

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Objections to Sizewell C
Date: 11 October 2021 20:09:41

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Since the recent soaring gas and electricity prices, along with panic queues at petrol stations the government and media have reacted with 'Nuclear is the answer!' But it can't be the answer as it will take at least 12 years if not more before it delivers the power. I oppose the £20 billion reactors planned for Sizewell C for the following reasons.

Who is going to pay for Sizewell C?

There are security issues and moral reasons for having China as a business partner. Pension funds and private business have shown little inclination to invest because of course cost overruns and overspends in the nuclear industry are notorious. The EPR reactor is unproven technology and problems due to its size and complex technology. Delays in Olkiluoto Finland, Flamanville France and now Hinkley are years behind, still not operational. Taishan reactor in China did work for 2 years but has had to be shut down due to fuel failure, the reasons not disclosed.

To use the regulated asset base (RAB) method would be a nuclear tax. The upfront costs of construction (which no private company would consider) would be put onto consumer's bills before the plant is operational. Another stealth tax on electricity bills. There are limits on the public purse and consumers ability or willingness to pay. Adding this burden on consumers would be a real vote loser.

Sizewell C will be obsolete in 12 years time. More renewables will be built and improved storage options as batteries improve. There are other options using Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) built by British companies such as Rolls Royce, which would be safer and have less impact on the environment.

Hinkley is built on rock but Sizewell would be built on sand beside a fast eroding coastline. The beach would be closed to build huge sea defences. The unpredictable coralline mud banks shift in front of Sizewell and with increasing incidence of climate change sea surges and rising sea levels it is predicted Sizewell will become an island by 2050. It is too big a project for such an unstable place.

The building of this project would do untold damage to the sites of scientific interest and the bordering Minster nature reserve. Nuclear energy is not green because of course there is a huge carbon cost is mining and purifying uranium, which is not renewable. The radioactive waste remains radioactive for 100,000 years and would have to sit in Suffolk

until a geological disposal site is found casing more costs and an immoral load for future generations to bear.

The coastal district of Suffolk would find it hard to cope with the biggest industrial building site in Europe. Our tourist industry, which is increasing year on year and employs more and more people would be severely restricted. There would be a negative impact on local businesses. The influx of migrant workers could cause social problems. There could be potential traffic problems as there aren't the roads in Suffolk to cope with the extra 10,00 cars buses and HGVs.

Nuclear builds use up huge amounts of water and East Suffolk is a very dry county. There would be problems with a sustainable supply. There is talk about water tankers, desalination plants, and sewage or winter storage reservoirs.

Sizewell C is just too big a project in the wrong place.

Too damaging, too costly, too risky.

Yours sincerely

Brian Lowry