

M. J. Dover
Ref:-20034904

Comments on ExA question 1.

Q1.3.1

Much has happened since the “Powering Up Britain” document was written, the nation has had at least three Prime Ministers & three Secretary of State for Energy & Net Zero. The price of energy to consumers has reached record financial prices, the Government has had to increase the national debt attempting to bail out households, there is a new phrase replacing the much mooted “Energy Security” and that is “Energy Poverty”, yet his document shouts about “Cheap” & “Clean” energy.

This month the Government announced increased subsidy payments for off shore Wind Turbine, Solar too have I believe had an announced subsidy lift. The cheap energy that has been promised has not been delivered,

The last round of bids for wind farm licences realised a nil take up, the wind farm developers had asked for increased subsidies, which the Government then would not offer. So Developers used a tactical move by mutual agreement it seems, to force the Government to agree to enhanced payments, by steadfastly refusing to build more off shore Wind Turbines. So this month the Government awarded a circa 66% increase (index linked) increase in CfD subsidies. I believe the cost of CfD off shore wind turbine is circa £171 per MW as opposed to gas at circa £80 per MW prior to green levy.

The consumer is now locked into contracts that cost over double the cost of efficient, reliable, gas turbine generation.

Solar too I believe has been awarded a CfD subsidy uplift in the region of 32% I cannot fathom how Renewable Energy will, as the document suggests be Cheaper.

“ Cleaner” another phantom claim, a cursory look at the Country of Manufacture of the Equipment particularly Solar Panels, Batteries but also wind turbines, reveals that the majority of energy generation is achieved by burning ever increasing quantities of coal, with planned coal fired power stations in production, China is responsible for almost one third of the CO2 Emissions globally, add to that the unsustainable mineral mining, including alleged exploitation of child miners in the Congo delving for toxic Lithium. Lakes of toxic poisonous brine in the refining stages and millions of tons of toxic tailings in the extraction of said minerals. Add to this the allegations of dubious labour regimes in the manufacture of panels. All this prior to shipping, delivery construction and we have yet to face the spectre of waste and disposal on a product that will be serviceable for between 10-15

years before replacement is required(and then on a steady decline from it's inefficient optimum). Recycling panels is extremely expensive, so many if not all will in all inevitably, end up in landfill.

I know it's not clean.

Opening comment was about reliance on Putins Russian Gas, but are we dashing headlong into reliance on China and US profit seekers albeit at a much higher price for our electricity and facing potential food price hikes as we source and import increased quantities of food to replace the farm produce we've sacrificed for Solar & Wind.

Businesses moving away from dirty energy sources has not proved cheap or effective in Port Talbot, The steel works there owned by TATA have been forced to shed circa 3000 jobs and cease smelting using the traditional blast furnace, it to be replaced by an electric smelter, however that will smelt scrap metal for low quality steel products, it means high quality carbon steel can no longer be manufactured, steel for buildings, steel for ships etc. we must now import it from another BRICs country, nearer home Scunthorpe steel works is facing a similar fate or closure. Two small communities devastated the cost to the taxpayer is in the region of £5 million for Port Talbot alone. As a result of we are even more dependent on belligerent nations for our goods & services.

Q1.3.2

If the development should not go ahead, the impact on the Government's net zero would be negligible, given the amount of subsidies paid to renewable companies because their energy production is available when least needed, leading to many having to go off line.

I think the country should invest in a fleet of nuclear power stations for low carbon clean energy, reliant, cost effective and controllable, density of power & a much reduced footprint. Using solar and wind turbines backed up with closed and open circulating gas turbines for up to 60 years could stifle the development of nuclear power stations until well into the future. This will leave consumers with an expensive and inefficient energy supply, in addition to increased food prices.

Q1.3.3

If the development(s) are permitted it will devastate the area for three or four generations, by which time it is very likely that this rural area will never be able to return to it's former state, it would be impossible to restore the landscape that has taken several millennia evolve, back to a pre solar norm. Communities would be splintered or non existent, as rural employment & opportunities are lost, pastoral care of parts of the countryside enclosing, surround by or merely adjacent to these

sprawling industrialisations will cease, current wildlife will be displaced or destroyed probably replaced by species of vermin.

Homes will be monetarily devalued and less attractive to potential buyers (evidence of this is currently experienced) These sites are in all probability destined to become the brownfield site of the future. Enterprise zones perhaps, in vain effort to attract employers to help tackle the growing army of the unemployed in local townships, It will probably not be returned to farming, the farmers long gone, morphed into greedy landowners seeking the next stream of revenue from their post Solar bramble choked and compacted infertile land that's been starved of nutrients and care for six decades plus.

Perhaps the socioeconomic benefits will be realised in the City on stock markets dealing in the Energy sector, certainly the overseas investors will benefit from the high costs of renewable energy, the landowners too will reap the benefits of rental.

The initial flurry of promised well paid jobs in the "Renewables" industry here will mainly be contracted staff brought into the area for construction, for the operational phase, very few will be required for operation and even that will in all probability be contractual as opposed to local.

This is an NSIP, one of potentially 5 in our area, but those that benefit the most don't live here,(other than the avarice affected farmers) they live in USA, in London, in China, in Canada, Bankers, Investors, Lawyers, Advisors.

Chris Skidmore asks for net zero communities, with net zero homes, but none of the new housing being built have solar panels fitted to help with energy/ carbon offsetting. Why?

How will the existing housing stock be brought up to date in a net zero world, who will finance the transition, insulate and innovate, particularly in difficult Financial conditions and living in an economically depressed area.

But how will this dependency on inefficient & intermittent solar & wind, Most of which is manufactured by a belligerent nation, a nation that controls circa 90% of rare earth & mineral mining & processing a nation that has recently placed export controls on Germanium & Gallium, both vital in the production of semiconductors. China has the monopoly in Solar wafer processing and panel manufacture, China manufactures and supplies a high volume of wind turbine gearboxes and blades.

The UK is rapidly becoming dependant, Food, Energy means, Steel, etc. are we swapping one belligerent nation for another.