

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Sizewell C  
**Date:** 12 October 2021 22:40:46  
**Attachments:** [Sizewell planning items.docx](#)

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I wish to object to the building of Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station development.

After such a protracted period it is disappointing that the applicants have been submitting a constant stream of amendments to confuse and obfuscate the proposals right up to the final moments of the consideration period. It is difficult for an individual to ascertain the competence of the applicant, but one thing, that is clear, and that is with the experience they claim from Hinckley, this state of affairs should not be happening and it does little to inspire confidence that they know what they are doing. Furthermore, I would suggest that this is a display of incompetence and that their application should be dismissed forthwith.

Despite all the time that has passed, the question of building anything of this scale, and especially two nuclear reactors on an eroding coastline has not been addressed. As the timeline for submissions closes we see that there are several emergency coastal defence works taking place [Emergency coastal defence work](#) both to the North and South of Sizewell that are in addition to planned activities to shore up the eroding coast. Coupled with the national and local policy for managed retreat of the coastal margins, including the immediate adjacent area of Minsmere and Sizewell marshes, highlights the stupidity of building a facility that for hundreds of years into the future will need significant national funding to protect its integrity as it becomes an island encircled by the North Sea. It is also completely unreasonable to expect our children and future generations to have to clean up the physical and economic mess that this will leave.

Despite the fact that the coast is eroding and the applicants own risk assessment showing that the site and facility will be flooded in the future, the fiasco of the applicants realisation that they do not have enough fresh water in the East of England to support the construction and operation of the

site is beyond comprehension. Those living in East Anglia know all too well of water shortages and hosepipe bans in summer months. The climate and geology of East of England means that we do not have much rainfall or natural capacity to store vast quantities in reserve. The very late suggestion to implement a desalination facility must also be looked at from an environmental aspect. The quantities of water needed will result in significant upsurge in the salinity of the local sea waters. Together with the rise in temperature of the local waters due to the reactor cooling water requirements (another ignored by-product of nuclear generation leading to a rise in sea temperatures and thus global warming) means that significant damage will be happening to the marine life of the North Sea.

Another consideration that should be examined, is where power is actually required in the country. I would suggest that the big cities and industrial areas would be high on the list. There are none of those in East Anglia, meaning that any power generation at Sizewell would need to be transmitted elsewhere in the country. Power transmission results in losses, and thus over-generation is needed to account for inefficiency of the distribution network. A reasonable estimate would suggest between 10-20% losses. If large scale power generation is deemed necessary than it seems sensible to me to place it closer to where it is needed to reduce the cost of over-generation, which is not in a remote and eroding coastal area.

The question of confidence in the design and national integrity is also relevant. Several countries have built or are building to this design, and all have cost and timescale overruns. It is still not known what the final cost to the British Public will be for Hinkley, and its guesswork to suggest what the final cost Sizewell will be for the British Public, especially when the design is reliant upon two countries to which the UK has deteriorating international relationships. However, it should be a relevant planning consideration that the particular French/Chinese design proposed has not been successfully brought on-line anywhere in the world. The only operational facility, in China, has major problems and reactors have had to be shut down. It is not known when or if it may restart. Renewable energy may from time to time not be productive, but we do know it will start again without intervention and not cause a nuclear holocaust if it ever gets flooded, and, for the equivalent investment cost of Hinkley and Sizewell would produce significantly more long term sustainable power that would not be a disastrous legacy for future generations .

External to the actual Sizewell development, the significant disturbance to the local environment, ecosystems, biodiversity and local communities is being discounted by the applicant and government. We hear that there will be jobs created and a boost to the local economy, but nothing will mitigate against the devastation to the environment during and after the building and

lifetime of this power station. The only jobs and local economy boost seems to be in the building of accommodation villages and carparks for workers that will move from Hinckley. There is no overall or long lasting benefit to the local area, in much the same way as the two previous power stations at Sizewell didn't result in long term benefits, the only thing that will be left after the build will be the destruction of the things the global communities are saying we should be protecting to avoid climate change and destruction of our natural environments.

Therefore I conclude by strongly suggesting that the Sizewell nuclear power station proposal is the wrong solution for delivering power and should not be allowed to materialise.

