Department for Energy Security & Net Zero

A National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation, EN-7: Response and new Consultation

Closing date: 3 April 2025, 12.00 noon

February 2025

Territorial extent

This consultation relates to the exercise of powers in England and Wales. Energy policy is generally a matter reserved to UK Ministers but the powers relevant to this consultation do not apply in Scotland and Northern Ireland because the legal power to consent to the construction of electricity generating stations more than 50 MW of capacity has been executively devolved to Scottish Ministers and is also devolved in Northern Ireland. Additionally, the Wales Act 2017 gives Welsh Ministers the responsibility to consent the construction of electricity generating stations with a generating capacity between 10 MW and 350 MW.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/official-documents..

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at NuclearNPS.Consultation@energysecurity.gov.uk.

Contents

Foreword

For this government, nuclear has an essential role to play in our mission to make Britain a clean energy superpower. As a source of clean, stable and reliable power, it offers huge opportunities to deliver energy security and climate security, as well as economic security for workers and communities across the country.

Our mission is about replacing Britain's dependence on fossil fuel markets controlled by dictators and petrostates with clean homegrown power that we control. We are entering an era of clean electricity as the foundation of our energy system and, in that context, we need all the clean power sources at our disposal.

As a result, nuclear will play a very important role in the energy system we are building – but it is also an essential part of the kind of economy we are trying to build. The industry has a proud record of supporting tens of thousands of well-paid, highly skilled, unionised jobs, and we are determined to ensure it continues to be an economic engine for communities around our country.

That is why we are driving forward Hinkley Point C, Sizewell C and Great British Nuclear's Small Modular Reactor competition. At the same time, we are working with industry to break down the barriers to investing in nuclear, including planning, grid, supply chains and skills.

This new National Policy Statement, called EN-7, is a vital part of that work. Back in 2009, as Energy Secretary, I identified the 8 sites for new nuclear, still recognised in the current planning framework. These sites remain well-placed to host new projects, but developments since then mean a new planning framework is now needed.

By adopting a criteria-based approach, EN-7 will enable nuclear development in more places alongside the 8 previously identified sites, while maintaining the highest standards of safety, security and environmental protection. In the process, it will support cutting-edge technologies, such as SMRs and AMRs, as well as gigawatt-scale plants – helping unlock nuclear's potential to boost our energy security, create good jobs, drive growth and support climate action.

The government is committed to working in partnership with investors, developers, manufacturers, trade unions, communities, and the whole nuclear industry to realise this potential. We welcome your views in response to this consultation as we seize the opportunities of nuclear power for our country.

The Rt Hon Ed Miliband MP

Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero

General information

Consultation details

Issued: 6 February 2025

Respond by: 3 April 2025 @ 12pm

Enquiries to: nuclearnps.consultation@energysecurity.gov.uk

Please do not send consultation responses to this email address, see below details on responding via Citizen Space.

Consultation reference: New Nuclear NPS Siting

Audiences: The government wants to hear from members of the public, industry, non-governmental organisations, interested public bodies and organisations, and nearby states.

How to respond

We are inviting responses to this Consultation, where possible, via the online e-consultation platform, Citizen Space.

In this Consultation, the government wants to hear from members of the public, industry, non-governmental organisations, interested public bodies and organisations, and nearby states. When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please clarify the interests represented by the organisation and, where applicable, how you assembled the views of members.

Your response will be most useful if it is framed in direct response to the questions posed, although further comments and evidence are also welcome. When considering responses to this consultation, the government will give greater weight to responses that are based on argument and evidence, rather than simple expressions of support or opposition.

Consultations receive a high level of interest across many sectors. Using the online service assists our analysis of the responses, enabling more efficient and effective consideration of the issues raised. Therefore, we strongly encourage responses via Citizen Space. Please contact us if you intend to respond using an alternative method.

Respond online at: energygovuk.citizenspace.com/energy-security/nps-nuclear-energy-generation-en7-followon-consult

Alternatively, discuss with us alternative response methods:

Email or write to New Nuclear NPS Team:

Email: nuclearnps.consultation@energysecurity.gov.uk

Address:

New Nuclear NPS Team
Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
3-8 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

Confidentiality and data protection

Information you provide in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be disclosed in accordance with UK legislation (the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential please tell us, but be aware that we cannot guarantee confidentiality in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not be regarded by us as a confidentiality request.

We will process your personal data in accordance with all applicable data protection laws. See our privacy policy.

We will summarise all responses and publish this summary on GOV.UK. The summary will include a list of names or organisations that responded, but not people's personal names, addresses or other contact details.

Quality assurance

This consultation has been carried out in accordance with the government's consultation principles.

If you have any complaints about the way this consultation has been conducted, please email: bru@energysecurity.gov.uk.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The government is committed to making the UK a clean energy superpower by accelerating towards net zero, protecting consumers and supporting jobs across the country. Nuclear energy will be essential in this transition and the government is committed to driving nuclear forward, including through giving industry clarity on our long-term plans for nuclear and how we see its role in a clean power system. A key part of this is having an effective planning system that gives developers certainty by making the standards clear from the outset, ensuring the process is as smooth as possible for nuclear developers to bring safe and sustainable new nuclear projects through the development consent regime.

1.1.2 The 2011 National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation (EN-6) applies to nuclear projects capable of being deployed by the end of 2025. This new National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation (EN-7) will set out the criteria developers must meet within their application for Development Consent, including on site assessment and the design of the proposed nuclear infrastructure, providing a robust policy framework to guide decision-making.

1.1.3 The planning system for major infrastructure needs to be rapid, consistent and accountable. The National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation sets out government policy on how applications for Development Consent to build nuclear infrastructure will be handled. It clearly outlines the considerations and standards that applicants and other stakeholders will need to address, ensuring transparency and understanding throughout the process.

1.1.4 Designated under the Planning Act 2008, National Policy Statements serve as crucial guidance for decision-makers, delineating the necessity for infrastructure and outlining the policy framework for making planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure projects. The overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), redesignated in January 2024 (originally designated in July 2011), explains that Critical National Priority (CNP) projects are essential for achieving the UK's energy goals. These projects are given special importance because they help with national security, economic growth, and reaching net zero emissions. Essentially, the benefits of these projects are in general considered to outweigh any remaining negative impacts that can't be fully mitigated.

1.1.5 The first round consultation was launched in January 2024 (‘*A National Policy Statement for new nuclear power generation: new approach to siting beyond 2025)*[1] and covered the site assessment criteria and process for developing a new National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation. This was the first step towards designating a new National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation beyond 2025, EN-7. The consultation was published on 11 January and closed on 10 March 2024, and there were 141 respondents. In response to the consultation, industry and stakeholders signalled positive support for the proposed approach to EN-7.

1.1.6 This second round consultation and the draft EN-7 outlines a strategic approach to planning to help navigate the changing nuclear landscape in the UK since EN-6 was designated in 2011. The draft EN-7 will:

i. provide for Small and Advanced Modular Reactors, as well as GW-scale nuclear infrastructure

ii. bring nuclear into line with other energy infrastructure and provide applicants with robust criteria for site selection

iii. remove deployment deadlines from the planning framework for new nuclear

1.1.7 Now that the policy approach is more defined, this second round consultation uses terminology differently to the first round consultation:

i. ‘Nuclear infrastructure’ is the term used in EN-7 and this second round consultation to refer to all projects within the scope of EN-7, which EN-7 defines as:

“infrastructure using nuclear fission to generate energy, as well as to any infrastructure ancillary to this (as per paragraph 1.3.13 of EN-1) that is:

A. defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project by the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), or

B. treated as development for which Development Consent is required according to Section 35 and 35ZA of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended)”

Where we refer to a specific type of nuclear infrastructure, or to nuclear energy generating stations that do not fall within the EN-7 definition of Nuclear Infrastructure in this second round consultation, we use more specific language.

ii. ‘Development’ has the same meaning in this second round consultation as in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), set out in Section 32 of that Act.

[1] Consultation for a new National Policy Statement *https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/approach-to-siting-new-nuclear-power-stations-beyond-2025*

iii. 'Developer' is used in this second round consultation to refer to a person who has yet to apply for Development Consent, and has the same meaning as in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended):

"a person who is wholly or partly responsible for carrying out a development"

iv. 'Applicant' is used in this second round consultation, and EN-7 itself, to refer to a developer (as defined above) who has applied for Development Consent, and must meet the criteria set out in EN-7 to secure Development Consent for their proposed nuclear infrastructure.

v. Going forward we will no longer use the terms 'Exclusionary' and 'Discretionary' to divide the criteria within EN-7. We will only use these terms in this second round consultation when referring to the content of the first round consultation, or stakeholder responses to that content. We are proposing these changes because within the draft EN-7, failing to satisfy any single Factor Influencing Site Selection, Technical Consideration and/ or Impact criteria are grounds for an application for Development Consent to be refused by the Secretary of State.

