

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Sizewell C is ALL WRONG!  
**Date:** 05 August 2021 15:20:38

---

I beg the Planning Inspectorate to recognise the many hugely compelling arguments against going ahead with the Sizewell C project. I would also like to ask them to take action as a matter of urgency to prevent the inevitable and devastating damage that will be caused by proceeding with Sizewell C.

Numerous reports have identified the disadvantages and dangers associated with the Sizewell C project:

- Its negative environmental impact, which is evident in multiple ways, on multiple levels.
- The lack of an effective plan to mitigate the effects of this negative environmental impact.
- The absence of economic benefits and the presence of vast, mounting and unjustifiable costs.
- The extremely worrying financial risks associated with the project.
- Major concerns about the track record of the companies involved in the build.
- Serious concerns about the safety of similar nuclear power plants.
- Huge questions about the rationale for going ahead with this project in this place at this time.

**THE DECISION-MAKING CONTEXT HAS CHANGED SINCE THE PROJECT WAS FIRST PROPOSED  
- THIS NEEDS TO BE RECOGNISED AND ACTED UPON AS A MATTER OF URGENCY**

When this Sizewell C project was first mooted, climate change was not on the agenda in the way it is now.

The need for urgent action to protect the environment and to identify safe sources of energy was not recognised as clearly or as widely as it is now.

Infrastructure had not begun to be sufficiently developed to make alternative ethical energy sources viable propositions.

Decisions made in the past by politicians worldwide have allowed developers to damage the environment and to systematically destroy habitats. These decisions have put in jeopardy all kinds of life forms and have contributed substantially to world-wide climate change along with increasingly frequent extreme weather events.

The fragile coastline in Suffolk needs protection from developments like Sizewell C: A and B have done too much damage already.

The consistent difficulty of finding sound ethical financial investors for Sizewell C sends a loud clear message: it is obviously not an ethical nor a morally correct choice.

**EARLIER DECISIONS/COMMITMENTS NEED TO BE REVIEWED AND REVOKED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.**

**MANY ARE CLEARLY NO LONGER DEFENSIBLE.**

**THE DECISION TO BUILD SIZEWELL C IS CLEARLY ONE OF THESE.**

**THERE ARE NO ETHICAL, ECONOMIC OR ENVIRONMENTAL ARGUMENTS TO JUSTIFY SUPPORT FOR THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT.**

**ETHICAL SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF ENERGY NEED TO BE DEVELOPED**

As much funding as possible needs to be diverted to SOUNDER developments that do minimal damage to the environment.

Sizewell C is a diversion from and so a threat to such developments.

It is a complete waste of taxpayers' money and a huge hole in the nation's pocket at a time when the nation needs to watch very carefully how it recovers from effects of Covid-19.

It has long been recognised, in the UK and around Europe, that Sizewell C is not a sound or a cost-effective option.

Funding problems have dogged the project and some very risky options have been considered. It is already on target to go vastly over-budget, to cost considerably more than more environmentally-friendly alternatives, and to fail to deliver on time or in time to provide much-needed energy.

Sizewell C is a drain on valuable resources.

It will not contribute enough to offset or justify its escalating costs.

The recent request for funding for a 'temporary' desalination plant is just one more example of poor planning and escalating costs.

## **SIZEWELL C IS A THREAT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLEANER MORE ETHICAL ENERGY SOURCES**

### **THE THREAT TO TOURISM**

Sizewell C represents a threat to the tourist industry on which Suffolk depends so heavily.

Traffic (much of it far too heavy and noisy to be supported in small villages), new roads, unsightly spoil heaps, disruption of AONB's, vast out-of-character complexes to house temporary workers, car parks, outages, etc., all of these and more unsavoury aspects will be evident for many, many years to come.

They will impede the work of conservationists and will do nothing to preserve the quiet serenity so characteristic of this part of Suffolk and so attractive to residents, visitors and wild life.

Sizewell A is ugly, Therese Coffey's admiration of Sizewell B as an "icon" is shared by very few, Sizewell C will destroy and alter even more of the Suffolk coastline, rendering a huge stretch of coastline inaccessible and unpleasant for many years to come.

When, in a relatively short time, Sizewell C becomes obsolete, Sizewell D, E, F etc. will continue to decimate this part of the fragile Suffolk coast.

**PLEASE STOP NOW BEFORE ANY MORE DAMAGE IS DONE.**

**MONSTROUS BUILDINGS LIKE THESE ARE NOT EFFECTIVE AS TOURIST ATTRACTIONS.**

**THEY ARE THE COMPLETE OPPOSITE!**

### **THE COST TO RESIDENTS AND CONSUMERS**

Energy costs are about to soar.

Sizewell C will do nothing to protect consumers from this.

If a nuclear tax is imposed, it will only increase the burden.

It is more expensive than alternative options.

It will not be contributing soon enough or enough, to compete with alternative cheaper options.

It will cost consumers far too not just in fuel bills but in quality of life.

**SIZEWELL C IS UNACCEPTABLY LOW VALUE FOR MONEY, SO LOW THAT ONE WONDERS WHO EXACTLY IS GOING TO BENEFIT FROM IT. IS IT JUST A CLOSED-DOOR DEAL IN FACT?**

**WHY IS IT GOING AHEAD WHEN THERE ARE NO OBVIOUS GROUNDS FOR IT AND SO MANY ARGUMENTS AGAINST IT?**

There are many other compelling reasons for a radical rethink about Sizewell C. EDF's proposals not only fail to address the concerns of local people and businesses, they seem constantly to raise fresh problems and worries.

Please reconsider!

Yours,  
Helen Barrett