From: [redacted]
To: Wylfa Newydd
Subject: Re: Amended deadline : 2 to 6 Wylfa Site Assessment
Date: 09 March 2019 16:47:57

Dear Kay,

Thank you for this.

The clarification asked for is the following:

Appendix 16a in Rep 2-002:
Proposed New NPS for Nuclear Power.
Submission by Horizon Nuclear Power. To support a submission as part of Annex A ; New NPS Listing Guidance "Wylfa Site: Supplementary Information Report", August 2018

With thanks,

Linda
On 7 Mar 2019, at 12:06, Wylfa Newydd wrote:

> Dear Linda
>
> Thank you for your email, I can confirm that this was published as part of the D5 submisions as it was received on 12 February.
>
> The reference is REP5-082 and a copy can be found here: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010007/EN010007-002971-Linda%20Rogers%20-%20REsponse%20to%20the%20EXA's%20FWQ.pdf
>
> Kind regards
>
> Kay Sully
> Case Manager
>
> From: Linda Rogers [redacted]
> Sent: 02 March 2019 11:54
> To: wylfa@pins.gsi.gov.uk
> Subject: Amended deadline : 2 to 6 Wylfa Site Assessment
>
> Please note that I was mistaken in the number of the deadline for my recent submission. I apologise, and hope that the submission might still be taken into account. It should be Deadline 6
>
> Best wishes,
>
> Linda Rogers
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
>
> From: Linda Rogers [redacted]
> Date: 12 February 2019 17:35:52 GMT
> To: Wylfa@pins.gsi.gov.uk<mailto:Wylfa@pins.gsi.gov.uk>
> Subject: Fwd: Deadline 2 Submission Wylfa Site Assessment
>
>
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>

>
> From: Linda Rogers [redacted]
> Date: 12 February 2019 01:47:29 GMT
> To: Wylfa@pins.gsi.gov.uk<mailto:Wylfa@pins.gsi.gov.uk>
> Subject: Deadline 2 Submission Wylfa Site Assessment
>
> Deadline 2 submission - Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions
> registration identification number 20011136.
>
> 1) I question how Appendix 16a can be unquestionably accepted by the Inspectors, when evidence is unverified and unverifiable.
> What criteria is to be used and where is it documented, to assess Appendix 16a when
>
> a) there is no current NPS up to 2025? How can Horizon claim it can meet the new NPS when the consultation for criteria is not complete?
>
> b) the government has not yet completed the DCO assessment on the nominated sites? On what basis can Inspectors accept Appendix 16a as relevant to the application?
>
>
>
> 2) I would submit that as a highly protected internationally designated site of ecological importance, where Horizon admits that
> "At the strategic stage, it is sufficient to draw the same conclusion as the
> original siting assessment, that long lasting adverse effects on the AONB are
> likely given the scale of the project." (3.11.12, Appendix 16a)
> the designations are sufficient to dismiss Horizon's case.
>
> Habitat Regulations Site Report for Wylfa -Summary Overview of Key Stages
> Stage 4: Assessment where no Alternative Solutions Exist
> " If no alternative solutions exist, consideration should be given to whether the sites host priority habitats/species....
> If IROPI are determined, then compensatory measures must be designed, assessed and put in place..."
>
> As already stated, longlasting adverse effects on the AONB are likely, deeming compensatory measures inadequate.
>
> Furthermore, since the withdrawal of both Toshiba from the Moorside project and the suspension of development by Hitachi at Oldbury, it is no longer the case that the government has no alternatives in relation to its choice of sites. The IROPI for Wylfa no longer has the same status.
>
> Appendix 16a states:
>
> As in 2009, Exclusionary criteria are those that if breached would categorically exclude a site from further consideration
>
> C7 - Internationally designated sites of ecological
> importance
> Paragraph I.65 of Annex I notes that it would be preferable for sites to be
> nominated in areas unlikely to cause an adverse effect on the integrity of any
> internationally designated sites of ecological importance.
>
> For these reasons I do not agree with Horizon's explanation of why it is reasonable to conclude that the site can be licensed, constructed and deployed by 2035, as set out in Appendix 16a
>
> Linda Rogers
>
[redacted]

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