Broadly, the criteria referred to as 'Exclusionary' within the first round consultation are those where there is only one way that an applicant may demonstrate they meet the standards set out in the National Policy Statement; for example for Population Density, the proposed development must meet the requirements of the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion or Development Consent will be refused. The criteria previously referred to as 'Discretionary' within the first round consultation are those where the applicant may have more options about how to satisfy the requirements of EN-7, but must nonetheless do so. For example, for Flood Risk, the applicant may meet the criteria by locating the proposed development in a location where there is no significant flood risk now and in future, or by engineering defences sufficient to protect the infrastructure now and in future without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

1.2 Structure of this document

1.2.1 This document combines a government response to the first round consultation launched in January 2024 and a new second round consultation on the draft National Policy Statement, EN-7:

- Section 2 sets out the government's analysis of views and responses to the first round consultation in more detail
- Section 3 is the government's response to the views provided through the first round consultation, combined with a new second round consultation on the draft National Policy Statement, EN-7. This section covers:
  - Our overall approach to EN-7, including how our approach differs from EN-6
  - Specific elements of the assessment criteria that inform the case for siting nuclear infrastructure. This covers Factors Influencing Site Selection, Technical Considerations and Impacts

- Section 4 provides a summary of the second round consultation questions
- Section 5 sets out the process and timeline towards designation of EN-7

2 Government analysis of responses to ‘A National Policy Statement for new nuclear power generation: new approach to siting beyond 2025’ consultation

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Section 2 provides an analysis of the responses received to the first round consultation launched in January 2024, titled ‘A National Policy Statement for new nuclear power generation: new approach to siting beyond 2025.’[1]

2.2 Scope of the consultation

2.2.1 The first round consultation, launched in January 2024, focused on potential changes to the nuclear siting approach to inform the drafting of the new National Policy Statement, EN-7. We have carefully considered all responses received, and appreciate the time and effort invested by all respondents. This input has been instrumental in shaping our next steps. While we plan to proceed with many of our initial proposals, we have adjusted others based on the responses provided. These adjustments are outlined in Section 3. This Section also provides the government’s responses to the questions asked in the first round consultation.

2.2.2 Issues beyond the scope of the first round consultation, such as on the government’s policy for offshore nuclear siting, the role of Great British Nuclear (GBN) or nuclear energy’s role in the future energy mix, are not included in this government response. We also acknowledge that a number of respondents raised concerns about nuclear safety, environmental impact and cost. These issues are not addressed here because the overarching energy National Policy Statement, EN-1, sets out the government’s conclusion that there is an urgent need for new nuclear, which is a safe and low carbon source of energy.

2.2.3 In some instances, the responses received were relevant to a different question within the consultation. In these situations, the points raised have been addressed under the most appropriate question.

2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 The first round consultation was published online with an accompanying survey link, allowing respondents to participate via Citizen Space or by email. All responses submitted were reviewed and categorised according to relevant questions to ensure

consistency. Overall, 141 consultation responses were received, 113 (80%) via Citizen Space and 28 (20%) by email.

2.3.2 Respondents were able to select multiple interests that they considered applied to them, and as such, totalled to more than the 141 respondents who responded to the consultation. For example, an individual may have selected that they were both a ‘member of the general public’ and a ‘local community member in the vicinity of an existing nuclear installation’. Therefore, throughout this document, any data that is broken down by respondent type may not add to 141.

2.3.3 The consultation featured both closed-ended questions, where respondents could select from predefined answers ('Strongly Agree', 'Agree', 'Undecided', 'Disagree', 'Strongly Disagree', 'Not Enough Information'), and open-ended questions with free text boxes. Unanswered questions were recorded as ‘Not Answered’.

2.3.4 Quantitative data was collated from the pre-defined answers and are reflected by the number of respondents and corresponding percentage of those who agreed or disagreed; note that the values may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Not all respondents answered every question, therefore the total number of responses for some questions is less than the total number of respondents to the consultation.

2.3.5 Open-ended responses underwent a manual review, with responses grouped into themes. The analysis was qualitative and therefore do not have defined numerical data. Each response could belong to multiple themes, resulting in a higher number of themed responses than total responses. Responses that did not fit into any theme were categorised as 'Other' and were regularly reviewed to determine if new themes were needed, though none were identified. Responses underwent quantitative and qualitative analysis. Each response was reviewed twice to identify themes and policy recommendations, followed by a consistency check. The analysis was quantified where possible, but weighting was not applied due to the small sample size and overlapping memberships.

2.4 The key policy proposals (consultation questions 1–4)

2.4.1 Question 1: EN-6 applies only to GW-scale projects. In this consultation we propose EN-7 applies to GW-scale projects, and in addition Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors. What is your view on the government proposal to expand the range of technologies covered by the new nuclear National Policy Statement?

75 (59%) of the 128 respondents, including nuclear developers and industry experts, supported the inclusion of Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors in EN-7, citing increased opportunities, diversity, and contributions to energy security and net zero goals. Conversely, 52 (41%) respondents, mainly from individual members of the public and environmental campaign groups, disagreed with the proposal due to concerns about radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management, safety, ecological impacts, and opposition in principle to nuclear energy. Respondents in support emphasised the need for a standardised planning approach across all nuclear projects to ensure consistency and clarity.

2.4.2 Question 2: EN-6 includes government assessed potential sites. In this consultation we propose EN-7 empowers developers to assess and identify potential sites using robust criteria. What is your view on the government proposal to shift its nuclear siting policy to a criteria-based approach?

2.4.3 60 (47%) of the 129 respondents, primarily from the nuclear industry, supported the criteria-based approach, citing increased opportunities, flexibility, and alignment with industry needs. 56 (43%) respondents, including several individual members of public and environmental campaign groups, expressed concerns about the risk of applicants having too much freedom in site selection, potential ecological impacts, and the loss of protections for sites designated in EN-6. Some also raised concerns that a criteria-based approach might broaden the range of alternative sites that applicants must consider.

2.4.4 Question 3: EN-6 includes a time limit on deployment of new nuclear power stations. In this consultation we propose EN-7 is not time restricted to support long-term planning. What is your view on the government proposal to shift its nuclear siting policy to an unrestricted timeframe approach?

2.4.5 63 (50%) of the 123 respondents supported the removal of the deployment time limit, citing increased flexibility and the potential to accelerate nuclear development. Those in favour included respondents from the nuclear industry and local authorities. Conversely, 50 (40%) respondents, primarily from individual members of public and community groups, expressed concerns about the lack of a timeframe. They suggested that deadlines help ensure timely development and provide certainty. Industry stakeholders also highlighted the importance of maintaining momentum in nuclear project delivery.

2.4.6 Question 4: The National Policy Statement aims to deliver increased flexibility to diversify nuclear sites to help meet our net zero ambitions, while ensuring that siting of new nuclear power stations is constrained by appropriate criteria. To what extent do you agree that the key policy proposals outlined in this section (extending the National Policy Statement to new technologies, adopting a criteria-based approach to siting new developments, and removing the deployment time limit to open more siting) achieve these aims?

2.4.7 As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. The responses to this question are addressed elsewhere in Section 2.4.

2.5 Broadening the scope of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime (consultation questions 5–6)

2.5.1 **Question 5: Do you agree that legislation should be brought forward to include all nuclear fission projects within the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project**

regime in England, including reactors with a generating output of less than 50 MW and reactors that only produce heat or synthetic fuels such as hydrogen?

2.5.2 As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. The responses to this question are addressed in paragraph 2.5.4.

2.5.3 **Question 6: Do you have any evidence or technical information regarding fission reactors which only produce heat or synthetic fuels that may be useful to help inform whether they should be included in the nuclear National Policy Statement beyond 2025?**

2.5.4 94 (76%) of the 123 responses supported including all nuclear fission projects within the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime, highlighting benefits such as increased opportunities and consistency in planning. However, concerns were raised by 12 (10%) respondents about the cost and the potential resource intensity of the planning process for smaller projects. Some stakeholders suggested a more flexible approach for smaller, innovative reactors and called for clearer legal definitions.

2.6 Site assessment criteria that are impacted as a result of our key policy proposals (consultation questions 7–7d)

2.6.1 Question 7: Do you agree that we have correctly identified the criteria that are impacted by our proposed key policy changes?

As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. The responses to this question included topics such as strengthening the flooding criterion, including additional criteria such as climate change, marine environment, social impact and protected wildlife and habitats, considering different criteria for different technologies and the possibility of a risk-based approach to certain criteria for advanced nuclear. These topics are covered in other areas of this document: see question 7a and 7b for flood risk and assessment; question 7c for locational characteristics and population densities; and question 8a for climate change. Calls for additional criteria will be addressed in the response to questions 7c, 7d and 8.

2.6.2 Question 7a: Further comments regarding flooding, tsunami and storm surge and coastal processes

2.6.3 The 27 responses were mixed, with concerns over flood risk at both coastal and inland sites. Some stakeholders, including local authorities and public bodies, suggested making flooding an exclusionary criterion and recommended that local modelling be used in flood risk assessments. There was recognition across a number of responses that the inclusion of inland flooding as a consideration in this criterion could be applicable for new nuclear technologies, but there were very limited comments provided about the tsunami or storm surge elements of the flooding, tsunami and storm surge criterion, or the coastal processes criterion. One response questioned the relevance of

tsunamis to the UK, while another suggested that areas at risk of tsunamis should be made exclusionary.

