

**All Party Parliamentary Nuclear Energy Group response to the Government
Consultation: the Future of Nuclear Power**

The role of nuclear power in a low carbon UK economy

INTRODUCTION

The All Party Parliamentary Nuclear Energy Group welcomes the opportunity to submit a considered response to the Government consultation on the Government Consultation: The Future of Nuclear Power. The All Party Parliamentary Nuclear Energy Group (APPNEG) is a cross party group and consists of over 150 members that encompass a range of MP's and Peers from all the main parties interested in a nuclear component within a balanced energy policy. We believe it is essential we do not make the same mistakes of the past. During the 80's we had coal versus nuclear - we must not allow our energy policy to become a contest between renewable versus nuclear as there is, without doubt, a need for all forms of energy to be developed if we are to achieve an energy policy that will benefit the UK PLC as a whole. Security of supply and climate change is twin challenges and cannot be met without the use of all energy sources

The All Party Parliamentary Nuclear Energy Group was established in 2002 to ensure the issue of nuclear energy had a forum where debate in a full, open and factual manner could occur and ensuring all interested Members of Parliament, Peers and the industry had the opportunity to discuss the positives and negatives of energy generation from nuclear energy and the future of the UK's energy needs. The group welcomes this Government Consultation and hopes our input will be seen as a positive contribution that will be helpful and will assist in the process of the delivery of a comprehensive UK energy policy.

1. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU BELIEVE THAT TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENSURING THE SECURITY OF ENERGY SUPPLIES ARE CRITICAL CHALLENGES FOR THE UK THAT REQUIRE SIGNIFICANT ACTION IN THE NEAR TERM AND A SUSTAINED STRATEGY BETWEEN NOW AND 2050?

The UK's influence on climate change in terms of the production of greenhouse gas is small compared to the high levels of pollution emanating from countries such as the US and China. But we must continue to lead the world by example, as we did by achieving the Kyoto protocol. Leading by example and seeking international agreement in order to reduce the effects of climate change is an absolute priority for the Government.

Climate change is recognised as a threat to international peace, security of supply and economic development. A secure and cheap source of energy will become an important issue in the future in terms of stability and global prosperity. It is estimated that some 100 million people could be affected by global warming and at from the risk of flooding by 2080 if climate change is not tackled. Convincing the public of the devastating damage emanating from

climate change and ensuring they understand the need to conserve energy is a major challenge.

As long as we have an apparent secure source of energy supply which is easily accessible and taken for granted, it will be very difficult to convince the public of the eminent dangers of climate change.

The government, through positive energy saving initiatives, has encouraged the public to participate in energy efficiency measures. However it appears that the public, on the whole, are not convinced of the arguments and remain sceptical the government must redouble their efforts to persuade the general public of the need for energy saving schemes

The APPNEG believes security of supply must be of major concern. Dependence on imported gas from Russia and the Middle East would be a gamble and an unacceptable risk. We believe a core source of energy supply is vital. Only gas, coal or nuclear generation can provide a core source of energy. Emissions from gas and coal, unless we develop technologies such as clean coal technology or carbon capture and storage, would prevent us achieving our targets for the reduction of CO₂ emissions. Therefore, the need for new nuclear build which emits no CO₂ as part of a balanced energy policy is vital.

Professor James Lovelock is on record as saying “when we reach a level of 430 ppm we could be at the point of no return as far as climate change is concerned”.

We are therefore concerned that the government’s target of stabilising greenhouse gases between 450 and 550 ppm by 2050 could be a dangerous target and we urge the government to conduct a scientific analysis to ascertain the targets we must set.

If we are to reduce the effects of climate change we must ensure a reduction of CO₂ emissions and only nuclear energy is a zero emission source. Coal is plentiful in the UK and for that reason we should be providing urgent investment in clean coal and carbon capture technology. Oil and gas are finite sources and in order to protect our reserves we should reduce wherever possible energy usage from both these sources.

2. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT’S VIEWS ON CARBON EMISSIONS FROM NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

The APPNEG agree with the Government’s views on carbon emissions from nuclear power stations. The environmental lobby presents spurious arguments that through the mining of uranium, the transportation of fuel and the construction of nuclear power stations, nuclear is not CO₂ emission free. When one examines these arguments, apart from the mining of uranium, it is impossible to construct wind farms, gas or coal fired power plants without the

attendant transportation and construction cycle leading to CO₂ emissions. The major issue must, and should be, the levels of CO₂ emissions during the life cycle of the power generation. It is acknowledged that gas and coal fired generation produce higher levels of CO₂ emissions during their productive life cycle than nuclear power and this is the principal reason why nuclear energy must be part of the government's energy policy

The new generation of nuclear power stations use less materials, are more efficient and have a smaller footprint and will be more easily decommissioned than existing nuclear power stations. Nuclear power has, as part of the UK energy mix, provided a substantial contribution to our electricity generation over the last 50 years. It must continue to be part of a balanced energy policy if we are to effectively tackle climate change.

