

**Response from Ivor and Jean Murrell (IP number 20025821) to the Business Secretary of State's invitation Interested Parties to send submissions in response to additional information on the Sizewell C project.**

**May 16<sup>th</sup> 2022**

We live in [REDACTED] so have a very keen interest in all the potential local problems that will arise if Sizewell C and D are built. In addition, we consider the whole project now technically outmoded and seriously overpriced compared to current energy possibilities, as well as being a potential environmental disaster. I must state that we are not against nuclear power if it is in its modern concept of much smaller, localised, molten salt reactors. Such plants are so much safer, cheaper and with minimised nuclear waste production.

Despite the long years that this vast project has been rumbling on, the consultation with all interested bodies has been inadequate and the lack of logic and consideration of potential problems have been astounding. Just one example is the case that the water supply problem for the site has only recently arisen, and the possibility of having to build a desalination plant is being hastily tabled. Water will not just be needed to build the plant, but for the extent of its operating life. The cramped Sizewell site does not have sufficient space for this to be done.

If the project goes ahead the proposal is for work to start on site before any transport improvements are done. This means that for about the first two-years of heavily increased traffic on the unimproved B112, with up to 600 heavy goods vehicles per day coming to site. All contractors will have to travel by private vehicles as no off-site car parks will have been built. That seems to be a quite acceptable chaos to the project applicant, but it will be a genuine problem of safety on the narrow winding road and a disruption to local travel. This indifference to potential problems for local inhabitants is seemingly widespread practice in the proposal.

When work finally does start on the problem of a massive increase in vehicle movements, the choice of bypass route again is selected for maximum disruption. The alternative proposal, Route W, which would have been a better option for local inhabitants and favoured by Suffolk County Council, was ignored in the applicant's proposal.

These are all issues of the immediate future, but even bigger problems quickly arise when considering further ahead. The site is not ideally geographically located for a nuclear plant with on-site, long-term, nuclear waste storage needs. This really seems to have only been superficially addressed. It has just been announced that the Government would like Sizewell B to now operate for another 20 years beyond its original closure date, from 2035 to 2055. We know that climate change will increase sea level and wave erosion, but Sizewell B does not meet the requirements for protection introduced after The Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster in 2011. There is a strong forecast that the Sizewell site will become an island in the encroaching sea in the mid 2100's, and the proposed beach sea wall, although massive, will not protect the nuclear waste stored on site from the sea's ingress. If this seems an

exaggeration, please remember that Dunwich was second largest town in Suffolk in the 11<sup>th</sup> Century, but by the 13<sup>th</sup> century most of it was over a half a mile out in the North Sea.

It will take to 2135 to safely remove all waste from existing nuclear action at Sizewell, so the large tonnage (five thousand tonnes?) of nuclear waste to be stored on site from the proposed operation of a Sizewell C and a Sizewell D will be well into the time when the site will be surrounded by the sea.

Finally, a political and financial consideration. If this plant goes ahead a significant part of the cost will fall on the public and the electricity produced from Sizewell C and Sizewell D will be so much more expensive, by the time they are 'on-line', than the cost from renewables and MSR plants.

How can such a decision begin to be justified against the current social backdrop of society's difficult finances? Sizewell C and D are not a successful cost-effective answer to our energy needs, nor will they help prevent climate change -- they would exacerbate the problems of both.

We have been told that the Plutonium for these two proposed plants will be sourced from Russia. If that is correct that is yet another item that will require reconsideration.

Ivor and Jean Murrell