2.6.4 Question 7b: Evidence for government to consider as part of considerations of whether to narrow the scope of flood risk assessments

2.6.5 Of the 27 responses received to this question, most respondents provided further opinion on the flood risk criterion. Limited evidence on the flood risk assessments was received. Some industry respondents identified the benefits of narrowing the flood risk assessment scope to focus consideration of alternative sites to the regional and local levels, particularly for Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors. However, others, including local authorities, argued that flood risk should be an exclusionary criterion and expressed concerns about the long-term viability of flood risk assessments. Some stakeholders also questioned whether the new criteria-based approach could create extra burdens for applicants undertaking the flood risk assessment or if applicants might not conduct assessments thoroughly.

2.6.6 Question 7c: Further comments regarding locational characteristics and population densities

2.6.7 Of the 37 responses received, the majority 31 (84%) respondents sought changes to the population density criterion. Nuclear industry stakeholders argued that the semi-urban exclusionary criterion was not suitable for Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors, which could provide energy and heat closer to populated areas and industrial clusters. They suggested a more risk-based approach, citing international practices. Conversely, responses from some community groups and individual members of public expressed safety concerns, feeling that the criterion might not offer adequate protections.

2.6.8 Question 7d: Further comments regarding other criteria that are impacted upon that have not been identified above

2.6.9 As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. Many responses wanted to see climate change included in the criteria. Further criteria were proposed: geology and seismology characteristics, World Heritage Sites, Local Wildlife Sites, existing infrastructure around sites and protecting Marine Conservation Zones. Others expressed concerns about the impact of site infrastructure and transport on the health and safety of residents. Climate change, and the government's position on a climate change criterion, is discussed in responses to Question 8a. Marine Conservation Zones are already captured under the Nationally Designated Sites of Ecological Importance criterion and are discussed in responses to Question 9d. World Heritage sites are already captured by the Areas of Amenity and Landscape Value and Cultural Heritage criteria and are discussed in responses to Question 9e.

2.7 Matters considered for, but discounted from, inclusion as new site assessment criteria (consultation questions 8–8c)

2.7.1 **Question 8: Do you agree that we have correctly identified that these criteria are embedded in EN-7, EN-1 and within wider guidance?**

2.7.2 As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. This question produced responses which suggested having specific site assessment criteria for climate change resilience and adaptation, and groundwater protection. Some respondents suggested the consideration of new impacts or criteria: social and economic criteria; and water management. The responses to this question are addressed elsewhere in Section 2. Groundwater protection and climate change are discussed in 8a and 8c. Flood risk is discussed further in response to questions 7a and 7b and population density is discussed further in response to question 7c. Access to suitable sources of potable water is discussed in the response to question 8c.

2.7.3 **Question 8a: Further comments regarding climate change resilience and adaptation**

2.7.4 24 respondents provided feedback on climate change resilience and adaptation. Many of these respondents called for climate change to be included as a specific site assessment criterion, and some suggested it should be exclusionary. Concerns were raised about the impact of rising sea levels, flooding, and extreme weather events on nuclear sites. Industry respondents suggested that different technologies, like Small Modular Reactors, might require distinct considerations.

2.7.5 **Question 8b: Further comments regarding groundwater protection**

2.7.6 19 respondents commented on groundwater protection, with 13 (68%) respondents advocating for it to be included as a specific site assessment criterion. These respondents mainly represented local authorities, environmental campaigning groups, and regulators. They suggested that groundwater source protection zones should be included as a site assessment criterion. Concerns were raised about the risk of radioactive waste contaminating groundwater, though this is addressed separately under radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management considerations.

2.7.7 **Question 8c: Other criteria that should be considered for discounting from the National Policy Statement as they are embedded elsewhere**

2.7.8 As set out in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. Some respondents expressed that there should be different criteria for Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors due to their lesser impact; and that siting criteria should be consistent across the regulators. Four further criteria were suggested by five respondents: marine environment; radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management; social and economic criterion; and protecting potable water. Concerns

surrounding radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management, and social and economic impacts are addressed in questions 10b and question 8 respectively.

2.8 Site assessment criteria without significant development (consultation questions 9–9h)

2.8.1 Question 9: Do you agree that we have correctly identified that these criteria do not require any significant development?

As set out in paragraph 2.2.3, there are certain questions where the responses received were relevant to and have been considered in other questions. Several of the issues raised are covered in sub-question responses where we have provided more detailed responses. Proximity to military activities is discussed in responses to question 9a, impacts on aviation fuel production is discussed in 9c, integration of marine plans is discussed in 9g and changes to siting criteria and siting criteria more broadly are discussed in 9f.

2.8.2 Question 9a: Further comments regarding proximity to military activities

2.8.3 Out of 18 respondents, some supported the current criterion and some highlighted the potential benefits of siting nuclear infrastructure near military facilities such as enhanced security and operational suitability. They also suggested smaller Advanced Nuclear Technologies pose lower risks compared to larger types of infrastructure. Other stakeholders requested further clarification on what constitutes "military activities" and suggested that certain Ministry of Defence areas might be suitable for nuclear development. They also advocated for consideration of the marine plans at the site selection stage to mitigate conflict with defence activities in the marine area.

2.8.4 Question 9b: Further comments regarding proximity to major hazard sites and major accident hazard pipelines

2.8.5 Of the 12 respondents to this question, most were from the nuclear development sector or energy professionals. They supported the current criterion and suggested that the smaller nature of Advanced Nuclear Technologies and their lower risk profile could allow for these to be situated closer to hazardous sites. They also suggested that the reduced size and inherent safety features of Advanced Nuclear Technologies mitigate the risks associated with major hazard sites, as the threats to nuclear facilities are covered in safety assessments, ensuring that risks are addressed before obtaining a nuclear site license. However, some stakeholders suggested that the criteria should allow more flexibility for Small Modular Reactors and address additional risks such as wind turbines. They argued that stricter limitations may hinder the optimal siting of nuclear facilities.

2.8.6 Question 9c: Further comments regarding proximity to civil aircraft and spacecraft movements

2.8.7 15 respondents provided feedback, primarily from nuclear development organisations and supply chains. Most agreed that the current criterion sufficiently addresses risks

posed by aircraft movements, especially for smaller Advanced Nuclear Technologies, which they suggested pose reduced risks. Some stakeholders highlighted potential benefits of siting Advanced Nuclear Technologies near airports or military bases for energy generation. However, a minority called for further development of the criterion, particularly regarding nuclear technologies for aviation fuel production and the proximity of Small Modular Reactors to aviation facilities.

2.8.8 Question 9d: Further comments regarding nationally and internationally designated sites of ecological importance

2.8.9 18 respondents commented on these criteria. Most supported retaining the current criteria, noting that new technologies like Advanced Modular Reactors could reduce the environmental impact. Some, however, called for further development, advocating for a more exclusionary approach, including expanding the criteria to cover adjacent and marine areas. Others emphasised the need for stricter protections for National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and World Heritage Sites.

2.8.10 Question 9e: Further comments regarding areas of amenity and landscape value and cultural heritage

2.8.11 A total of 18 respondents provided feedback, with many calling for further development of the criteria. Some suggested making the criteria exclusionary, especially for areas like National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and World Heritage Sites. Others supported the current criteria but recommended reviewing the wording to ensure they are sufficiently robust, with greater clarity on landscape categorisation and protection, particularly given new duties from the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023.

2.8.12 Question 9f: Further comments regarding size of site to accommodate operation

2.8.13 15 respondents commented on size of site, with many suggesting the criteria should be more comprehensive, including landscaping and space for construction, servicing, and transportation. Some stakeholders supported the criteria, especially for Small Modular Reactors due to their smaller footprint. Others called for revisions to consider distributed storage facilities and long-term radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management more explicitly.

2.8.14 Question 9g: Further comments regarding access to suitable sources of cooling

2.8.15 25 respondents provided feedback. Some stakeholders agreed the current criterion was adequate, while others called for clearer distinctions between GW-scale and smaller projects. Some Non-Governmental Organisations advocated for cooling water to be an exclusionary criterion. Other respondents emphasised that Advanced Nuclear Technologies might use alternative cooling methods. Concerns were raised about the environmental impact on marine life and the need to differentiate cooling needs based on the scale of the nuclear project.

2.8.16 Question 9h: Further comments regarding other criteria that are without significant development but have not been identified above

2.8.17 As set out in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. Radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management was raised here and some responses suggested that EN-7 should mirror EN-6's approach but extend to cover Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors. This is discussed further in responses to question 10b. Impacts of Multiple Reactors and Biodiversity Net Gain was also raised as respondents support the consideration of cumulative effects from multiple reactors proposed on one site, urging for EN-7 to be relevant to all scales of development. This is discussed further in responses to question 10c and 10e respectively.

2.9 Other matters considered in EN-6 (consultation questions 10–10f)

2.9.1 Question 10: Do you agree with the approach we have proposed in regard to the other matters that were considered in EN-6 and will need considering in EN-7?

2.9.2 As noted in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. Responses outlined that these matters which required consideration in EN-6 were important to keep developing in planning, policy, and regulation, and that the criteria-led approach overall would support the nuclear industry. Several of the issues raised are covered in sub-question responses where we have provided more detailed responses. Merits of a nominated site in comparison to alternative solutions is discussed in the response to 10a and radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management is discussed in the response to 10b. Standardisation and efficiency in the planning process and the implementation section more broadly is addressed in response 10a. Grandfathering of EN-6 sites and concerns over the shift from the government identifying potential sites to a criteria-led approach is addressed in the response to question 2.