Yours faithfully

NCV Smith, C.Eng MIET

## Objection to Sizewell C

After such a protracted period it is disappointing that the applicants have been submitting a constant stream of amendments to confuse and obfuscate the proposals right up to the final moments of the consideration period. It is difficult for an individual to ascertain the competence of the applicant, but one thing, that is clear, and that is with the experience they claim from Hinckley, this state of affairs should not be happening and it does little to inspire confidence that they know what they are doing. Furthermore, I would suggest that this is a display of incompetence and that their application should be dismissed forthwith.

Despite all the time that has passed, the question of building anything of this scale, and especially two nuclear reactors on an eroding coastline has not been addressed. As the timeline for submissions closes we see that there are several emergency coastal defence works taking place ( [latest-news-repairs-maintenance - coastaleast \(coasteast.org.uk\)](https://www.coasteast.org.uk/latest-news-repairs-maintenance-coastaleast) both to the North and South of Sizewell that are in addition to planned activities to shore up the eroding coast. Coupled with the national and local policy for managed retreat of the coastal margins, including the immediate adjacent area of Minsmere and Sizewell marshes, highlights the stupidity of building a facility that for hundreds of years into the future will need significant national funding to protect its integrity as it becomes an island facility encircled by the North Sea. It is also completely unreasonable to expect our children and future generations to have to clean up the physical and economic mess that this will leave.

Despite the fact that the coast is eroding and the applicants own risk assessment showing that the site and facility will be flooded in the future, the fiasco of the applicants realisation that they do not have enough fresh water in the East of England to support the construction and operation of the site is beyond comprehension. Those living in East Anglia know all too well of water shortages and hosepipe bans in summer months. The climate and geology of East of England means that we do not have much rainfall or natural capacity to store vast quantities in reserve. The very late suggestion to implement a desalination facility must also be looked at from an environmental aspect. The quantities of water needed will result in significant upsurge in the salinity of the local sea waters. Together with the rise in temperature of the local waters due to the reactor cooling water requirements (another ignored by-product of

nuclear generation leading to a rise in sea temperatures and thus global warming) means that significant damage will be happening to the marine life of the North Sea.

Another consideration that should be examined, is where power is actually required in the country. I would suggest that the big cities and industrial areas would be high on the list. There are none of those in East Anglia, meaning that any power generation at Sizewell would need to be transmitted elsewhere in the country. Power transmission results in losses, and thus over-generation is needed to account for inefficiency of the distribution network. A reasonable estimate would suggest between 10-20% losses. If large scale power generation is deemed necessary than it seems sensible to me to place it closer to where it is needed to reduce the cost of over-generation, which is not in a remote and eroding coastal area.

The question of confidence in the design and national integrity is also relevant. Several countries have built or are building to this design, and all have cost and timescale overruns. It is still not known what the final cost to the British Public will be for Hinkley, and its guesswork to suggest what the final cost Sizewell will be for the British Public, especially when the design is reliant upon two countries to which the UK has deteriorating international relationships. However, it should be a relevant planning consideration that the particular French/Chinese design proposed has not been successfully brought on-line anywhere in the world. The only operational facility, in China, has major problems and reactors have had to be shut down. It is not known when or if it may restart. Renewable energy may from time to time not be productive, but we do know it will start again without intervention and not cause a nuclear holocaust if it ever gets flooded, and, for the equivalent investment cost of Hinkley and Sizewell would produce significantly more long term sustainable power that would not be a disastrous legacy for future generations .

External to the actual Sizewell development, the significant disturbance to the local environment, ecosystems, biodiversity and local communities is being discounted by the applicant and government. We hear that there will be jobs created and a boost to the local economy, but nothing will mitigate against the devastation to the environment during and after the building and lifetime of this power station. The only jobs and local economy boost seems to be in the building of accommodation villages and carparks for workers that will move from Hinkley. There is no overall or long lasting benefit to the local area, in

much the same way as the two previous power stations at Sizewell didn't result in long term benefits, the only thing that will be left after the build will be the destruction of the things the global communities are saying we should be protecting to avoid climate change and destruction of our natural environments.

Therefore I conclude by strongly suggesting that the Sizewell nuclear power station proposal is the wrong solution for delivering power and should not be allowed to materialise.

Yours faithfully

NCV Smith, C.Eng MIET