

Response to DECC re justification for 2 ABWR's at Wylfa and Oldbury

There is no justification for continuing with new nuclear program, the benefits from operation clearly do not outweigh the detriments with the radioactive legacy waste generated and the potential for a nuclear disaster on a small overpopulated island country such as the UK.

The health issues with regard to the normal environmental releases have been proven to increase childhood leukaemia within 5 km down wind of nuclear plants. (Kikk report) Any radioactive releases into the environment must cease as the background radiation is increasing and will have an effect on the global environment, this cannot be seen until it is too late we cannot knowingly be laying this foundation for the future.

It cannot be justified on economic grounds as the subsidies required to attract this form of investment break EU rules on open competition and market failure. Nuclear expansion will only serve to divert money away from renewable technologies like tidal and wind and solar power which the UK is poised ready to do with the right government support.

Hitachi reactors had a very poor track record on performance before they were shut down in Japan, these Japanese reactors would have to have a 100% improvement on performance on their load factor to actually meet the figures which they are priced at. Japan is desperate to export their nuclear technology as they are seriously leaving the industry behind like many other countries around the world after the Fukushima disaster which is still ongoing. Why should we be having something that nobody else wants in this country.

The safety case in nuclear is always based on the likelihood of a major incident being extremely remote. As we can see with the industry's track record with all the past events Windscale, 3 mile island, Chernobyl and Fukushima which are the most noticeable to the general public, they have failed to meet the safety case many times with disastrous consequences. I am sure when all these reactors were being planned they would have been justified that the benefits outweigh the detriments which clearly show how wrong the decision makers can be.

The legacy we should be giving future generations is sustainable energy supply through renewables and not hazardous waste which has got to be controlled for thousands of years with detrimental health risks.

There is no feasible way of dealing with the waste or making it safe, for a technology that has been around for over 50 years. It is old technology and needs to be finished with.

Yours sincerely

Josephine Smoldon