

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wylfa Newydd](#)
Subject: Objection to Nuclear Plant at Anglesey
Date: 14 August 2018 16:21:20

I am putting forward objections to the current proposal for a Nuclear Plant in Anglesey for the following reasons:

1. There still exists substantial ambiguity over the exact site(s) to be dedicated to this (and related, local) development.
2. I now question the need in as far as:
 - a. the Government has been misguided in their prediction of electricity consumption in the UK. The forecasting mechanism that is used by the Government is therefore unrealistic, unreliable and should not be used as material evidence for this application in Anglesey.
 - b. The potential for energy saving was not fully assessed by Government until after EN-6 had been approved. The Government data used in this argument is one that is incomplete, misleading and therefore immaterial to the justification of this application.
 - c. The Government is misguided and that experts in nuclear power have indicated the contrary in that it is indeed uncompetitive.
 - d. The Government would need to revise their forecast to reflect actual and current data to better accurately forecast electricity supply and demand based on trend analysis to be extrapolated for forecasting in the years following 2040 when it is operational.
 - e. The Government failed to note that renewable energy projects attract funding and had they approved this going forward, public funding would have been available before Brexit (and perhaps afterwards if the Government had argued for that case for the benefit of Ireland's future demand). Nuclear power does not attract funding and therefore to attempt to justify the cost/needs analysis of the latter and not the former would seem irrational and inconsistent.
3. It is also questionable as to the Government's determination of costs associated with this proposal when the full life-cycle of the project has yet to be decided upon. The Government is misguided in its interpretation of costs related to nuclear energy compared to that of renewable energy and lacks strategic long-term thinking and planning for storage and management of spent fuel waste.
4. Factors affecting Carlingford Lough and beyond due to the builds of nuclear plants along the western coasts of England and Wales:
 - a. With the wind direction of storms in Northern Ireland being South-easterly (while prevailing winds are usually south-westerly), there would be a high risk factor of air and sea pollution being carried directly to our Lough, coastline and beyond. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure our Human Rights are protected now in their determination of this application and therefore these risk factors should be taken into serious consideration.
 - b. Fishing Industry in the Irish Sea and Carlingford Lough uniquely, (including costs) where information is more readily available on pollution and therefore consumer demand will decline in line with consumer confidence.
 - c. Farming and related industries will be affected if any seepage or waste is poured into the Irish Sea or indeed carried through the air. The Government is misguided in not taking this risk factor into consideration in affecting the farming industry locally and any potential for exports (including in and out from the Republic of Ireland)
 - d. Higher levels of sickness and deaths arising from digestion of radioactive water and food sources will further put strain on our NHS. Regardless of what the Government intend to plan for the NHS in the future, it is the Government's responsibility now to factor in these costs taking into consideration our current health system.
 - e. Northern Ireland is distinct from the rest of the UK (and Ireland) in that it does not enjoy the protection of an Environment Protection Agency (EPA). In fact, Ireland has two, one being specifically set up as a "Radiation EPA" to, inter alia, provide for crises management, monitoring and reporting on radiation levels in the air, water and land.

To provide for the Human Rights Act 2000, the Government must protect our lives and homes. The cost of setting up an EPA (and comprehensive

and appropriate legislation) to provide Northern Ireland with the same protection as the rest of the UK has not been factored into this application or indeed any other nuclear applications. This is a material matter and one that the Government must address before any further approvals and/or consents are made. The Human Rights Convention is still applicable at this time and the Government have misguided themselves where they have perceived that the potential risk to NI would be unlikely when we still have evidence of Sellafield's pollution in our Lough.

f. The cost of climate change has not been taken into consideration for +30m and therefore demonstrates that the application is lacking in integrity and robustness. With the rise in sea level the risk is higher for any nuclear coastal development that would promote seepage into the sea and affect those factors highlighted above.

g. As the world does not hold a permanent GDF to date, it is premature of the Government to proceed with any nuclear development without the proper facilities in place, having been tested and approved by experts for its suitability and safety.

I believe that the arguments outlined above are all material to this application and any ongoing and subsequent applications for development of nuclear plants along the western coast of England and Wales. The proposal is contrary to the Human Rights Convention for the people living around and reliant upon, Carlingford Lough which will have protection of the HRC after Brexit as it is jointly owned by both Governments.

Colum Sands



This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