2.9.3 Question 10a: Further comments regarding merits of a nominated site in comparison to other alternative solutions

2.9.4 33 respondents commented on the merits of a nominated site in comparison to alternative solutions. Some argued that requiring alternative site assessments could be costly and resource-intensive for applicants, while others believed that sites should be selected based on their merits. Local authorities favoured continuing the use of EN-6 sites without reassessment. Some stakeholders called for collaboration between industry and government to ensure suitable site selection, stressing the need for flexibility to meet nuclear capacity targets.

2.9.5 Question 10b: Further comments regarding radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management

2.9.6 26 respondents raised concerns about there not being a Geological Disposal Facility in the UK at present, creating uncertainty for long-term radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management and disposal for new nuclear projects. Stakeholders emphasised the need for flexible regulatory frameworks to address emerging challenges, technological advancements, and the potential for reusing spent fuel. Other concerns included the long-term storage of spent fuel on site, suitability of a Geological Disposal Facility, and the siting of a Geological Disposal Facility, which are covered in separate policy documents. Public safety and community benefits were also highlighted.

2.9.7 Question 10c: Further comments regarding impacts of multiple reactors

2.9.8 30 respondents provided feedback on the impact of deploying multiple reactors on a single site. Some stakeholders stressed the importance of setting the maximum number of reactors early on, especially given the modular nature of new technologies. Others noted that nuclear sites might be developed in phases, making it difficult to determine the final number of reactors at the outset. Concerns were raised about regulatory challenges, cumulative impacts on resources, and the risks of unplanned expansions. Respondents called for strategic assessments of land use, cooling needs, radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management, and environmental impacts for sites with multiple reactors.

2.9.9 Question 10d: Further comments regarding ownership of sites

2.9.10 15 respondents commented on site ownership. Most agreed that land ownership should not be a criterion for site selection. Stakeholders argued that site suitability should be based on technical and environmental factors, not whether the landowner is willing to sell. They also raised concerns about changing ownership and emphasised the need for clear and transparent land management processes. Long-term considerations, such as decommissioning, were also highlighted.

2.9.11 Question 10e: Further comments regarding Biodiversity Net Gain

2.9.12 19 respondents provided input on Biodiversity Net Gain. Most agreed it should be a consideration for nuclear projects, though some respondents questioned the appropriate percentage for net gain. Concerns were raised about the costs and challenges of achieving Biodiversity Net Gain. Stakeholders emphasised the need for clear guidance, a strategic approach for large-scale projects, and strong environmental metrics and regulatory frameworks.

2.9.13 Question 10f: Further comments regarding other matters that should be considered further as part of the criteria-based approach

2.9.14 As set out in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. A variety of responses were received to this question, covering different matters that respondents felt should be considered further. There were some common comments regarding social-economic factors being included in the criteria-based approach, and that a criterion regarding the availability of existing infrastructure at a site may be useful. A regulator suggested there be a requirement for a criterion for water resources relating

to construction and operation (not just for cooling purposes). The responses to this question are addressed in questions 10 – 10e.

2.10 Implementation of key policy proposals (consultation questions 11–12)

2.10.1 Question 11: The 'Implementation' section describes how the new policy approach will be implemented. What are your views on the proposed model for implementation?

2.10.2 52 (43%) of the 120 respondents agreed with the proposed implementation model, particularly new nuclear developers and regulators, due to its support for energy security and nuclear generation diversity. Some respondents, however, sought more clarity on regulatory access, Great British Nuclear's role, and the need for a joined-up government approach. Concerns were raised by members of the public, environmental advocates, and some within the nuclear industry about risks related to site suitability and the lack of a strategic spatial plan. Some stakeholders also highlighted the importance of early engagement with local authorities and communities.

2.10.3 Question 12: What, if any, help from government or Great British Nuclear would you expect to see to support developers with site identification?

2.10.4 Of the 65 respondents, many called for greater clarity on Great British Nuclear's role, with most suggesting more support for developers intending to apply for Development Consent. Proposals included Great British Nuclear acting as a coordinator between developers intending to apply for Development Consent, government departments, and regulators to streamline regulatory processes and help with site identification. Respondents also emphasised the need for Great British Nuclear to engage early with local authorities, act as a repository of information, and support supply chains and skills development.

2.11 Any additional information (consultation question 13)

2.11.1 Question 13: Is there any additional information, perspective, or consideration that you believe is important to the development of the nuclear National Policy Statement, which may not have been adequately addressed or is missing from the consultation document? Please share your insights and suggestions.

2.11.2 As set out in paragraph 2.2.3, some responses are relevant to other questions. The main response theme for Question 13 was for a different approach to the criteria included in the siting approach. Many of these responses called for the inclusion of social and environmental criteria. Concerns around site ecology, safety and radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management remained common themes, as did the need for early and wide stakeholder engagement as part of implementation. The responses to this question are addressed elsewhere in Sections 2.4 - 2.10.

3 Government response to the first round consultation and the second round consultation on the draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation EN-7

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Section 3 contains our second round consultation, which outlines the government's approach to the draft EN-7 in light of responses to the first round consultation. Given the responses to the approach in the first round consultation, the Government intends to largely adopt the proposals outlined. This second round consultation will therefore concentrate on refining the draft EN-7 by addressing any outstanding issues to ensure the policy framework is robust and fit for purpose.

3.1.2 This section is structured as follows:

- our overall approach to EN-7
- the assessment criteria that will inform a decision on whether to grant Development Consent for nuclear infrastructure, including Factors Influencing Site Selection, Technical Considerations and Impacts

3.1.3 The first round consultation focused on the Factors Influencing Site Selection aspects of EN-7, which have been refined based on the feedback received. Although the Technical Considerations and Impacts were not consulted on in the first round consultation, they address similar considerations to those areas covered by the Factors Influencing Site Selection. As such, responses to the first round consultation informed and shaped the development of the Technical Considerations and Impact criteria outlined in the draft EN-7.

3.1.4 EN-6 included a range of criteria to inform decisions on the siting of new nuclear infrastructure. These criteria were used to assess the potential sites nominated by industry as part of the Strategic Siting Assessment carried out by government. In the first round consultation, it was proposed that the new National Policy Statement would be criteria-based using largely the same criteria as in EN-6, but that these site assessment criteria would be used by developers intending to apply for Development Consent to select suitable sites.

3.1.5 Given the volume, breadth, and detail of the responses, it is not feasible to address every point raised in response to the first round consultation in detail. We have focused on responding to the main areas of feedback, ensuring that the key issues raised by respondents are addressed, and we set out how our proposals have changed, or not, as a result of the feedback.

3.2 Overall approach to EN-7

3.2.1 When EN-6 was designated in 2011, the only feasible technology available was large-scale infrastructure capable of generating in excess of a GW of electricity, which meant EN-6 was only designed to facilitate this type of infrastructure. Within the document a range of sites were also listed where deployment of large-scale nuclear infrastructure was deemed possible by 2025. This list of potentially suitable sites was produced through developer site nominations and a government-led Strategic Siting Assessment.

3.2.2 We are now entering a period where the UK has opportunities to deploy a more diverse range of nuclear energy technologies. Consequently, it is vital to ensure the planning framework continues to evolve to reflect the range of nuclear technologies available and the energy security ambitions of government.

3.2.3 This section covers the three changes in approach proposed for EN-7, compared to EN-6.

3.2.4 **The inclusion of Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors alongside large-scale GW technologies.** As noted in section 2, 75 (59%) of the 128 respondents to this proposal in the first round consultation, including nuclear developers and industry experts, supported the inclusion of Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors in EN-7. Considering the first round consultation responses and the ongoing commitment to nuclear deployment, the government will design EN-7 to accommodate these types of infrastructure, alongside GW-scale infrastructure. This will support the nuclear industry's growth and innovation, the diversification of potential uses of nuclear, and recognises the increased opportunities for co-generation (for example providing district heating, supporting industrial applications, producing hydrogen, and enabling desalination). This unified planning policy for Small Modular Reactors, Advanced Modular Reactors, and GW-scale infrastructure will offer developers intending to apply for Development Consent the flexibility to deploy the right technology for their proposed usage and site.

3.2.5 While acknowledging concerns raised by respondents about potential safety and environmental impacts, the government believes the UK's stringent regulatory regime ensures these are properly managed. EN-7 will require that decisions on the applications for nuclear sites are informed by its criteria, sustainability and environmental assessments. Prior to deployment, Small and Advanced Modular Reactors will be required to meet the same safety standards as nuclear infrastructure operating now, including any new passive safety systems. Specific government policies for radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management will ensure that the waste from Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors can be managed safely and effectively, similar to how radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management from nuclear infrastructure operating now is safely stored and disposed of without any harm to the public or environment.

