

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Sizewell C really must not be allowed to go ahead!
Date: 12 October 2021 20:57:57

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I am writing to express my deep concern that approval of Sizewell C nuclear power station is the wrong decision for next stage energy generation. In summary it will:

- Directly create huge environmental damage today extending well beyond the Suffolk coast.
 - Aggregates will be required from south west England and all communities in between - suffer the environmental degradation and pollution associated with extraction and development, for example.
 - Uranium ore to supply enriched fuel must be mined from Australia or Canada, where indigenous peoples are forced to live with radioactive tailings piles on their land forever.
- Significantly add to the UK's carbon emissions. The site's developers would like us to pretend that the UK is not responsible for the carbon emissions of the products we import - that the carbon used to mine the uranium to fuel the power station, the energy used to provide enriched U238, the fossil fuels used to ship all this around etc. are all someone else's problem. But the UK must be accountable for the carbon emissions of the products we import - in this case uranium mining, enrichment and fuel production.

But simply building the new power station - aggregates, concrete, steel manufacture (to name a few) - will produce huge volumes of carbon emissions. The carbon we put into the atmosphere over the construction lifetime can never be taken back. It contributes to the 2 degree climate heating which will have catastrophic consequences - not just for the UK, but across the Planet. Those consequences will be rolling on for 300 - 500 years - that's how long it takes for CO2 to be removed from the atmosphere. So hot in 2130 will be nothing like hot in 2230. EDF's suggestion that 6 years of running the power station 20 - 30 years from now will 'save' carbon put into the atmosphere next year, is fantasy mathematics! There is no 'weight watchers of the climate' - if I binge carbon today, I can diet carbon in 20 years. Once it's in the atmosphere, the Planet is stuck with it. For every ounce of concrete used to build Sizewell C, the Climate Heating will increase, increasing the risk to us all.

- Create the potential for a dramatic nuclear incident once sea levels really start to rise as polar icecap and glacier melting really start to take effect in the next 20 years. Both the 2 existing reactors and the proposed Sizewell C pose a significant risk to everyone living around the North Sea (not just the UK) once sea level rise and enhanced climate instability start to drive accelerated coastal erosion and increased frequency and height of storm surges in the next 15 - 20 years. I wonder whether anyone has done any homework into the 1953 storm surge that flooded the east coast of England? As the surge headed south, it generated (in the increasingly narrow North Sea on the Suffolk and Essex coasts), a 30 foot wall of water. Of course, that was then. No-one knows the height of an equivalent climate event in 2060 - except that sea levels will be much higher than 1953 and likely to overtop the sea defenses proposed at Sizewell. If not in 2060, then in the latter part of the 21st Century, Sizewell will inevitably become a potential Fukushima. It's not a matter of if, but when, as every year of rising sea levels go by.

Has anyone done any proper geological surveys of this part of the UK coastline, created

from sand dunes and soft mud, as it is? Hasn't anyone wondered why it was that Dunwich (just up the coast) fell into the sea? Why the Naze at Walton (a few miles south in Essex) extended for miles into the North Sea in the Middle Ages? Or maybe they did, and produced vacuous reports pretending that what happened in hundreds of years in the past, won't happen in 50 years in our Climate Emergency.

And then there's the plan to fill up the foreshore in front of Sizewell C with granite blocks – like we're got in Clacton-on-Sea to protect our beaches, but on a way more bigger scale. When did the people who made this proposal not notice that when you put hard infrastructure on sand dunes and soft mud rocks, the sea works its way in from behind? The Sizewell reactors cannot be made secure from sea level rise. Water always finds its own level.

But obviously, a nuclear reactor isn't just for 50 years, it's for a thousand years. Even if an acceptable solution is ever found for the UK's mountain of high level nuclear waste (which I doubt it will), it's removal wouldn't be a solution for disposal of the highly radioactive building itself. If UK Governments since the 1960s have proved unable to dispose of fuel rods, how will there be a solution for the steel and concrete of the building itself?

So don't you think the Planning Inspectorate has a moral duty to future generations (some of whom are your children, grandchildren and their descendants), to protect them from the long-term harm that will follow from approval of Sizewell C?

In 2160 people will look back at the decision you are about to make (these are the timescales), East Coast erosion and climate instability and wonder how people like us could have decided to put such dangerous technology on such unstable geology. Hoping we haven't seen Fukushima event before then!

Best wishes

Jo