EN010012 Sizewell C. My Ref SIZE-AFP324

FAO Gareth Leigh.

Dear Sir, thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Sizewell C project.

I have taken an interest in the SZC project for the last 8 years. Prior to that I had an interest in a previous application for a twin reactor PWR project in 1995-6, as an elected member for Suffolk Coastal District Council. That project was stopped as too expensive.

Now SZC Co project is obviously too expensive and represents poor value for money compared to alternatives. The developer appears to have set out to avoid proper scrutiny of some highly complex civil engineering, especially how, or if, the external curtain wall can be constructed. It is unforgivable that those tests are so late in the planning process when it could be argued that was an essential first step before even nominating the site. As was the need to identify a sustainable potable water supply. Both issues are identified in the IAEA Siting criteria which BEIS officers agreed should be used as a part of the revision of EN6 Nuclear Policy. [redacted]

I am a long term member of the BEIS/NGO forum and ONR/NGO forum.

I wish to make brief comment as follows:-

- There is no demonstration of need.
- The policy EN6 is out of date, the developer has continued to state it was capable of starting SZC construction by 2025 ie using the wrong definition in the existing EN6, which is “deployable” ie operational by 2025.
- There is now a dispute about the route and type of transmission lines which would be seen as essential for Sizewell C. This has brought to the fore the urgency for a review of future transmission of power by a “National Grid”. On the assumption that a largescale fixed output over centralised energy supply is probably unnecessary as smart technology evolves.

A previous minister had commenced a new consultation on EN6 starting December 2017. This was abandoned without appearing to take note of many unresolved issues, such as, deficit of town water, flood risk, climate change, AONB and SSSI principles. Many of these are regulatory functions. To my knowledge Regulatory work on that revised EN6 was not done. So how could a decision be made not to revise EN6?

- There is no understanding of how high burn spent fuel from an EPR can be managed or “disposed” of in a Geological Disposal Facility. (Disposal is the wrong terminology, the French authorities admit that the process has to be reversable). The pilot EPR plant Flamanville is delayed yet again, which may have guided a number of environmental outputs. The Taishan Number 1 reactor built using French components has a serious fault. The continued use of Russian fuel and the involvement of the TENEX company needs further understanding in view of Russia/Ukraine conflict.

Inadequate and missing information, lack of acceptable drawings, were all pointed out to BEIS at the first consultation. These are in my opinion still inadequate. I believe it is essential for such a sensitive and constrained site that all drawings are properly grid referenced and to scale.

- Direct sea water cooling is unlikely to be best available technique in view of urgent need to protect the marine environment and wider environment. Many respondents have criticised the methodology and there is also an outstanding change to fish deterrence awaiting decision in the Hinkley C case.

I cannot see how Sizewell is an acceptable development site for a project of this scale and size within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB on a Heritage Coast. Adequate cheaper, flexible and easily deployable alternatives exist which will result in economic benefit for all the UK.

Kind regards Mike Taylor

[redacted]

22nd May 2022.