

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C DCO Response to BEIS request for further information  
**Date:** 23 May 2022 23:48:59

---

Dear Gareth Leigh,

My IP no. 20026083

As someone who has engaged with PINS throughout the DCO examination and attended all the Issue Specific Hearings, I feel that I have a reasonable grasp of the Sizewell C project. What has been clear throughout the examination, and indeed during the pre-application consultancy period, the SZC project has been inadequately planned and the Applicant has ignored the voice of local communities. The DCO process is supposed to be front-loaded and if the Applicant had adopted this aim, there would not have been 22 major changes to the plans, the first batch of which were presented around the same time as the application-this would not have happened if the proposal had been adequately considered before the formal application. If the Applicant had listened to the local communities, they would have ensured they had a guaranteed potable water supply in the driest region in the UK, before submitting their DCO application. This would have avoided the farcical situation where a temporary desalination plant was proposed for construction, just a few months after the Applicant had discounted a desalination plant in its Water Strategy document. If the Applicant had listened to local communities who, for years, had said that the impact of the traffic on local towns and villages was totally unacceptable, there would not have had to be a major change to the transport plan part way through the examination. These are just two examples where this DCO application has fallen short.

Turning to the information recently submitted to BEIS, I would comment as follows:-

#### Desalination Plant

The Applicant's suggestion that a permanent desalination plant can be located either just north of the SSSI Crossing or on part of the Sizewell A site, is not accompanied by any environment impact assessment and is quite frankly ridiculous. The SSSI Crossing area is close to designated wildlife sites dependent on certain levels of high quality groundwater so a totally inappropriate place to site an environmentally damaging desalination plant due to potential contamination. Use of the Sizewell A site would result in the outage car park being built on Pill Box Field which has been recently planted with trees and shrubs as partial compensation for the destruction of Coronation Wood so would be unacceptable. Use of either of the proposed sites would result in the Sizewell nuclear complex further encroaching into the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the loss of this land would be contrary to the NPPF guidelines.

#### Sea Defences

The lack of a detailed design for the Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) highlights another failure to listen to the concerns of the local community who have been saying for

years that they are concerned about the risk of building 2 nuclear reactors on an eroding coast that will be further impacted due to the effects of climate change. After more than a decade of planning, to not have a final design for the HCDF is appalling. After all, the sea defences are key to the protection of the people and environment of Suffolk from the nuclear reactors and spent fuel stored on site.

With regard to the Soft Coast Defence Feature, I remain concerned that the Applicant has not modelled for storm surges of sufficient intensity or for repeat storms that could hit before the effects of the first storm/s have been replenished. My concerns are heightened by the fact that the modelling has been conducted by Cefas and I question their competence for this sort of work.

#### Government of Austria

I believe that the questions from the Austrian government highlight the inadequacy of SZC's arrangements for dealing with radioactive waste, particularly spent fuel. There is no geological disposal facility (GDF) and there is no guarantee there ever will be and even if a suitable willing community is found, there is no guarantee that it will be scientifically proved that a GDF will be a suitable way of disposing of SZC's waste. Coupled with the fact that the Applicant's flood risk assessments are inadequate anyway (as they only go up to 2140 whereas spent fuel will still be stored on site decades after that even if there is a GDF available) I believe that SZC cannot be approved without a GDF being available. I also believe it would be undemocratic to force the local community to host a de facto nuclear waste dump on the SZC site without appropriate consultation.

There are many other issues that I could raise but I feel that the Secretary of State has already predetermined the outcome of his department's DCO decision as a result of his statements promoting SZC and his willingness to fund the Applicant's pre-FID work with £100million of UK taxpayer's money. At the same time as promoting the SZC project, the SoS has shown contempt of the local community by refusing to engage with them. I sent the email below to the SoS back in October of last year and never even had an acknowledgement. Interestingly, the concerns raised last year are concerns that I still have today.

I urge the Secretary of State to refuse the SZC planning application.

Yours faithfully

Christopher Wilson, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Chris Wilson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 October 2021 23:23  
**To:** enquiries@beis.gov.uk <enquiries@beis.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FAO Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng, Secretary of State, BEIS

Dear Secretary of State,  
Please find below my email calling on the Chancellor to not support the financing of the risky, financially damaging and ill-conceived Sizewell C project. I should be pleased if you would advise why you believe UK taxpayer funds should be risked on an EPR design that may never work and will be surplus to requirements by the time that it may become operational.

