

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wylfa Newydd](#)
Subject: text of oral presentation
Date: 05 March 2019 22:56:20
Attachments: [Horizon oral presentation.docx](#)

--



<https://you.38degrees.org.uk/petitions/anglesey-says-no-to-pylons>

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

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak at this hearing

I am Jonathan Dean and I am very active with the community group “Anglesey Says No to Pylons”, representing almost 14,000 who have signed our petition and almost 800 who registered as Interested Parties for the National Grid DCO.

I was brought up on Anglesey after my parents moved here when I was aged four so that my [REDACTED] He was the [REDACTED] while the [REDACTED]

I was brought up with nuclear power, so have no “ideological” opposition, but not long before my father died he did tell me his only career regret was believing the lies about how economic it was.

Maybe this recent “pause” is just another example of that.

My career has been spent in management consultancy, working with companies such as BP and Shell on supply chain strategy. My knowledge of supply chains tells me this isn’t the best place for a power station, given where the main demand for power comes from, but I do accept the SSA has chosen this site.

The Planning Act (2008) encourages developers to “bundle” all aspects of a programme of work into a single application.

Horizon have done this to great effect, with the power station, the workers’ accommodation, the road infrastructure, the cooling water supply, the boiler feed-water supply ... all rolled into one application.

But with one exception – the export connection to the grid.

EN-1 s4.9.2 states “The Government ... envisages that wherever possible, applications for new generating stations and related infrastructure should be contained in a single application ... or ... in separate applications submitted in tandem which have been prepared in an integrated way”

The proposed grid development is not included in this application, and there is no evidence that the two applications were prepared in an integrated way. There has been no combined impact assessment and no combined consultation.

Indeed now ... there isn't even an application from National Grid!

EN-6 s3.14.1 makes it quite clear the grid connection was not considered in the SSA, but does imply that the developer of the power station can come forward with their own proposals, or can influence the proposals of National Grid.

Now within the whole programme, the connection costs are ... some small percentage of total costs ... even for an underground connection, so **I would urge you to make a condition of this DCO, that the developer work with National Grid on their future plans, to develop a connection that is acceptable to the people of Anglesey, which pylons certainly are not.**

EN-1 s4.6 considers combined heat and power, or as we used to call it, waste heat recovery.

Horizon have looked into this, with a “text book” scenario of using waste heat for residential space heating, but quickly ruled it out on economic grounds. And I'm sure they're right.

It was, though, disappointing there has been no evaluation of the feasibility of aquaculture, which in a coastal region would seem pretty obvious, would leave an embedded, economic legacy and which forms the backbone of the Orthios proposals at Holyhead.

Waste heat may also be recovered from buried transmission cables, but this opportunity is hampered by the industry structure.

National Grid have the cables and technology to recover the energy, but do not have a license to sell it.

Horizon have a license to sell energy, but don't have the cables or technology.

I would urge you to make a condition of this DCO, that Horizon work with National Grid, and others, on an integrated energy solution that would maximise local benefits.

Thank you, that's all I wanted to say, but would be happy to take any questions