

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: EDF report to shareholders May 2021  
**Date:** 19 May 2021 09:43:52  
**Attachments:** [Mike Taylor Presentation to PINS open floor hearing May 18th 2021.odt](#)

---

20025871.

Dear Case team, following my presentation your planning inspector requested a link to the EDF Universal Registration Document 2020 report which I quoted from.  
The correct link is below and was sent to yourselves earlier for information.

I wish to point out that my question as to the legality of agreements etc is not based on any legal opinion but is based on my interpretation of the site licencing documents being used by the Office of Nuclear regulation.

regards Mike Taylor

Sent from [Outlook](#)

---

**From:** Mike Taylor [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 April 2021 10:55  
**To:** SizewellC <[sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Fw: EDF report to shareholders May 2021

Dear Case team, I sent this attachment to you for information. Please note that the attachment brings up a link to a 2019 report which appears to have been added /changed.  
The correct report is at

<https://labrador.cld.bz/EDF-2020-Universal-Registration-Document>

	<h2>EDF / 2020 Universal Registration Document</h2> <p>Contents. 1 THE GROUP, ITS STRATEGY AND ACTIVITIES. 5 THE GROUP'S FINANCIAL. 5. PERFORMANCE AND OUTLOOK * 265 Review of the financial situation 5.1 and results 2020 266 Subsequent events 5.2 293 Changes in market prices 5.3 at end</p> <p>labrador.cld.bz</p>
---	--

Regards Mike  
Sent from [Outlook](#)

---

**From:** Mike Taylor  
**Sent:** 12 April 2021 16:51  
**To:** SizewellC <[sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** EDF report to shareholders May 2021

Dear case team, please see attached extract from the EDF France shareholders report meeting and reference to a statement on Sizewell C which you may find of interest, particularly as it relates to the budget for this project and any future EDF involvement. I believe I previously raised the issue of how section 106 or CPOs or any other commitments could be funded as part of the DCO.

Regards Mike Taylor

20025871

Sent from [Outlook](#)



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

Mike Taylor Presentation to PINS open floor hearing May 18<sup>th</sup> 2021.

Good Morning I am a resident of Ieiston cum Sizewell since 1983

The Planning Act documents EN1 to EN6 are clearly out of date, as the inability to have an operational NPS at Sizewell C by 2025 is evident. I strongly object to this development.

There are now many more alternatives at reduced costs and deployable quicker to combat climate change. HOWEVER We are obliged to work to the existing policy EN6.

Compounded by the fact that EDF France the original developer with partner Chinese General Nuclear have now placed on record to their shareholders meetings in May 2021 that they do not wish to be a lead part of the developments. I will read verbatim from the 2020 EDF Universal registration document presented to shareholders in May 2021 Page 72.

I read from an extract verbatim "This project is based ..... None of these conditions are guaranteed at this time.

There appears a misunderstanding that EDF will be the developers of any SZC. This appears to raise issues of liability for section 106 agreements, licencing and other commitments some longstanding.

According to government Energy White paper statements, any project will be subject to a test for evidenced value for money. Therefore it could be argued that ALL future costs and liabilities will have to be properly evidenced to allow VFM study both to allow for a proper fully advised investment decision and to include a fully funded spent fuel and decommissioning programme up until final site clearance potentially 200 years in advance. This is Needed as part of the site licence process and is part of the Energy Act 2008.

The lack of key detail in the developers plans, evidenced in an FOI to Office of Nuclear Regulation, a copy of the reply was sent to PINS for information on 12th April 2021, raises many concerns about the constructability of the project, from engineering to source of construction material and disposal of waste. Whilst a replica of the incomplete Hinkley C is claimed by the developer, HPC has a different foundation, is closer to the source of construction materials and a potable water supply is available. The additional costs of peat extraction, land raising and disposal for Sizewell C may not be properly factored in. The sea water cooling system is not yet resolved at HPC and may be equally as controversial for Sizewell C.

At or around this point I ran out of time with my presentation.

EN6 makes assertions about grid capacity and availability to deploy at C.8.5 . This is controversial as it involves extra pylons across the Stour Valley AONB and may raise security and risks to the network. This problem was highlighted during lockdown 2020 when SZB capacity was reduced by half to one turbine due to risk of grid instability. The EPR with its one turbine I understand cannot be operated at half output. A further 3.2 GW added to the network at this point may not be safe and long term with climate change may not be sufficiently robust compared to local networks.

Request PINS takes advice on the implications of SZC on grid and future networks.

EN6 makes assertions about disposability of spent fuel to a notional GDF being available from 2130 C.8.23 for new build waste which appears unrealistic, and ultimately indicates the need for long term storage on site of radioactive spent fuel. The High burn up spent fuel as envisaged for the EPR for SZC has no operating history and no storage history. Even the 143 casks for SZB have no final destination, posing a safety risk for many years and requiring a repackaging facility to be retained after generation ceases. Leaving future generations to tackle the problem.

Request PINS fully understand the whole of the nuclear fuel cycle including capacity of the storage ponds, fuel handling routes, design and capacity of storage building No 44 and repackaging facility, especially considering the potential long term impact of climate change. The landscaping of a large and intrusive Dry store is of major concern as its indicated site is on the extreme western edge of the development and cannot be screened due to the impacts on the neighbouring SSSI.

PINS may wish to consider a visit to the DFS at SZB.

Mike Taylor 18<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

Presentation 14

20025871