

Sizewell C Plan Project EN010012

Applicant - SZC Co

Comments on Applicant's responses to questions raised by the Secretary of State

David Adelson B.A. (Interested Party registration number 20025635)

Date 23rd May 2022

Water supply (questions 3.1 & 3.2)

The applicant's response basically says there is no new information since the examination. SZC Co tries to make out that NWL has made a commitment to supply the water, but all that has really happened is that the demand has been added to a list of things to plan for; this doesn't mean that it can be done. Further, SZC Co says that NWL has a legal duty to supply the water under Sections 55 and 56 of the Water Industry Act, but in fact this only obliges NWL to make best endeavours. "Best endeavours" can't produce water where there is none.

The difficulty of water supply in this dry region, to enable the plant to be operated once built, is reason enough in itself not to build it on the Suffolk Coast.

Perhaps the applicant has a strategy here to try and fool the SoS into giving approval, leaving the inevitable and huge problem to be solved later on - by claiming that "too much public money has already been spent to allow the project to stop for want of water supply", and thus forcing the government to expend yet further large sums to subsidise an economically infeasible new water supply project.

Desalination (Question 3.3)

The applicant's answers show that the temporary desalination plant would not be sufficient to meet the permanent water demand, and put forward the idea of a larger permanent desalination solution. This has never been part of the Development Consent application and would in itself require a new complete planning process, including properly considering its siting, environmental impact etc, and its cost and feasibility. It would require proper input from experts in the field rather than the opinion of SZC Co, whose planning competence has already been proven to be woeful.

Sizewell Link Road and Two Village Bypass (Question 4.1)

The SoS has asked a good question about providing adequate transport infrastructure, to provide a little relief - not only local residents, but also all communities served by the A12, before subjecting them to the huge additional traffic caused by main construction. In the undesirable event of the project proceeding, I support this idea. The applicant's answers complain that it will delay the project; but it's better to do it in the best way possible in view of the havoc that the construction will cause. It may impact the profitability of the project – but for local residents, why should life be made more hellish than necessary for the sake of saving a foreign electricity company a bit of money?

Pedestrian Road Crossings, A12 and Theberton (Question 4.3)

In the applicant's estimates of driver delay time, there are assumptions about frequency of pedestrians calls and the length of time for each one. I don't dispute the length of time, and the frequencies quoted could be reasonable, but the assumptions should be checked.

However, the conclusions that delays would be insignificant based on vehicles only being stopped while the lights are red are questionable. I claim no expertise in traffic management, but all drivers are aware that traffic queues don't clear instantaneously when the lights turn green, as each vehicle in turn has to wait for the one in front to travel some distance before it can start to move itself. At busy times, vehicles (which would include construction HGVs) can join the back of the queue faster than they clear at the front, causing lengthening tailbacks. This may or

may not occur with these pedestrian crossings; but the applicant's answers do not seem to be thorough enough to be reassuring.

Effect of Sizewell B operational cease on Coastal Processes (Question 5.2)

The question of coastal instability is surely one of the most concerning areas of the whole proposal. The SoS is surely well aware that the Suffolk Coast in general is eroding at a rapid rate. The applicant keeps claiming that the Sizewell site itself is stable, or “relatively stable”, but it’s very important to understand this in the timescale of the project, especially post-operation (which will be at least as long as operation). The effect of these coastal processes over long periods of time is not predictable. There can be changes owing to natural cycles, singular natural events, and new or ceased human activities. Anyone who puts even a simple building near the shore in East Anglia - perhaps intended to be used during their own lifetime - is taking a big gamble with their money. And the proposed nuclear power station is anything but a simple building; it is a vast industrial complex, containing at its core and producing as waste, some of the most hazardous substances known to humankind. These substances remain dangerous for many millennia.

The station needs to remain 100% safe from the sea for about 180 years (see below). Other ways to think about that...

- around 3 human lifetimes as an adult
- around 6-7 human generations. So if a person starts working on the build next year, it might be their great-great-great-great-grandchildren who finish tidying up the mess of a former nuclear power station, which by then could quite likely be well out to sea.
- if construction had started (on a stable site) at the death of William IV, we might be coming to the end of decommissioning about now.

It’s more than a gamble with money – it’s a huge gamble with the lives, health and livelihoods of millions of people. People who live and work not just near to Sizewell, but for hundreds of miles around, including continental Europe. The potential benefits are not worth the risks.

The site must be protected for this long period (much longer than the date of 2140 which the applicant talks about) because still, after nearly 70 years of the nuclear power industry in the United Kingdom, there is no site for permanent safe disposal of nuclear waste. No effective progress has been made on this matter in all that time, and there is there no hope of a disposal site being available any time soon. And even if we had one now, it would take many decades to move the waste created already into safe disposal. Realistic estimates of the removal of spent fuel and completion of decommissioning range from 2190 to 2200.

This risk alone is sufficient reason not to build Sizewell C nuclear power station.

The applicant’s answer fails to address the points raised in [REP8-280](#), concerning

- the true position of the HCDF compared to the current coastline,
- the fact that the current SZB salient has moved the existing beach Eastward right along the planned SZC frontage, meaning that the existing beach will erode rapidly and threaten the HCDF once the SZB salient erodes away - which the applicant itself says in 4.2.2 is expected to happen over the course of only a year
- the inadequacy of current SCDF modelling.

Habitat Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity and Ecology (Question 8.1)

The question is to Natural England, but the applicant makes a statement intended to re-assure the SoS about compliance with planning regulations requiring biodiversity net gain (BNG), and with the Environment Act 2021. I respectfully remind the SoS of the applicant’s unsupported claims of BNG in previous submissions, which have been refuted by many submissions from interested parties (e.g. [REP6-075](#)). The proposal involves damage to an SSSI and therefore cannot claim any BNG. This is major damage to a very important SSSI.

In summary, Sizewell C is an extremely bad project, doing nothing to decrease UK dependency on foreign powers for energy, and the location is entirely unsuitable – for reasons of ground instability, rising sea level, lack of potable water, poor transport links, damage to the local economy, and increasingly huge cost. These answers from the applicant to the SoS’s questions do nothing to change any of this.