ANNEX A: Issues relating to National Policy Statements and the interim Weightman Report

1. Revised draft Nuclear National Policy Statement (EN-6)

Alongside EN-1, EN-6 provides the primary basis for decisions taken by the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) on applications it receives for nuclear power stations. It contains planning guidance to the IPC as well as the 8 sites that the Government believes are potentially suitable for the deployment of nuclear power stations by 2025[1].

2.1 Assessment Principles, impacts and general siting considerations

In the light of your considerations of the events in Japan:

> *(i) We would welcome your advice on whether there is any significant evidence to suggest that the general assessment principles and guidance on impacts and siting considerations set out in parts 2 & 3 of the revised draft of EN-6 do not remain valid;*
>
> *(ii) In relation to spent fuel and radioactive waste management, we would welcome your advice on whether there is any significant evidence that leads you to question the validity of the assertions in EN-6 that, for a new build site, it should be practicable to provide safe and secure interim on-site storage prior to disposal in a geological disposal facility.*

2.2 Strategic Suitability of Sites

The revised draft Nuclear National Policy Statement identifies sites that are potentially suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear power station by 2025.

> *(iii) In the light of your assessment of the events in Japan, do you consider that changes may be needed to the nuclear regulatory regime, its processes or standards that would threaten ONR's ability to regulate the design, construction, commissioning and start-up of a programme of new nuclear power stations by 2025?*

Annex B of the consultation draft of EN-6 lists the sites and the results of the assessment of each site against the Strategic Siting Criteria. Conclusions with regard to those sites' suitability have drawn on advice provided by the safety, security and environmental regulators. There are generic and site-specific questions which arise in connection with the regulatory advice we have incorporated in our assessment of these sites.

In the light of your consideration of the events in Japan:

<u>(a) Demographics:</u>

> *(iv) Regulatory advice on the strategic suitability of sites was based on the semi-urban criterion with consideration of populations out to 30km. Is there significant evidence to suggest that the basis for your advice is no longer valid?*
>
> *(v) The Strategic Siting Assessment, whilst considering demographics, did not consider in detail the extent and capacity for emergency planning. Is your advice that this*

[1] As noted, the Government is currently considering responses to public consultation and Parliamentary scrutiny, and as such the list has not been finalised.

remains an issue which should be considered at the licensing stage rather than at the strategic level?

(b) Seismic risk and capable faulting

(vi)The Strategic Siting Assessments have not considered this due to the assumption of an overall low level of seismic activity in the UK and on the grounds that faulting can only be determined by site-specific detailed investigation. Do you consider that this remains appropriate?

(c) Flood risk, tsunami and storm surge

(vii) The regulatory advice on the strategic suitability of nominated sites in relation to extreme flooding, tsunami and storm surge was based on risk estimates that were considered valid at the time. Do you consider that this strategic level advice remains valid?

(viii) New sites in Flood Zone 3 have been considered potentially suitable from a nuclear safety standpoint. Do you consider that this remains a valid position?

(d) Size of Site and proximity to other hazardous installations

(ix) Is your advice in relation to the minimum size of site or the proximity of adjacent hazardous facilities still valid?

(e) Site-specific Advice

We would be grateful if you could consider the advice you have provided as part of the Strategic Siting Assessment in relation to each of the 8 sites listed in the draft nuclear NPS remains valid, or advise us of any significant changes.

3. Any other relevant factors

We would be grateful if you could advise us of any other factors which you consider we should take into account in finalising the NPS.