

Additional Written Representation from Ian Galloway following The Sizewell Project – July ISH's

OVERVIEW

My name is Ian Galloway and I am a resident of Kelsale-cum-Carlton, one of the largest (by size) Parishes in Suffolk.

During and subsequent to the fortnight of ISH's (5th-16th July 2021) a number of items in the World News were notable and potentially had an impact on the proposed construction of a power station at Sizewell in Suffolk.

It is not my intention to burden the ExA with a long exposition on each, more; to ensure that they individually and collectively are included in the considerations of the Applicant, Interested Parties and the ExA as the application for Development Consent continues its' passage through the prescribed process(es).

Lunar Nodal Precession - Coastal threat?

NASA disclosed the results of their extensive research programme conducted in respect to the moons influence on tides and weather on earth.

'Moon wobble' was popularised by the press as a sobriquet for a long recognised phenomenon (Lunar Nodal Precession) that NASA now believe has the potential to inflict widespread coastal damage on North America and elsewhere in the world. Moreover, NASA is warning that the established (18.6 yearly) cyclical event (in combination with global sea level rises and climate change) may inflict the severest damage witnessed yet, during 2036!

Having listened to some of the discussions during the relevant ISH's it occurs to me that this phenomenon, whilst having a relatively small impact individually, should at least be considered by the; Applicant, ExA and relevant Interested Parties, when looking forward over a hundred years at the security of the proposed SZC site.

Taishan Nuclear Power Plant

Following rumours of a 'leak' at the Taishan Reactor earlier in the year [rebutted by China who blamed damaged fuel rods as responsible for increased levels of radioactivity], the FT yesterday [22nd July] stated EDF had said it would have shut the reactor in southern China down if the facility were in France, but that the decision to continue operating the joint venture was beyond its control.

I won't rehearse the track record of this technology again and the other sites that remain unproductive. However, I would point out that that according to the FT article, were EDF the decision maker, this incident might have seen the only productive reactor of this type shut down.

I ask the ExA, the Regulators and other Interested Parties to reflect on just what type of incident it will take for this technology to be consigned to the 'scrap pile'?

'Urgency' and Energy Shortages

Seasoned OFH and ISH attendees will be familiar with the Applicants predilection for including 'urgency' in every other sentence, sometimes more than once!

In the Daily Telegraph today [23rd July] an article by Rachel Millard spelt out how the Applicants desire to push ahead with a twelve year construction programme to address the urgent requirement for additional production capacity may be just a bit too late.

Under the headline "National Grid warns of energy shortages threat this winter as nuclear sites are shut" Ms Millard highlights the closure of two EDF nuclear plants [Hunterston B and Dungeness B], combined with workers returning to office buildings is likely to lead to low energy supplies this winter.

As an experienced Change Agent and Project Director of more than thirty years I am all too aware of the need (sometimes) to galvanise change by creating a 'burning platform'. It seems this technique has not been lost on the Applicant.

From this insight it seems to me that; deployment of this unproven technology (see Taishan above), at the end of a twelve year construction period, is akin to closing a very large stable door with 'rock armour', long after the horse has bolted.

It is often said that all projects only have three strategic levers; time, cost and quality. In this particular case I am led to understand that all three are effectively 'maxed out'!

Indeed Ms Williamson (for the Applicant) more or less said the same thing during the ISH alluding to the change in the underpinning Project Management methodology, away from 'waterfall' and closer to an 'agile' approach.

As a consequence, it seems the time is right to recognise that; 'big nuclear' is not the answer to today's issue.

Yes, I recognise that 'the need' has to be addressed and yes it needs to have at least one (preferably several) alternatives that have; more temporal agility, lower unit cost and quality integral to their design.

I do not wish to stray into 'policy', but I would ask the ExA, Interested Parties and indeed the Applicant to take a step back and look at the most recent crop of 'big nuclear sites' using this technology, recognise the problems and reconcile themselves to the truth...this solution it is just not deployable to meet 'urgent need'.

And on a personal note...

Received today, a text from Essex and Suffolk Water reads:

"Hi Suffolk! Water use is increasing rapidly as the summer continues. Please think about how much water you're using, especially in the garden and don't leave sprinklers on. Here's some tips to help you use less water.
www.eswater.co.uk/summerOptOut

Water is a big issue in the East of England and summers invariably stress the resources and the infrastructure. Is it really right to deal with water outside of the DCO?