

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** SIZEWELL C PROJECT- DEADLINE 10 - FINANCIAL FOLLY  
**Date:** 14 October 2021 20:47:42

---

Dear SZC project team,  
This is, I realise, a late submission but I hope you might accept it before the Examination closes.  
Many thanks to you all for your technical support over the last few months.  
Best wishes. Victoria

Re. NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd (Deadline 10) Sizewell C Project  
Dated 14th October 2021

Interested Party: VICTORIA HAMBLEY - UNIQUE NUMBER: 20026680

Earlier this year the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that Sizewell C must represent value for money. In the two years since SZC revised its forecast for Sizewell C, construction for Hinkley C has risen from £18 billion to £23 billion. On that basis the current forecast for Sizewell C of £20 billion must be closer to £25 billion. This is before the effects of rising fuel, materials and labour costs are factored into the equation. One suspects that, should it be constructed, Sizewell C would cost at least twice that. At a time of rapidly rising inflation, the idea that taxpayers foot the bill for the construction of SZC via the Regulated Asset Base is unconscionable particularly as this also means that they are responsible for the inevitable delays and rising costs. (No nuclear power station has ever been built on time or on budget).

The cost of SZC is though not just a monetary one. It is also about the loss to the environment, to biodiversity (which is as much of an emergency as climate), and to the local community in one of the last truly rural parts of England within 2 hours of London. The combination of Sizewell C with a tsunami of onshore infrastructure for windfarms off the East Anglia coast would be devastating and would turn a rural environment with some of the world's rarest habitats into an industrial one.

The saddest thing is that Sizewell C is so expensive and so uncertain (the EPR has yet to be proven to work) that billions of pounds of taxpayers money could be spent on something that may never produce any energy. Instead one suspects that there will be a point during construction when the costs have risen so far - a bit like HS2 and the Garden Bridge - that the decision is made to abandon the project. However by that time the damage will be done, not only to the environment, the rural economy and the local community, but also to ordinary households throughout the country saddled with unaffordable energy bills that push them further into poverty. And it is the poor and the young that will suffer the most. When the bills become unaffordable those with moderate to high incomes will find the necessary income to invest in ways that reduce their reliance on the energy companies.

And the stupidest thing is that Sizewell C is the wrong project, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. The land on which EDF plans to construct SZC could be a dedicated renewables centre for offshore wind coming from the East Coast as well as other new, green, clean energy sources (nuclear is neither clean nor green). Instead it's proposed that motorway-width cable trenches for every windfarm be dug across the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB to a rural village 6 miles away. So rather than a truly innovative, state of the art centre for renewable energy of which the whole country could be proud, we are faced with an outdated technology that will be obsolete if and when construction is ever completed.

We all know it's not the Planning Inspectorate's job to decide Government Policy; its task is to achieve the best possible DCO on which the Secretary of State can make an informed decision. Yet everyone who has followed the Examination over the last few months believes SZC's plans to be built on sand. Insufficient potable water, an inadequate CEA, unresolved environmental issues, an incomplete transport plan.... This DCO should be allowed to sink without trace. Which, of course, is precisely what may happen to Sizewell C if it is built on this eroding coast.