

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wylfa Newydd](#)
Subject: Impact on tregelé
Date: 17 January 2019 20:04:14
Attachments: [Wylfa Newydd DCO impact llanbadrig D4.docx](#)

I attach a note about Tregele

Roger Dobson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Wylfa Newydd Development Consent Order Examination January 2019

Note on Environmental Impact upon Tregele by Roger Dobson on behalf of Llanbadrig and Mechell Community Councils

During the issue specific hearings held at the Treardur Bay Hotel from the 7th – 11th January contributions were made that we believe are relevant to the impact Wylfa Newydd development upon the village of Tregele:

Transport: During the discussion on transport and increased levels of traffic on the A5025 Mr Huw Percy of IACC acknowledged that the improved road would have enough capacity for the projected increase in traffic volumes but expressed concern about the effect of increased traffic upon residents of the villages between Valley and the Wylfa Site. It may have been an unintentional oversight that Mr Percy omitted to refer to Tregele. We believe that Tregele will be the most affected of all Anglesey communities especially in the years before the new A5025/Wylfa access is constructed. Tregele is also threatened by the probable increase of traffic on the minor road that passes through the heart of Tregele and Mechell. We have proposed to Horizon and IOACC several measures that would reduce impact, particularly regarding safety e.g. reduced speed limits, pedestrian crossing at Tregele garage, and CCTV monitoring.

Site Campus: The Examining Authority highlighted the potential issue of proximity of the site campus to construction noise and the implication for sleep of night workers.

Section 106: learned Counsel for Gwynedd argued that '*the money should follow the impact*' and NRW referred to an endangered species of great crested newts. We argue that people who live in village of Tregele are similarly endangered.

It is unfortunate that despite significant dialogue with Horizon management since October they have failed to advise us of their response documents at deadline 2 (REP2 -006) and deadline 3 (REP3 - 051 Local Noise Mitigation Strategy). In an ideal world we would have studied all the D2 & D3 library documents before last week's hearing however. We hope the panel will understand that we are all volunteers. The work we do on the DCO is in our own time fitted in with other important work and personal commitments. The holiday break did not help. Therefore, we have had less than two days to digest and react to these documents.

I wrote to Horizon on the 1st July 2018 requesting Horizon identifies which properties will be affected and what process would be adopted to communicate this important matter to residents. I have pursued this request through every SOCG meeting since but have not received a response save an informal comment that informing the Community Council of individual properties could be a breach of confidentiality.

I am unclear whether this is a legal constraint but as far as I understand none of my neighbours have been contacted about this matter.

In REP2-006 Horizon appears to contradict the data to which we referred. Horizon now states: "effects from vibration only relates to 12 properties (not 55)" In fact we referred to 54 properties predicted to suffer major adverse effects based on Horizon's own document 6.10.2 ES Volume J2. It is no comfort to learn now that 12 properties fall in the vibration category. Horizon state that receptors will be notified via an update of Wylfa Newydd CoCP at deadline 4 (today). This is a thoroughly unsatisfactory medium for communicating with local residents.

We do not dispute that Horizon has consulted extensively and hosted numerous events in our community. However, we question whether these have been meaningful consultations given Horizon's reluctance to take account of feedback.

We welcome the changed threshold in noise and consequential significant increase in designated area. We also regard the revised proposals for improved insulation including fencing as positive.

We were informed by the panel that compensation does not fall within the terms of the DCO. We wonder whether there is some other route for mitigating impact upon Tregele (and it now appears a wider area) either through some encouragement for Horizon to revisit its voluntary arrangement or via the Section 106 provisions. Horizon contests that it has treated people less well than the local animal population. The DCO application supporting documents are far more extensive in describing mitigation for terns, seagulls etc than that covering local people. Horizon has purchased parcels of land away from the site as alternate habitat for important species. Perhaps the greatest contrast is Horizon's commendable rehousing of bats and owls – they are already enjoying new luxury in purpose-built towers and barns constructed most attractively in reclaimed stone. Yet our residents are treated less favourably - if they want to be rehoused it is largely at their own expense.

We believe that Horizon's proposed mitigation fall far short of what is reasonable. We have proposed modest costed improvements to Horizon – but so far, there has been no response. We argue that property owners should have some financial compensation for the inconvenience of having their home adapted so that continuing to live in there is tolerable. We argue that the miserly sum Horizon proposes to facilitate relocation bears little relation to actual cost and is flawed in applying the same amount to each home owner. The cost of a move varies with the value of the house. We argue that compensation should be a representative percentage of property value.

Returning to the argument from Gwynedd that the money should follow the impact. Tregele will suffer the greatest impact. We do not argue that a disproportionate amount of compensation should be targeted on Tregele, but we do believe it should be at a fair, appropriate level whether provided direct by Horizon or via Section 106.