

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Attn: Kwasi Kwarteng - objection to the Sizewell C planning application based on just about everything
Date: 20 May 2022 13:51:18

Dear Mr Kwarteng,

May I open this letter by saying that I am not philosophically opposed to nuclear power. I believe in the need for a non-intermittent, cost effective energy supply. As it stand, nuclear is the most effective solution.

However, there is nothing - literally, nothing - about the applicant's current proposal that meets even the broadest definition of 'effective solution'.

We have heard just this morning that Hinckley Point will run a further £3bn over budget. It has effectively doubled in price since its inception. There is no evidence to suggest that SizewellC will fare any better. In fact, given the uncertainties regarding European supply chains, increasing cost of transport and possible privatisation of EDF, most pundits would agree that SizewellC is likely to be more costly. Indeed, it has already increased in budget by some £4bn.

This leads to the inevitable question funding. The political expediency of passing these budgetary uncertainties onto the electorate through RAB is questionable and open to public scrutiny as regards 'ROI'. No government would emerge from such attention with a rosette. All this in a climate where pension funds and sovereign funds are undecided about nuclear's green credentials and antipathetic to large-scale environmentally-damaging infrastructure projects.

The notion of non-intermittent supply is another deciding factor whereby SizewellC offers little to reassure. Currently, EDF has 30 nuclear power stations out of service. The UK is indeed supplying France with power, as a result. And yet, we are asking that same French company to build SizewellC. SizewellB was out of service for 3 months last year and, across the world, a blended average suggests that EPR's only ever work at 60% capacity. You will no doubt be familiar with similar stories from Taishan and others. EPRs do not - and never have - offered a non-intermittent source of power.

And so, we move to another 'plus' for the current proposal - the impact on the local economy. The proposal has long vaunted an uplift in local East Suffolk economy associated with becoming the largest building project in Europe. For sure, laying 680 football pitches-worth of concrete will require some local labour; but this will come at the much greater cost to the local tourist industry, which has grown exponentially over the last 5 years. It is estimated that tourism brought in £750M in 2019 and, given East Suffolk's popularity as a staycation destination, one can only guess at the equivalent numbers for the last two years. The local jobs will be short-term and low skilled with most of the middle and senior management positions likely to be imported from Hinckley Point (if it ever completes) or further afield. Make no mistake, the local economy will suffer in the medium to long-term from the current proposal.

The arguments above make no mention of the environmental damage to an already fragile coastline, the obliteration of Minsmere - the jewel in RSPB's crown, and inevitable surge in crime which many Leiston residents remember from SizewellB's construction.

But I return to my first statement. I am not anti-nuclear. My point of view is not borne from a parochial outlook based on what might happen at the back of my garden. SMR technology - championed by Rolls Royce - will start to deliver power to the national grid by 2030 according to the latest forecasts. EDF have made a similar claim for their SMRs - particularly well-timed to coincide with President Macron's election. 2030 is 5 years before even the most optimistic forecasts for the completion of SizewellC.

Surely this government's binoculars can see this toxic white elephant approaching from a distant horizon. Surely, this government should back a plan that puts nimble, cost effective British SMR technology ahead of out-dated French monoliths.

I implore you to exercise the sound reason and perspective that prompted my ballot-box tick and reject this non-sensical aberration of a proposal. Please reject the current proposal for SizewellC.

Many thanks

Alex Johnston