The CoRWM report indicated deep geological retrievable storage of waste, which has been produced from civil and military operations over the last 50 years, as a possible solution to the nuclear waste problem. And whilst we procrastinate over the implementation of their recommendations nuclear waste will remain a good and effective scare story for the so called environmentalists.

We have safely stored nuclear waste over the last 50 years, 90% of which came from military sources. This waste will continue to exist regardless of whether we build new nuclear power plants. Nuclear waste does not require a new technical solution but political will. Other countries are dealing with waste disposal and taking decisions that are necessary now. The government must take immediate steps to identify a suitable solution and site for deep geological disposal based on the comprehensive report from CoRWM as soon as possible. A time span as suggested of some 50 years is not acceptable.

We recognise the need for adequate discussions with any community where a possible site may be identified. We feel the government must supply factual information, have comprehensive discussions with all interested parties and reach agreement as soon as it is deemed possible. For too long this country has allowed scaremongering and misinformation to be circulated unchallenged. We have safely stored our nuclear waste legacy for 50 years and now is the time to deliver a long term solution.

3. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE SECURITY OF SUPPLY IMPACT OF NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's view on the issue of security of supply. Oil, coal and gas are finite sources and produce additional CO₂ emissions compared to nuclear energy. Nuclear ENERGY IS RECOGNISED INTERNATIONALLY AS A CLEAN WAY TO PRODUCE ENERGY. OVER 430 REACTORS ARE IN OPERATION WORLDWIDE. It would be folly to allow the complete decline of this alternative source of energy.

Nuclear power HAS THE BENEFIT OF BEING a core source of fuel and during its production cycle produces no CO₂ gas. Energy demand is ever increasing and finite sources such as gas and oil will be more and more in demand.

It is possible that we could see global instability because of reduced supplies of gas and without nuclear energy we would be seriously disadvantaged globally in terms of growth, production and security of supply.

The private sector has indicated their willingness to get involved provided they are convinced of stability within the energy industry. Building nuclear power stations within the UK on existing sites would protect our security of supply and must be given the go ahead as soon as practically possible.

4. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE ECONOMICS OF NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's views on the economics of new nuclear power stations. Gas and oil are finite sources of energy and competition internationally for these scarce resources could lead to the market determining the international price of both gas and oil, this we believe, because of the competition, would see huge increases which could lead to problems with security of supply.

There have been a considerable number of studies that refute the belief that nuclear is the most expensive source of generation. The Royal Engineering Academy's assessment (the Cost of Generating Electricity) arrived at some interesting conclusions. They recognised that the complex financial structures of commercial projects mean that is often impossible to compare accurately the capital costs of generating plant in a meaningful way.

For base load operation i.e. Those plants which are operated continuously, the cheapest way to generate electricity in the future from new plant, i.e. Ignoring rehabilitation of existing plant, is by constructing combined cycle gas turbine plant designed to burn natural gas. In their comparison of the different base load plants, gas-fired CCGT was listed at 2.2p per kwh, nuclear fission plant at 2.3p per kwh, coal-fired pulverised fuel (PF) steam plant at 2.5p per kwh, coal-fired circulating fluidised bed (CFB) steam plant at 2.6p per kwh and coal-fired integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) at 3.2p per kwh. These estimates were before gas became as expensive as it is today. It would be worthwhile for the Government to examine in detail the real cost of generation at today's prices. The Government modelling, taking everything into consideration, has already concluded that excluding nuclear is the more expensive route to achieving our carbon goal.

The Royal Academy of Engineering also concluded that renewables were generally more expensive than conventional generation technologies. This,

they believed, was due in part to the immaturity of the technology and the more limited opportunity to take advantage of cost savings brought about by economies of scale. Additionally, fast response standby generating plant may have to be provided to maintain security of supply. On this basis onshore wind with standby generation was estimated at 6.8kwh, offshore wind farm with standby generation 7.2kwh and wave and marine 6.6kwh.

The APPNEG also believe renewable energy is heavily subsidised by consumers through the Renewables Obligation (RO). It is very attractive at present to build on shore wind farms due to the RO however this must be revised to encourage R&D in all forms of renewable energy.