3.2.6 **A criteria-based approach.** As noted in section 2**,** 60 (47%) out of 129 respondents, primarily from the nuclear industry, supported the criteria-based approach. The

government will implement a criteria-based approach in EN-7, moving away from the EN-6 approach of identifying locations potentially suitable for development by a specified date. In moving to this approach, the criteria will cater for different nuclear technologies and project sizes, whilst screening out unsuitable locations and ensuring nuclear is developed in suitable areas. This greater flexibility, reflecting the diverse needs of emerging nuclear technologies, also enables the potential to identify and develop new suitable sites over the long term. EN-7 will provide a framework of robust criteria to guide applicants in selecting and developing suitable sites, focusing on safety, security, and managing environmental and other impacts to host locations and communities. Given the continuity in criteria between EN-6 and EN-7, the sites listed in EN-6 are likely to retain inherent positive attributes that make them attractive for consideration for development within the regime set by EN-7. Alongside a new criteria-based approach, EN-7 will aim to encourage the development of those sites listed in EN-6 even though EN-6 is no longer the primary National Policy Statement.

3.2.7 **The removal of a deployment deadline.** As noted in Section 2, 63 (50%) out of 126 respondents supported the removal of the deployment time limit. The government will not include a deployment time limit in EN-7, reflecting the significant support for this flexible approach. The use of a relatively near-term deadline (in nuclear deployment terms) in EN-6, which was designated in 2011 and included a deadline of 2025, did not appear to expedite nuclear projects. The removal of this time limit will provide planning certainty and avoid discouraging developments which are in the early stages of planning and may not have met a set deployment deadline.

3.3 Broadening the scope of projects entering the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime

3.3.1 The first round consultation proposed bringing nuclear energy generating stations with a generating capacity below 50 MW (electric), as well as energy generating stations generating heat, into the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime. The current arrangements governing the 50 MW (electric) threshold for nuclear projects are set out in the Planning Act 2008. This Act stipulates that developments over 50 MW (electric) are treated as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in England and are subject to the Development Consent process. There is currently no threshold for heat producing infrastructure.

3.3.2 As noted in Section 2.5.4, 94 (76%) of the 123 responses supported including all nuclear fission projects within the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime, highlighting benefits such as increased opportunities and consistency in planning. Considering the consultation responses, the government will proceed with broadening the scope of the Planning Act to include energy generating stations generating heat, though legislative changes may not be in place before EN-7's designation in 2025. Until then, EN-7 will guide planning decisions, with existing routes under the Planning Act 2008 available for projects.

3.3.3 Upon further consideration of the existing flexibility in the planning framework and considering consultation feedback, the government has decided to not currently proceed with the proposed amendments to the 50 MW (electric) generating threshold. For the immediate future we consider that retaining the 50 MW (electric) threshold in the planning and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime will support the development of advanced nuclear technologies and ensure that planning requirements are proportionate to the scale and impact of different projects. Projects below 50 MW (electric) may still require Secretary of State approval for development under the following statutory provisions:

- Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Secretary of State for the Housing, Communities and Local Government can 'call in' projects
- Section 35 and Section 35ZA of the Planning Act 2008 – developers can request their projects are treated as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, requiring a Development Consent application, which the relevant Secretary of State may agree to if they are satisfied the project meets relevant criteria.

3.3.4 The Welsh government has established the Infrastructure (Wales) Act 2024 for the consenting of large-scale infrastructure projects. This will capture projects in Wales that have between 50 and 350 MW (electric) generating threshold (except Wind that has no upper threshold). Welsh government have consulted on their proposals (Implementing the Infrastructure (Wales) Act 2024,[2] for the implementation of the Act. Projects below 50 MW (electric) may still require Welsh Ministers approval for development through:

- Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Welsh Ministers can 'call in' projects
- Section 22 and 23 of the 2024 Act – developers can request their projects are treated as a Significant Infrastructure Project, or Welsh Ministers can direct a development is a Significant Infrastructure Project if they are satisfied the project meets relevant criteria (details are set out in the consultation paper on projects that may be directed, and will consider the inclusion of infrastructure with a generating capacity below 50 MW (electric), as well as infrastructure generating heat)

3.3.5 In Wales, projects with an installed output of more than 350 MW (electric) are examined by the Planning Inspectorate and decided by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero.

Question 1: To what extent do you agree with the modification of this approach in light of the consultation feedback:

To retain the < 50 MW (electric) threshold in the existing planning framework and to review our position in the future?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the question

[2] https://www.gov.wales/implementing-infrastructure-wales-act-2024

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 1a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

3.4 Overall approach to EN-7: Implementation and additional pre-application support

3.4.1 The first round consultation launched in January 2024. It proposed that developers intending to apply for Development Consent should use the population density and proximity to military activities criteria, set out in EN-7, to screen and identify potentially suitable sites, before continuing site characterisation to determine whether a site meets the other criteria. This marks a change from the EN-6 process whereby government assessed nominated sites against these criteria. The first round consultation recommended that developers intending to apply for Development Consent undertake early engagement with the relevant regulators to assist with applications for environmental permits and planning consent. The developer may then consider if it would be appropriate to apply for a Development Consent Order.

3.4.2 Considering the first round consultation responses, the government will move forward with this approach, focusing on improving early engagement with both local authorities and regulators. Recent planning reforms aim to streamline the process, including a fast-track option for significant projects and enhanced pre-application services. The government is preparing a supplementary information document and will engage with industry to inform its development.

3.5 Other considerations and principles

Climate change adaptation and mitigation

3.5.1 Climate change adaptation and mitigation will form a core part of EN-7, and the government recognises the calls for climate change to be included as a specific site assessment criterion, as well as the concerns around the impact of extreme weather events on nuclear infrastructure. However, we are satisfied that EN-1, the relevant

criteria in EN-7 and wider guidance[3] sufficiently address the issues raised through addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation in an overarching chapter and as part of the relevant criteria, such as flood risk. Therefore, the government will proceed with the proposed approach of not adding a specific climate change criterion but will ensure that the effects of climate change are prominently referenced within relevant sections of EN-7.

Impacts of multiple reactors

3.5.2 The government acknowledges the views raised in response to the first round consultation proposal to enable phased development of multiple reactors on a site. Considering the supportive responses to the proposals in the first round consultation, EN-7 will enable deployment of multiple reactors and/or multiple reactor types at a site.

3.5.3 Nuclear infrastructure has normally been developed at a site as one large project, rather than something expanded over time in 'phases', which is more common with renewable energy generation and other forms of development such as housing. However, Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors may support a deployment pattern where nuclear infrastructure expands over time, either as part of phases provided for in a single Development Consent Order (along with mitigations for the impacts of each phase), or as separate Development Consent Orders if the applicant did not plan for phased development at the outset.

3.5.4 This is clearly addressed in EN-7, where it is stated that applicants may apply for a single Development Consent Order which provides for development in phases, or seek a Development Consent Order for each separate phase of development as their intentions for the site evolve over time. This approach ensures that every phase of nuclear infrastructure development is subject to the appropriate safety and sustainability standards provided for in EN-7, EN-1 and other relevant legal, planning and regulatory requirements.

Radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management

3.5.5 The government acknowledges the concerns raised in response to the first round consultation about radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel from nuclear infrastructure, including from advanced nuclear technologies which may produce new forms of waste.

3.5.6 EN-7 responds to these concerns by clearly setting out how the proposals brought forward by the applicant comprehensively accommodate the safe and secure interim storage of radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, including protecting relevant infrastructure from threats including flooding. EN-7 also clearly states that through environmental assessment, environmental permitting and nuclear site licensing,

[3] The most recent such material at the time of publication: Climate change adaptation: policy information (2022). *https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/climate-change-adaptation-policy-information/climate-change-adaptation-policy-information*.

applicants will be required to demonstrate that spent fuel and the most hazardous radioactive waste arising from the operation of the nuclear infrastructure can be managed within the planned UK Geological Disposal Facility. Applicants will also be required by environmental assessment, environmental permitting and nuclear site licensing to demonstrate that there will be safe, secure and environmentally acceptable interim storage arrangements until a Geological Disposal Facility can accept the waste.

Security of site

3.5.7 Ensuring that new nuclear infrastructure is properly secured is vital. EN-7 refers to Section 4.16 of EN-1, which addresses this in detail. The Office for Nuclear Regulation independently regulates security for the UK's civil nuclear industry, ensuring that security is maintained for the full life cycle of the nuclear facility. EN-7 states that applicants should consult with the Office for Nuclear Regulation to ensure that security measures and the management of security risks have been adequately considered.

The potential suitability of sites listed in EN-6 for nuclear development

3.5.8 The government has considered suggestions to include a statement on the suitability of the sites listed in EN-6 for nuclear development.

3.5.9 EN-6 listed eight named sites that it concluded were potentially suitable for the development of GW-scale nuclear infrastructure by 2025, based on a Strategic Siting Assessment. Developers were still required to secure a Development Consent Order before development could commence at those sites.

3.5.10 The conclusions on the potential suitability of sites in EN-6 necessarily relied on a detailed and timely assessment of the sites, and to reach a similar conclusion EN-7 would require the same rigorous evidence base. The Site Nominations and Strategic Siting Assessment process that informed EN-6 took approximately three years.

3.5.11 The sites listed in EN-6 retain positive attributes that make them suitable for future nuclear projects. The consistency in criteria between EN-6 and EN-7 allows these attributes, identified by the Strategic Siting Assessment, to be considered in any application for Development Consent, unless they no longer apply. Alongside a new criteria-based approach, EN-7 will aim to encourage the development of those sites listed in EN-6 even though EN-6 is no longer the primary National Policy Statement.