Yours faithfully,  
Christopher Wilson [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Chris Wilson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 17 October 2021 22:47  
**To:** public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gov.uk <public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FAO Rt Hon Rishi Sunak, Chancellor of the Exchequer, HM Treasury

Dear Chancellor,  
[UK government investment in Sizewell C Nuclear power station](#)

I wish to express my deep concern about reports that the UK government are planning to risk UK taxpayer funds and force all UK electricity bill payers to pay upfront via a RAB funding model, to support the construction and operation of Sizewell C (SZC) nuclear power stations. There seems to be a knee-jerk reaction within the current government to the recent spike in gas prices. However, SZC will not be operational until, at best, around 2035 and its construction and fuelling requirements will have produced a carbon debt of several millions of tonnes, so will not help with energy supplies and will actually hinder achieving net-zero electricity supplies by 2035. Indeed, by diverting investment away from quicker to deploy renewable electricity generation and storage facilities, SZC will hinder the production of clean electricity to replace the UK's current dependence on gas supplies.

I believe the very premise that large nuclear power stations are needed, is built on data that is at best incomplete or at worst deliberately manipulated to show a pre-determined result. Here, I am talking about BEIS's DDM modelling which does not, for example, incorporate a realistic green hydrogen strategy where excess wind or solar is used to produce green hydrogen rather than be curtailed. Even with the inadequacies apparent with the current BEIS modelling, a report submitted as part of the SZC DCO examination (<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp->

[content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010012/EN010012-005256-DL2%20-%20TASC%20\(b\)%20Alternatives.pdf](content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010012/EN010012-005256-DL2%20-%20TASC%20(b)%20Alternatives.pdf)) states "The [BEIS] modelling shows that a combination of renewable energy technologies and carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies can provide such reliable power and in some scenarios at a lower cost than current nuclear technologies such as the Sizewell C (SZC) project proposal." i.e. the nuclear option is not the cheapest one.

EDF's original budget for SZC was £20billion, but it is telling that they have been unwilling to disclose any updated costings. Given the Hinkley Point C costs are now forecast to be at least £23billion and that the SZC site is anticipated to present greater geological difficulties, that construction on the SZC site will be more difficult due to it being surrounded by designated wildlife sites on 3 sides and the operating nuclear power plant at Sizewell B on the other, that it has not been demonstrated that the site can be kept safe from rising sea levels and increased storm surges throughout its full lifetime, that SZC does not have a guaranteed supply of mains water for its construction (up to 4million litres per day is needed during its 10-12 year construction period) or operation (up to 2.8million litres per day during its 60 years of operation) and now want to install a desalination plant for construction and may need to have a lengthy, costly, environmentally-damaging transfer main constructed to meet operational requirements-all adding extra costs. How can the UK government commit its citizens to a project when they don't know the final costs? SZC's costs do not, of course, end with construction. We are all aware that electricity generated from new nuclear reactors remains the most expensive source. In addition, future generations will have the responsibility, financially and environmentally, of looking after the toxic radioactive waste for thousands of years.

Sizewell C would be an extremely risky investment, not only because of the doubts about its final cost of construction but also due to the unproven nature of the EPR technology. The only operational EPRs, in Taishan China, were built to Chinese regulatory standards and I understand it was a simplified design that now operates a lower output than designed. Even then, one of these has had to be shut down for safety reasons. There are no operational EPRs built to European safety standards and despite construction of Olkiluoto, Finland and Flamanville, France starting in 2005 and 2007 respectively, neither are operational. The EPR is owned by EDF, a company owned 83% by the French government, yet the French have decided not to build any more of this design. I do not understand why the UK government wants to force its population to effectively subsidise a French government owned company.

Finally, at a time when we acknowledge that the UK is one of the most nature depleted countries in the world and we know biodiversity loss is a crisis of equal enormity as climate change, it would be a travesty to allow SZC to be built in Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, destroying the Heritage Coast, causing devastation to nationally and internationally designated wildlife sites, including the internationally famous RSPB Minsmere nature reserve.

I urge you not to risk UK taxpayers' money on this environmentally damaging and ill-conceived project.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Wilson, 