The other factor we feel should be considered is that the private sector is willing to fund the building, decommissioning and waste solution for new nuclear build. Without nuclear power at any price we will not meet our targets for CO₂ reductions and run the risk of threatening our security of supply by depending on gas as our core source.

5. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE VALUE OF HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS AN OPTION? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's views on the value of having nuclear power as an option. Our reasons are quite clear. Nuclear energy is a core source of energy production and could be developed beyond the 20% that exists at present. As part of a balanced energy policy it would create stability and security. We believe it is commercially sound, and the fact that the private sector have indicated their willingness to fund the building of a new generation of nuclear power stations, accepting at the same time they will be responsible for the cost of decommissioning, proves the case for nuclear being part of a balanced energy policy. Reducing carbon emissions is absolutely vital and only nuclear power can deliver the level of emissions which we believe would be acceptable. We reject the argument that nuclear energy undermines renewable energy, energy efficiency and the more decentralised energy systems required for a low carbon future.

6. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE SAFETY, SECURITY, HEALTH AND NON-PROLIFERATIONS ISSUES? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

Whilst we recognise the Government statement regarding the need to manage the risks attached to nuclear power stations in terms of safety, security, health and non proliferation we believe the history of nuclear generation within the UK demonstrates the strength of our present legislative safeguards.

The UK nuclear industry has an unparalleled safety record which is the envy of the world. Whilst we must continue to maintain, improve and if necessary further refine our regulatory processes it is important to recognise that as a nation we have adopted the highest and most stringent regulatory systems in the world. On that basis we should have no fears regarding safety, security, health and safety or our ability to deliver a safe and effective generation from our nuclear processes.

The regulatory framework that exists within the UK is one of the most effective methods of protecting the security and health of the individuals who work within the nuclear industry.

7. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE TRANSPORT OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

The government's views concerning the transportation of nuclear materials strengthen the argument on the basis of our safety record over the last 40 years. It has been necessary to transport materials and this has been tested to the maximum by those who are opposed to nuclear energy. They have failed to make any valid case due to the standards we have enforced to ensure the safety of transportation. The regulatory standards for flasks used in the transportation of radioactive material have met the most stringent examination and has proven we can transport the most radioactive material in the safest and most secure way. It is the safest and most reliable method of transportation anywhere in the world. If we agree to the commissioning of deep geological disposal it is important we re examine our regulatory requirements for transportation of spent fuel. However on past experience any additional need to transport nuclear material will create no concerns for public safety. At present 70% of the UK waste is stored at Sellafield and it would be logical to build deep geological caverns at that plant. Obviously the need exists to discuss, consult and reach agreement with the local communities and this discussion and consultation should take place as a matter of urgency.

We are concerned that the government seem to dismiss reprocessing due to concerns regarding the additional transportation of nuclear material we believe it would be unwise for the government not to consider reprocessing of spent fuel rods which could reduce the nuclear waste levels that exist at present. Reprocessing is an opportunity to reduce the dependence on imported uranium by producing mox fuel which could be used as a power source in a new generation of nuclear power stations. We have proven our safety record on transportation and should not be concerned if any increase is required.

8. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON WASTE AND DECOMMISSIONING? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's views on waste and decommissioning. The consultation process embarked on by CoRWM arrived at conclusions that we believe are satisfactory. The existing waste legacy from civil and nuclear use and all future waste products from new nuclear power stations could be disposed of in a geological repository. We see one major issue with the report from CoRWM. They indicated such a repository would take some 40 to 50 years to be serviceable.

This time span is totally unacceptable and does nothing to engender support from the wider communities or defeat the arguments of that opposed to nuclear energy generation. Whilst we accept there may be ethical issues surrounding the creation of additional nuclear waste from new nuclear power stations. It is recognised that the waste from the new generation of nuclear power stations is much less than previous designs and is in fact manageable. We already safely store our nuclear waste and in our view the future of our energy supplies in terms of public acceptability of how we manage our nuclear waste cannot be left in limbo because the political will is not there to deliver a political decision on geological retrievable storage for 50 years. Nuclear waste is not a technical problem it is a political one.

9. WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING NUCLEAR WASTE OF TAKING A DECISION TO ALLOW ENERGY COMPANIES TO BUILD NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS?

In our view the implications for the management of existing nuclear waste by a decision to allow energy companies to build new nuclear power stations is minimal. The new generation of nuclear power stations based on the designs we know are available such as those manufactured by Westinghouse, Areva or AECL all produce significantly less nuclear waste than existing plants.