3.5.12 Through the new criteria-based approach, the government will empower developers intending to apply for Development Consent to identify sites which are optimal for their project, bringing nuclear in line with other energy technologies.

Merits of a nominated site in comparison to other alternative solutions

3.5.13 The government acknowledges the views raised in response to the first round consultation proposal and will deploy the proposals outlined in the consultation. Developers will need to work with the Planning Inspectorate to consider alternative

solutions and/or sites at the project level in the same way as for other infrastructure projects.

Question 2: To what extent do you believe the draft National Policy Statement is adequately future proofed to accommodate advancements in nuclear technologies?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the question

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 2a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, 100 words)

Question 3: Are there specific planning or siting considerations that should be addressed to ensure the National Policy Statement remains flexible to deployment of nuclear in diverse locations

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 3a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

3.6 Specific criteria: Factors influencing site selection

3.6.1 Factors Influencing Site Selection will help applicants assess locations to identify characteristics that help minimise the cost and complexity of planning, regulatory approvals, construction, operation, decommissioning, and radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management.

3.6.2 Many of these criteria are covered in this section and in the Technical Considerations and Impacts sections, reflecting that applicants will consider them both during site assessment, and during the design of the infrastructure at the site.

3.6.3 The Population Density and Proximity to Military Activities criteria must be passed in the manner prescribed within EN-7 or a site will be deemed inappropriate for the development of nuclear infrastructure.

Question 4: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to remove the distinction between previously exclusionary and discretionary criteria (see paragraph 1.1.7 (v) for more information)?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the proposal

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 4a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Population density

3.6.4 The Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion complements the UK's world leading nuclear regulatory system by managing the potential risk to populated areas from nuclear infrastructure by limiting how close to densely populated areas it can be developed, mitigating the impact in the extremely unlikely event of an incident posing a risk beyond the nuclear site boundary. The Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion is based on the potential risks of infrastructure utilising nuclear fission to generate energy.

3.6.5 A minority of overall respondents (37 of 141 respondents) addressed this question, but the majority of these (84%), mostly from industry, suggested reviewing or removing the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion because they believed new nuclear technologies could be safely located closer to densely populated areas.

3.6.6 Small Modular Reactor and Advanced Modular Reactor technologies have a significant potential role to play in supplying low carbon energy, both to the national electricity grid and to high-demand local users such as data centres, gigafactories, hydrogen and synthetic fuel production and/or industrial clusters. The government is committed to working with industry to realise this potential, such as through the Great British Nuclear Small Modular Reactor competition.

3.6.7 Given the early stage of development of many Small Modular Reactor and Advanced Modular Reactor designs, there is limited evidence available to demonstrate that novel nuclear fission technologies present a significantly different risk to existing nuclear fission technologies. There is also limited evidence to indicate that the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion will prevent the deployment of this technology in economically efficient locations. Therefore, the government believes it prudent to continue to apply the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion in EN-7.

3.6.8 Once more operational experience and further underpinning evidence around advanced nuclear technologies is available, there may be a case for modifying the criterion. EN-7, including the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion, will be reviewed every 5 years to

ensure it remains relevant and effective. Any review of EN-7 or specific criteria will be based on evidence from the sector and international standards. The UK's stringent regulatory framework will continue to ensure public safety in any future adjustments to the criterion.

Question 5: The government currently plans to retain the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion in EN-7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the inclusion:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 5a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, 150 words)

Question 6: We are open to revising the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion in the future. How should this criterion change in the future to better support the deployment of advanced nuclear technologies, and what evidence supports your suggestion? Please reference your sources. Please use the text box to answer (max 500 words).

Proximity to military activities

3.6.9 There were 18 responses to this criterion; some were supportive and some sought further clarification and support. The government therefore intends to maintain a criterion on proximity to military activities that clearly requires the Secretary of State for Defence to be satisfied that the proposed infrastructure would not unacceptably affect defence interests, whilst allowing nuclear infrastructure where they may benefit from proximity to military sites.

3.6.10 Some responses to the first round consultation asked for further clarification and support in applying this criterion. To address this, the government has provided further guidance in EN-7 as to how this criterion applies, how developers intending to apply for Development Consent can assess whether a proposed site might impact on defence interests and how they can contact the Ministry of Defence.

Flooding

3.6.11 The government plans to proceed with a Factor Influencing Site Selection criterion for flooding. Based on the feedback from the first round consultation which called for increased protection against flood risk and expanding the criterion to cover more types of flooding, we have strengthened the wording of the criterion to better address all flood

risks, including coastal, lacustrine, and riverine. Developers intending to apply for Development Consent are also now clearly expected to engage early with regulators and must continue to demonstrate site resilience against worst-case climate scenarios throughout the lifetime of the proposed site.

3.6.12 This Factor Influencing Site Selection Flooding criterion focusses on requiring the applicant to assess the potential for the site to meet the stringent flooding requirements set out in the Technical Consideration Flooding criterion. This will help ensure developers do not proceed with detailed design work on a site that cannot practicably be made safe from flooding for its full life cycle, or only made safe with disproportionate expense and disruption.

3.6.13 Given the limited response in the consultation on the coastal processes' criterion, the government will proceed with maintaining the current criterion. However, accounting for the views on expanding the flooding criterion as above, the government has expanded the criterion to account for other landform change processes, including estuarine, riverine and lacustrine processes.

Proximity to major hazard sites and major accident hazard pipelines

3.6.14 Most of the 12 respondents to this issue supported retaining this criterion, which required the proximity of potential nuclear sites to major hazards sites and major accident hazard pipelines to be assessed. Therefore, EN-7 will include this criterion. This criterion protects nuclear infrastructure and other locations whilst allowing for flexibility in site assessments where safe and appropriate.

3.6.15 Regular reviews of EN-7 will continue to ensure that the criterion remains relevant and effective. Specific issues raised in responses, like wind turbine risks, are already addressed in site safety assessments, so the government does not consider additional changes are necessary. If there is a need for a hazardous substances consent relating to the nuclear infrastructure, the Office for Nuclear Regulation must be engaged as part of Nuclear Site Licencing.

Proximity to civil aircraft and spacecraft movements

3.6.16 Most of the 15 respondents to this criterion agreed that it sufficiently addresses the risks posed by aircraft movements. The government sees no need to amend the criterion and deems that the current safety protocols are sufficient.

3.6.17 Existing regulations governing the siting of nuclear facilities already incorporate stringent safety measures to address any potential risks from nearby aircraft or spaceport activities. Siting near aviation facilities will be considered on a case-by-case basis in close consultation with the relevant regulators, who will take on responsibility for ensuring the safety of the infrastructure across its full life cycle.

Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

3.6.18 Most of the 18 respondents to this issue supported retaining a criteria incorporating international and national sites of ecological importance, with some arguing Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors could have a lower environmental impact. Some respondents argued the criterion should be more restrictive and incorporate other protected landscapes and features such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage Sites.

3.6.19 The guidance in EN-1 emphasises the importance of biodiversity, geological conservation, and Biodiversity Net Gain in nuclear infrastructure development. Developers intending to apply for Development Consent must commit to implement the mitigation hierarchy, seek opportunities for environmental enhancement, and comply with the requirements on Biodiversity Net Gain for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects when they come into force, as per the Environment Act 2021. Proposals will be subject to environmental assessment and must protect designated ecological and geological sites, align with national strategies, and consider impacts across the project's full lifecycle, ensuring sustainability alongside energy needs. The draft EN-7 clearly refers to these requirements on developers intending to apply for Development Consent and requires them to be taken into account both at the site assessment and infrastructure design stages.

3.6.20 While EN-6 had one criterion for nationally designated sites and a second criterion for internationally designated sites, EN-7 has consolidated these two criteria into a single "Biodiversity and Geological Conservation" criterion. This is in line with the approach taken in the other energy National Policy Statements. The combined criterion in EN-7 does not reduce any protections for designated sites.

3.6.21 Suggestions for this criterion to incorporate other protected landscapes are noted, these are already covered under other criteria in EN-1, such as "Landscape Value" and "Cultural Heritage". While EN-6 had one criterion for nationally designated sites and a second criterion for internationally designated sites, EN-7 has consolidated these two criteria into a single "Biodiversity and Geological Conservation" criterion. This is in line with the approach taken in the other energy National Policy Statements. The combined criterion in EN-7 does not reduce any protections for designated sites.

Areas of amenity and landscape value and heritage significance

3.6.22 Broadly, the 18 respondents who addressed this issue sought a more restrictive criterion in EN-7.

3.6.23 This Factor Influencing Site Selection criterion in EN-7 requires applicants to assess the potential impacts on amenity, landscape value and heritage significance during the site assessment stage, so that an informed decision can be taken on whether the need to mitigate such impacts renders the site unattractive from a development perspective. EN-7 requires the full range of potential impacts to be considered, including over the whole life cycle of the infrastructure starting with construction. This criterion also advises applicants to engage early with Historic England and Cadw for advice they may be able

to offer on the likelihood that the construction of the infrastructure will impact on or uncover archaeological assets that may need recovery.

