that you are clear and understand that I agree with and feel extremely strongly about every word that follows

Sizewell C is the wrong project in the wrong place and will not help the UK achieve its objectives.

The wrong project:

- Sizewell C is slow – it would take 10-12 years to build, so no generate any power until 2034.
- Sizewell C is expensive, costing £20+ billion, which could be invested in renewables such as offshore wind or hydrogen storage.
- Sizewell C takes a lot of carbon to build. EDF's own estimates are that it would take 6 years to pay this back, meaning Sizewell C wouldn't contribute to net zero until 2040. The government's latest target is a 78% reduction in CO2 emissions by 2035.
- The type of reactor EDF wants to build (the EPR) has an appalling track record. The few EPRs under construction are all well over budget and – in France and Finland – running a decade late. The only operating EPR in China has reported degraded fuel rod sealings and been closed after international attention.
- No one yet knows how Sizewell C will be paid for; EDF wants consumers to help pay for the financing through a nuclear tax on energy bills (called a RAB model) and is pushing hard for legislation to allow this, but nuclear projects remain very risky.
- It won't help 'level up' the UK. Sites in the north and west would do more to narrow the economic gap.
- The UK government wants to eject EDF's controversial partner – China General Nuclear – but has not decided how.
- Nuclear energy is not green energy. There is as yet no long-term solution for nuclear waste.

The wrong place:

- EDF's claims of thousands of jobs for locals and billions of pounds spent locally are unproven. We maintain that Sizewell C would damage the local economy.
- EDF wants to bring its Hinkley workers to Sizewell. EDF estimates almost 6,000 workers would come into the area; 2,400 of them would live in a "campus" near the tiny hamlet of Eastbridge.
- Visitors would stay away, losing the tourism industry up to £40 million a year (independent research) and losing 400 jobs. EDF admits 725 'local' staff would come from other businesses.
- There would be around 12,000 extra vehicles a day on the A12, including 700 HGVs.
- The Sizewell C site is on an eroding coastline and surrounded by protected wildlife habitats.
- Toxic nuclear waste would have to remain on site for well over 100 years.
- The site is wholly within the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Construction will cut the AONB in half for a decade
- The site adjoins internationally famous RSPB Minsmere reserve, and some of Sizewell Marshes Site of Scientific Interest will be built on.
- There is no assured long term water supply for Sizewell C. To obtain enough potable (drinkable) water for construction, EDF has been forced to propose a desalination plant

I use the words above because they represent what I think. I could not put my concerns and protest about Sizewell C any better than I have here. Because other people have used these

words before me does not invalidate me using them to express my profound concern about this dangerous project that doesn't make any sense in any reasonable way. I am vehemently opposed to the building of Sizewell C for all the above reasons.
I implore you to consider the environmental impact that building Sizewell C will have for this area and to think about the legacy we leave our children.

Yours sincerely
Janet Pearce

On Wed, 13 Oct 2021 at 13:05, SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Pearce,

Thank you for your email.

Parts of your submission are not legible, as such, please could you resubmit in Microsoft Word format or resubmit without what appears to be attachment images.

Kind regards,

Jake Stephens

Sizewell C Case Team
National Infrastructure Planning

Helpline: 0303 444 5000
Email: Sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate (The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: @PINSgov

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

From: Janet Pearce <janetpearce77@gmail.com>
Sent: 13 October 2021 11:02
To: SizewellC <sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: I want to make the following protest

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Janet Pearce** <janetpearce77@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2021 at 21:35

Subject: I want to make the following protest

To: sizewellc@planninginspectirate.gov <sizewellc@planninginspectirate.gov>

To whom it may concern

I want to make sure that you are clear and understand that I agree with and feel extremely strongly about every word that follows

Sizewell C is the wrong project in the wrong place and will not help the UK achieve its objectives.

The wrong project:

- Sizewell C is slow – it would take 10-12 years to build, so not

generate any power until 2034.

- Sizewell C is expensive, costing £20+ billion, which could be invested in renewables such as offshore wind or hydrogen storage.
- Sizewell C takes a lot of carbon to build. EDF's own estimates are that it would take 6 years to pay this back, meaning Sizewell C wouldn't contribute to net zero until 2040. The government's latest target is a 78% reduction in CO2 emissions

by 2035.

- The type of reactor EDF wants to build (the EPR) has an appalling track record. The few EPRs under construction are all well over budget and – in France and Finland – running a decade late. The only operating EPR in China has reported degraded fuel rod sealings and been closed after international attention.

- No one yet knows how Sizewell C will be paid for; EDF wants consumers to help pay for the financing through a nuclear tax on energy bills (called a RAB model) and is pushing hard for legislation to allow this, but nuclear projects remain very risky.
- It won't help 'level up' the UK. Sites in the north and west would do more to narrow the economic gap.
- The UK government wants to eject EDF's controversial partner – China General Nuclear – but has not decided how.
- Nuclear energy is not green energy. There is as yet no long-term solution for nuclear waste.

The wrong place:

- EDF's claims of thousands of jobs for locals and billions of pounds spent locally are unproven. We maintain that Sizewell C would damage the local economy.

- EDF wants to bring its Hinkley workers to Sizewell. EDF estimates almost 6,000 workers would come into the area; 2,400 of them would live in a "campus" near the tiny hamlet of Eastbridge.
- Visitors would stay away, losing the tourism industry up to £40 million a year (independent research) and losing 400 jobs. EDF admits 725 'local' staff would come from other businesses.
- There would be around 12,000 extra vehicles a day on the A12, including 700

HGVs.

- The Sizewell C site is on an eroding coastline and surrounded by protected wildlife habitats.
- Toxic nuclear waste would have to remain on site for well over 100 years.
- The site is wholly within the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Construction will cut the AONB in half for a decade
- The site adjoins internationally famous RSPB Minsmere reserve,

and some of Sizewell Marshes Site of Scientific Interest will be built on.

- There is no assured long term water supply for Sizewell C. To obtain enough potable (drinkable) water for construction, EDF has been forced to propose a desalination plant

I use the words above because they represent what I think. I could not put my concerns and protest about Sizewell C any better than I have here. Because other people have used these words before me does not invalidate me using them to express my profound concern about this dangerous project that doesn't make any sense in any reasonable way.

Yours sincerely

Janet Pearce

[Please take a moment to review the Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice which can be accessed by clicking this link.](#)



Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete

this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72

