

To Sizewell Nuclear New Build, FREEPOST LON20574, London W1E 3EZ

Sizewell C & D Proposed Nuclear Development

Submission to the Stage 1 Pre-Application Consultation On Initial Proposals and Options

By Peter Lanyon,

3 Spencer Close, Little Plumstead, Norwich NR13 5JE

Email: peter.lanyon3@btinternet.com

I have environmental, humanitarian, family and recreational interests in Suffolk Coastal District area. I am not using your questionnaire, because I do not accept that you should so shape my comments, but I shall fit what I provide to what you ask as well as I can.

1. The Sizewell C Proposals

It is misleading of you to call it Sizewell C, since it is two stations, each one much larger than the existing ones. This can only be an attempt to minimise the scale of the proposal; not a good start, since it is so obviously a ruse.

You refer to the Government's identification of the site as "potentially suitable". This means "capable of becoming suitable depending upon circumstances". Relevant circumstances that have arisen since the Government's latest National Policy Statements of July 2011 are:

Increased severity of predicted climate change, in the marked absence of any improvement in predicting both the stability of the site's coastline and the collateral damage to neighbouring areas in consequence of the proposal and its engineered defences

Increased threats to fauna and flora in consequence of continued anthropogenic disruption of their environments, leading to increased value and necessity of SSSIs, Ramsar Sites, AONBs etc

Increased appreciation, consequent upon Fukushima, of the need for the proposed sites to be entirely and securely bunded to contain all the contaminated water consequent upon a LOCA, while the proposal does not include this and the site would not be big enough to house this

Increased awareness of the threats from terrorism that make necessary the secure containment of the fuel ponds, that the proposal does not include

Extended timescale even further into 22nd century (2150 -2160 at least) of on-site storage of spent fuel, consequent upon the collapse of the Cumbrian plans for a GDF, while Government stated limits for prediction of climate change effects remain at 2100.

2. Proposed Temporary Developments, and 6. Sea Transport

The jetty would cause unpredictable decrease in the stability of the coast. The dredging in connection with it (of which I can find no mention) would exacerbate this and damage fauna and flora. Details of the permanent parts of the jetty are so lacking as to make the entire jetty proposals look furtive and evasive.

15. People and Economy

You say you are keen to enable people to make the most of the opportunities arising from the development, while you deliberately omit any invitation to us to comment upon the problems arising from it. We are concerned about the welfare of the area and our descendants in it particularly from 2100 onwards for:

Government cannot predict beyond then whether or not the coast will be stable

Yet spent fuel will have to be stored on site at least until 2130 because there will be no where and no way to move it safely if the coast becomes unstable

Yet the NPSs accepted on-site storage of spent fuel because moving it was so dangerous and because there would be nowhere to move it to (so "10 year reviews to check on safety and move it if necessary" are bogus)

Lord Stern announced less than a fortnight ago that climate change will be far more severe than he predicted

The collapse of the Cumbrian GDF means the fuel would have to stay on-site for much longer still

Colin Turner on 29.1.2013 glossed complacently the extensive continuing ignorance of the coastal processes presently at work, and virtually ignored the effects the proposal would have on those processes, and ignored too the knock-on effects of the sea on neighbouring areas and their economies

Fukushima shows us that any nuclear station must be completely and safely bounded to contain all the contaminated water in the case of a LOCA, yet your plans do not show this and the site is not big enough to achieve it.

16. Consultation Process

You ask do I have any comments about the consultation process so far. I have. It is dishonest. It purports to enable us to comment on all the issues it raises (your Consultation Document, page 2, Scope of Consultation 1.1.12). Then it does not provide spaces for such things as coastal instability and erosion. Yet these issues inevitably involve the "safety, reliability and sustainability over the whole life of the Sizewell C Project", so you are unjustified in saying "our Objectives are to ... Comply with the regulatory requirements and apply company standards" (ibid page 3, 1.2.4).

Further, when it was pointed out, I understand by two District Councils, that you had not provided enough information on Coastal Processes, you hurriedly put on a presentation that complacently glossed the fact that very little is known about the processes, but this information was not widely available to the public, and anyway was very late on in the consultation process, when most submissions would already have been made.

Peter Lanyon

1 February 2013

CC: Mark Wilson, Sizewell C Case Manager, National Infrastructure Directorate, Temple Quay House Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

Paul Wood, Sizewell C Project Officer, Planning Department, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Melton Hill, Woodbridge IP12 1AU