3.6.24 The relevant Impact criterion on areas of amenity and landscape value and heritage significance in EN-7 addresses the requirements on the applicant to address these impacts in the design of the infrastructure once the proposed site has been chosen. This is addressed in paragraphs 3.8.12–14 of this second round consultation.

Size of site

3.6.25 The 15 respondents which commented on the size of site criterion mostly suggested it should be comprehensive, including the space required for landscaping, servicing, transportation and waste storage and management.

3.6.26 In line with responses to the consultation, government has included a comprehensive size of site criterion within EN-7 which incorporates land for construction, operation, and decommissioning, including on-site spent fuel and radioactive waste storage, and to implement the mitigation hierarchy for impacts. Land for the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy can be separate from energy generation and transmission areas, and applicants have clear guidance to engage early with relevant bodies to join up the mitigation of impacts for the Development Consent process and actions taken to secure relevant regulatory licences and permits. Developers intending to apply for Development Consent must assume on-site storage for radioactive waste and spent fuel and should consider sites for future expansion to accommodate future upgrades or expansion or even changes in technology.

Access to suitable sources of cooling

3.6.27 Of the 25 respondents who addressed this criterion in the first round consultation, some agreed that the current criterion was adequate, while others called for a clear distinction between the cooling needs of GW-scale nuclear infrastructure compared to Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors.

3.6.28 The government has included a criterion on access to suitable sources of cooling, acknowledging the differences between the cooling needs of larger and smaller reactor technologies by noting the range of cooling technologies that may be used. Given that any of the cooling approaches set out, or a combination of them, may be used by GW-scale technologies, Small Modular Reactors and Advanced Modular Reactors, government judges it best to set clear requirements for sufficient access to cooling without specifying which cooling approach would be most appropriate for any specific nuclear technologies.

Ownership of sites

3.6.29 Respondents generally agreed that the ownership of sites should not be a criterion affecting the suitability of a site.

3.6.30 Therefore, government maintains that EN-7 will align with the land use policies set out in EN-1 rather than incorporating site ownership as a site assessment criterion. Developers intending to apply for Development Consent will be encouraged to engage with local communities early and formally consult on their development proposals.

3.7 Specific criteria: Technical Considerations

3.7.1 Technical Considerations are criteria that impose requirements on applicants for Development Consent to address issues relevant to the safe, secure, efficient and effective construction, operation and decommissioning of nuclear infrastructure. Factors Influencing Site Selection (section 3.6) address the assessment of sites whereas Technical Considerations address the design of the infrastructure itself once the site of the proposed infrastructure has been decided by the applicant.

Proximity to civil aircraft and spacecraft movements

3.7.2 As set out in paragraph 3.6.16, the government sees no need to amend the criterion on proximity to aircraft and spacecraft movements as current safety protocols are sufficient. Siting near aviation facilities can be considered on a case-by-case basis.

3.7.3 The government will keep this criterion under review as more data on the safety of Small and Advanced Modular Reactors becomes available, given some responses to the consultation suggested a different approach is taken for these types of nuclear infrastructure.

Access to transmission infrastructure

3.7.4 Access to transmission infrastructure will be crucial when developing nuclear infrastructure, to transmit the large amounts of energy generated to end-users. EN-7 includes a criterion requiring applicants to ensure any proposed infrastructure will be able to supply the energy it produces to end users and refers to the National Policy Statement on electricity networks infrastructure, EN-5.

3.7.5 Access to transmission infrastructure was not included in the first round consultation, but government anticipates that this criterion is unlikely to be controversial.

Size of site

3.7.6 As set out in paragraph 3.6.26, the government has addressed responses to the first round consultation by adopting a comprehensive size of site criterion in EN-7 that includes the full range of land needs, across the whole life cycle of the infrastructure.

3.7.7 Whereas the Factors Influencing Site Selection criterion on size of site requires applicants to assess how much land will be required for the full range of needs at the site assessment stage, the Technical Consideration criterion on size of site requires the applicant continue to develop their assessment of how much land is required as they design the proposed infrastructure.

Seismic hazards & ground stability

3.7.8 EN-7 includes a criterion requiring applicants to fully mitigate any risks posed by seismic hazards and ground instability to ensure significant harm to the project is avoided during the construction, operation, decommissioning, and radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel management relating to the proposed nuclear infrastructure.

3.7.9 Requirements for applicants to mitigate risks posed by seismic hazards and ground instability was not included in the first round consultation, but government anticipates that this criterion is unlikely to be controversial.

Emergency planning

3.7.10 This consideration addresses emergency planning for incidents affecting or extending beyond the site. Applicants must follow the Radiation Emergency Preparedness Regulations 2019 and include assessments and mitigations in their Development Consent Order applications. The Office for Nuclear Regulation will review these plans and provide advice to inform the Secretary of State's decision, but it is not a decision-maker or equivalent to the Planning Inspectorate.

3.7.11 The process for emergency planning, including the role of the regulatory bodies, was not included in the first round consultation, but government anticipates that this criterion is unlikely to be controversial.

Meteorological conditions

3.7.12 EN-7 includes a criterion requiring applicants to ensure their proposed design will be resilient to the potential impacts of meteorological conditions during construction, operation, decommissioning, and storage of waste and spent fuel relating to the proposed nuclear infrastructure. This includes taking into account the potential impacts of climate change on meteorological conditions.

3.7.13 Requirements for applicants to mitigate risks posed by meteorological conditions was not included in the first round consultation, but government anticipates that this criterion is unlikely to be controversial.

3.8 Specific criteria: Impacts

3.8.1 Impacts are criteria requiring the applicant to implement the mitigation hierarchy on any impacts that the construction, operation and decommissioning of nuclear infrastructure can have on neighbouring communities, landscapes and habitats. Factors Influencing Site Selection (section 3.6) address the assessment of the impacts implied by developing a particular site whereas Impacts require the applicant to consider how to implement the mitigation hierarchy at the site the applicant has chosen for the proposed infrastructure.

Flood Risk

3.8.2 As set out in paragraph 2.6.5, responses to the first round consultation called for the flood risk criterion to be strengthened and for the government to consider steps to ensure the Sequential Test can be completed by applicants during the Flood Risk Assessment.

3.8.3 The Technical Consideration criterion on Flood Risk in EN-7 requires applicants to demonstrate the proposed infrastructure will be made safe from flooding for its full life cycle. Where the proposed infrastructure would be built on land at risk of flooding, the applicant must complete a Flood Risk Assessment that includes a completed Sequential Test and Exception Test, collectively demonstrating that no alternative lower risk site is available, and that the infrastructure will be secured from flood risk during its life cycle and will not increase flood risk elsewhere. EN-7 will require applicants to demonstrate that the proposed infrastructure could be made secure against flood risk in future should climate change predictions prove correct, including how this adaptive approach would be funded. The government is satisfied these requirements, in combination with the regulatory regime which will continue to ensure nuclear infrastructure is kept secure from flooding on an ongoing basis, will ensure nuclear infrastructure will be made fully secure against flood risk even as the climate changes.

3.8.4 Some respondents to the consultation raised concerns about the practicability of completing the Sequential Test for nuclear infrastructure. We note the suggestions to narrow the scope of alternatives for the Sequential Test based on factors such as end use. However, we have discounted that as nuclear infrastructure supplying electricity to the national electricity grid and/or producing hydrogen for transport to end users by road may be sited relatively flexibly compared to other types of energy infrastructure, given it does not need to be located close to its fuel supply chain or end users. The government has chosen not to narrow the scope of alternatives when applying the Sequential Test to a potential site location but has provided some guidance in EN-7 to applicants on undertaking the Sequential Test, with examples of what could be considered when selecting reasonable alternatives for the flood risk assessment.

Water quality and resources

3.8.5 The first round consultation proposed not having a specific criterion on groundwater protection. 68% of the 19 respondents who commented on this issue called for groundwater protection to be included as a site assessment criterion.

3.8.6 The government acknowledges the importance of groundwater protection, alongside wider water quality and water resources issues, both for human and industrial utility and for nature recovery. Government judges that these issues are adequately covered by existing guidance, particularly EN-1 and the environmental permitting regime, and that therefore a specific criterion on groundwater in EN-7 is unnecessary.

3.8.7 Instead, EN-7 includes an Impact criterion on water quality and resources more broadly, containing guidance encouraging early consultation with regulators and requiring the

application of the mitigation hierarchy as set out in EN-1. This Impact criterion covers the range of potential impacts on water quality and resources, including from water discharge, water usage, impacts on fish and other aquatic biodiversity, and groundwater impacts, as well as mitigation measures. The decision reflects the existing robust processes that already prevent developments in areas where groundwater protection could be compromised.

Coastal and other Landform Change

3.8.8 There were no responses to the consultation which detailed suggestions for any changes to the Coastal Processes criterion.

3.8.9 As a result the Government has decided to retain the criterion but to enhance the wording to account for other landform changes as well as coastal processes with the inclusion of new technologies which may result in sites inland, located near to rivers, lakes and other types of water body. In particular, applicants are required by EN-7 to follow the Coastal Erosion requirements outlined in paragraphs 5.6.16 to 5.6.23 of EN-1 at estuarine, riverine and lacustrine locations in addition to coastal locations.

