

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: FW: Response invited by Secretary of State
Date: 23 May 2022 17:00:35
Importance: High

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Extremely poor and unacceptable answers

The invitation to respond to the latest chapter in the Sizewell C (& D in essence, as there are obviously two reactors) proposals thankfully gives another opportunity to highlight the extremely poor and unacceptable answers to the Secretary of State's specific questions ... reflecting yet again an attitude of complacency from EDF and their agents throughout to any opposition to their aims

Severe problems, poor forward planning

Severe problems relating to transport, disruption over a large part of the region for a decade or more, over use of the word "mitigation" relating to important SSSI and biodiversity issues not meeting current legislation, as well as amazing "after-thought" issues with water supply and sea defences, etc, etc only exacerbate their poor forward planning

Wrong place, knock-on consequences

Surely, your team recognises that most of the issues are due to a proposed site in the wrong place, which would degrade and directly adversely affect a region:

- Contributing greatly to the national tourism budget (important national employers such as Adnams having grave concerns as they would be hit in many ways)
- Where thousands of jobs lost due to devastation and damage to businesses and ecosystems outweighing any "created" by any such new installation
- Widely used to benefit the health of not only local residents but millions of visitors and additional home owners, so as a direct result of any go ahead what substantial, long term "hidden" costs will also unfold for our beleaguered NHS?

Yet more reactions against the project "go public" as costs soar

...and now, the RSPB has joined their massive voice in formally objecting to the project ...at the same time as EDF themselves posting additional costs approaching 50% of Hinckley to £26 billion and forecasting overdue production!

Levelling up, practical & more economical alternatives

Should the much publicised yet not widely supported "more nuclear" claims be justified (above proven quicker return renewable investment) then one simple remedy would be to locate any such additional resources in northern industrial regions to take advantage of existing transport infrastructure as this will also assist the "levelling up" campaign ...as well as saving an awful lot of revenue which frankly isn't available in such tight financial times?

Negative aspects outweigh peaceful protests

Locally we have been bombarded over the years by EDF with promotional material giving “updates” on the proposed project as if it were a foregone conclusion and unfortunately many in the area have almost been brain washed into accepting the development as inevitable, despite all the negative aspects of such proposals in rural Suffolk

I and my wife are truly Suffolk people, born and bred in this beautiful county ...plus working here with various organisations as well as enduring tough self employment conditions in recent years, PLEASE listen to the sensible solutions as there are many talented specialists from coastal engineers to local planners as well as the vigilant anti- Sizewell campaigners who also prove with their own very valid researched reasons why this proposal is, and always has been, a very bad idea!

Hopefully the Government Ministers will also recognise the extremely well planned, well executed PEACEFUL demonstrations held over the past and present with campaign against Sizewell C...

So, PLEASE can we stop wasting everyone’s valuable time and money on this poorly presented project, seemingly proposed just because “there’s one there already”

Thank you in anticipation

Richard (& Carolyn) Nichols