Biodiversity and geological impacts

3.8.10 As set out in paragraph 2.8.9, most of the 18 respondents on this issue called for a more restrictive criterion on biodiversity and geological impacts.

3.8.11 As noted in paragraph 3.6.19, the government is satisfied that EN-1 places appropriate requirements on applicants to implement the mitigation hierarchy in relation to biodiversity and geological impacts and go beyond compensation to net gain according to the government's Biodiversity Net Gain policy. Therefore, EN-7 includes an Impact criterion which clearly directs applicants to relevant requirements in EN-1, and to other relevant duties under the Environment Act 2021 in relation to environmental targets and have regard to the policies set out in the government's Environmental Improvement Plan. EN-7 also cross refers to the Water Quality and Resources criterion, reflecting the crucial role of water quality and resources in enabling nature recovery.

Landscape, heritage and visual impacts

3.8.12 As noted in paragraph 2.8.11, most of the 18 respondents who addressed this issue sought a more restrictive criterion in EN-7.

3.8.13 The government appreciates the need to respect the UK's rich heritage and distinctive and precious landscapes. However, the scale of nuclear infrastructure is highly likely to render the complete elimination of any visual intrusion impossible. Excluding nuclear development from these landscapes may not be appropriate given the critical need for secure, low carbon energy. The government has therefore focussed on ensuring EN-7 sets clear and comprehensive requirements for applicants to mitigate any impact on areas of amenity, landscapes and heritage, and design infrastructure so that it contributes, rather than detracts from, the sense of place and identity of its host landscape and community. This approach reflects the enormous contribution energy

infrastructure has made in the past to the character and identity of communities who have proudly worked to supply their neighbours and the wider UK with the energy essential for everyday life.

3.8.14 In practice, EN-7 clearly refers applicants to the requirements outlined in EN-1, particularly regarding nationally designated landscapes and heritage asset protection. Applicants will therefore be required to demonstrate how any landscape, heritage and visual impacts arising from the nuclear development can be mitigated through screening, landscaping and/or good design. EN-7 also includes clear guidance for applicants to engage with relevant statutory bodies to identify how best to mitigate impacts. Therefore, the government is satisfied the proposed criterion will ensure landscape, heritage and visual impacts are properly managed by applicants.

Socioeconomic

3.8.15 Nuclear infrastructure can have significant local socioeconomic impacts, particularly during construction, with both positive and negative effects. Development at coastal locations may affect rights of way and applicants are expected to mitigate these impacts and consider access improvements, as outlined in Sections 5.11 and 5.13 of EN-1.

3.8.16 Requirements for applicants to manage the socioeconomic impact of their projects was not included in the first round consultation, but the government anticipates that this criterion is unlikely to be controversial.

Human health and wellbeing

3.8.17 Nuclear infrastructure may impact rural and recreational land, as noted in Section 5.11 of EN-1. While significant noise, vibration, or air quality issues are unlikely during operation, construction-related transport may have local impacts. There are potential health benefits arising from the socioeconomic gains associated with new nuclear projects; however, there could be increased demand for health services due to more people moving to the surrounding area due to the employment opportunities provided by nuclear infrastructure.

3.8.18 Requirements for applicants to manage the human health and wellbeing impacts of their projects, beyond the obvious requirements to ensure that the infrastructure poses no significant threat to workers or the public, were not included in the first round consultation.

Traffic & transport

3.8.19 Nuclear infrastructure requires secure transportation routes for delivering components and staff during construction, as well as for moving fuel, materials, radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, and equipment during operation and decommissioning. Key transport infrastructure includes motorways, major highways, the strategic rail network, airports, and ports. EN-7 requires applicants to mitigate the impact of traffic and transport used to construct the nuclear infrastructure. This includes taking measures to minimise the use of transport infrastructure for project-related purposes at times when

other users will need it, and to identify wildlife habitats that could be harmed by traffic emissions and noise.

3.8.20 Requirements for applicants to manage the traffic and transport impact of their projects were not included in the first round consultation.

Question 7: If it's not already addressed elsewhere (for example in EN-1 and the Planning Inspectorate Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project Guidance), are there any specific areas of the draft EN-7 where further clarity or guidance is needed to help ensure successful implementation by developers, planners, and regulators?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 7a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

3.9 Implementation

3.9.1 The government understands the complexities of the nuclear planning, permitting and site licensing regimes and therefore aims to develop an enabling approach which addresses the need for new nuclear without impacting the robust safety, security and environmental protections offered by the UK regulatory regimes. The government intends to provide supplementary information alongside EN-7 to support developers intending to apply for Development Consent in applying EN-7 to their projects. This could detail an approach to navigating the Development Consent Order pre-application process; highlight other regimes and regulatory processes which should be undertaken; and signpost existing guidance. The government would therefore welcome input from all stakeholders around what additional information would be required to develop a more enabling approach whilst maintaining the robust regulatory regimes.

Question 8: Would additional support or information from the government be beneficial and assist developers intending to apply for Development Consent in implementing EN-7 and proceeding through the Development Consent Order pre-application process?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 8a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 9 (OPTIONAL): If you wish to be kept informed of the development of the supplementary information to the National Policy Statement please share your contact details (email address preferable) in the text box provided (max 150 words) so that we can seek your views.

4 Summary of the second round consultation questions

Question 1: To what extent do you agree with the modification of this approach in light of the consultation feedback:

To retain the < 50 MW (electric) threshold in the existing planning framework and to review our position in the future?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the question

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 1a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 2: To what extent do you believe the draft National Policy Statement is adequately future proofed to accommodate advancements in nuclear technologies?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the question

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 2a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 3: Are there specific planning or siting considerations that should be addressed to ensure the National Policy Statement remains flexible to deployment of nuclear in diverse locations?

- Yes

- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 3a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 4: To what extent do you agree with the proposal to remove the distinction between previously exclusionary and discretionary criteria (see paragraph 1.1.7 (v) for more information)?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the proposal

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 4a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, 150 words)

Question 5: The government currently plans to retain the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion in EN-7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the inclusion:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not enough information

Question 5a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, 150 words)

Question 6: We are open to revising the Semi-Urban Population Density Criterion in the future. How should this criterion change in the future to better support the deployment of advanced nuclear technologies, and what evidence supports your suggestion? Please reference your sources. Please use the text box to answer (free text, max 500 words).

Question 7: If it's not already addressed elsewhere (for example in EN-1 and the Planning Inspectorate Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project Guidance), are there any specific areas of the draft EN-7 where further clarity or guidance is needed to help ensure successful implementation by developers, planners, and regulators?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 7a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 8: Would additional support or information from the government be beneficial and assist developers intending to apply for Development Consent in implementing EN-7 and proceeding through the Development Consent Order pre-application process?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not enough information
- Other

Question 8a (OPTIONAL): If you would like to explain your response, please use the text box (free text, max 150 words)

Question 9 (OPTIONAL): If you wish to be kept informed of the development of the supplementary information to the National Policy Statement, please share your contact details (email address preferable) in the text box provided (max 150 words) so that we can seek your views.

Question 10: Please identify the single main sector or interest you represent in relation to the siting of new nuclear power stations

- Member of the general public
- Local community member in the vicinity of potential or existing nuclear installation
- Organisation responsible for/interested in new nuclear development.
- New nuclear development supply chain organisation
- Environmental advocate
- Energy business or industry, professional or expert
- Regulator
- Nuclear energy professional or expert
- Academic or researcher
- Local authority/government representative

- National government representative
- Non Government Organisation

Question 10 a (OPTIONAL): Please use the text box below to state any other sectors or interests you represent (free text, max 150 words)

5 Next steps: The process and timeline towards designating the new National Policy Statement EN-7

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 Section 5 sets out the process and timeline towards designating the new National Policy Statement for Nuclear Energy Generation EN-7.

5.2 The process and timeline

Timeline	Stage
Winter late 2024 – early 2025	Analysis of January 2024 first round consultation responses and government response. **Completed** with the publication of this document. Parliamentary Scrutiny: • Submit the draft National Policy Statement to relevant parliamentary committees for initial review • Conduct parliamentary committee hearings and gather feedback from MPs and stakeholders
Spring 2025	Analysis of second round consultation responses: • Begin analysing the responses to this consultation to gather insights and feedback • Complete the analysis and summarise key findings • Development of supplementary information
Spring/Summer 2025	Preparation and finalisation of the draft National Policy Statement and government response: • Incorporate feedback from the consultation analysis into the draft National Policy Statement • Finalise the draft National Policy Statement and prepare supporting documents for parliamentary scrutiny

Summer 2025	Revise draft National Policy Statement based on parliamentary feedback and prepare the final version for laying before Parliament.
Autumn 2025	Laying the document before parliament: • Lay final National Policy Statement document before Parliament for formal consideration • Conduct parliamentary debates and secure approval for the National Policy Statement
Late 2025	Final designation and publication: • Obtain ministerial approval for the final National Policy Statement • Prepare National Policy Statement for publication, including formatting and printing • Officially designate National Policy Statement and publish it on the government website

:

This publication is available from: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/draft-national-policy-statement-for-nuclear-energy-generation-en-7.

If you need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email NuclearNPS.Consultation@energysecurity.gov.uk. Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.