The estimates by nuclear power companies are that only 10% of high level nuclear waste would be produced and added to the existing nuclear waste legacy we have at present, over a 60 year period. This figure is based on the building of 10 new nuclear power stations within the UK. Therefore our conclusion is that there is no reason why new nuclear build should not take place.

10. WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE ETHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO A DECISION TO ALLOW NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS TO BE BUILT? AND HOW SHOULD THESE IS BALANCED AGAINST THE NEED TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE?

There are many ethical implications to be considered depending on one's point of view. Some may say the issue of production of additional waste is an ethical issue. One may also argue the loss of highly skilled employment where nuclear power plants are closed, with the attendant destruction of the local economy and the loss of communities is an ethical issue.

Any ethical considerations relating to a decision to allow new nuclear power stations to be built are offset by the need for a core source of energy generation that is carbon emission free and under the control of the United Kingdom regulatory authority.

The need for addressing the dangers of climate change and reducing CO₂ emissions make the strongest possible case for a new generation of nuclear power stations. The ethical considerations can and will be used to strengthen or weaken the case for new build depending on ones perspective.

The case for the building of a new generation of nuclear build is strong and robust. Public opinion over the last few years has indicated a major shift in support based on the concerns they have on relying on imported gas and the issue of climate change. Taking the argument to the country would, in our view, lead to a major acceptance and support for new build, especially in the communities where existing nuclear plants exist. These communities know and understand the economic case that exists for new build and the consequential delivery of highly skilled and well paid employment within their areas.

11. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's assessment of the environmental issues. Of course there will be disruption due to new build, but this will occur regardless of what type of power station is built. The new nuclear plants will be built in a modular manner and will take up less land than gas or coal and they will also have less impact on the environment and will produce no CO₂ gases

The government indicates that the environmental impact of new nuclear power stations would not be significantly different to other forms of electricity generation. It is recognised that new nuclear power stations produce no CO₂ emissions and produce less nuclear waste than in the past. It could also be argued that building new nuclear power stations, instead of gas or coal fired power plants, is more environmentally friendly for all the reasons already laid out in this consultation document

We believe it is in public interest to allow energy companies the option of investing in new nuclear power stations. The strategic siting assessment will be addressed by the companies themselves. It would be commonsense where existing nuclear power stations are accepted and welcomed by the communities and workforce to consider new build on these sites. Detailed consultation should take place within these communities, who we believe recognise the benefits they have experienced over the last 50 years in terms of economic prosperity and secure, safe, well paid employment within their areas.

12. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE SUPPLY OF NUCLEAR FUEL? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the Government's views on the supply of nuclear fuel. There is significant evidence that there is sufficient high grade uranium ores available to meet future global demands for at least the next 60 years. Building 10 nuclear power stations within the UK would have very little effect on the global demand for uranium. However, we sincerely believe a decision on reprocessing of spent fuel should be considered. An in-depth examination regarding maintaining a facility for reprocessing should be undertaken, with a view to identifying the benefits and opportunities this process could create to reduce our nuclear waste and produce mox fuel that could reduce our dependence on imported uranium.

We understand that in France they successfully reprocess and burn MOX fuel from reprocessing. They claim 96% of used fuel rods can be reprocessed, and this could assist in maintaining global supplies of uranium. The indications from the US are that they too are considering reprocessing and we must be involved. The new generation of nuclear plants can we understand burn MOX fuel.

13. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON THE SUPPLY CHAIN AND SKILLS CAPACITY? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We agree with the government's views in the long-term on the supply chain and skills capacity. Our agreement is dependant on the government commitment ensuring adequate opportunities for improving our skills base within the UK. It is vital that new nuclear build should create opportunities for employment and economic benefits within the communities in which new nuclear power stations may be built.

Urgent discussions should take place with the private sector to ensure agreement is reached on the number of construction and manufacturing jobs companies successful in bidding for new nuclear build would be sourced from

within the UK. The group also suggests that a joint comprehensive training programme should be established at the earliest opportunity to ensure we develop the skills and academic qualifications required in the construction and commissioning of new nuclear power stations. We further agree that an inadequate supply of skills and supply chain capacity should not provide a reason to prevent energy companies from investing in skill training necessary for the delivery of operational new nuclear power stations. There are huge benefits to the UK economy in supporting the need for adequate supply of skilled personal in both construction and manning of power stations

14. DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS ON REPROCESSING? WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS? ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE ARE MISSING? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

We disagree with the Government's views on reprocessing. To reject the opportunity to reprocess spent fuel would be unacceptable and a major mistake. If we are serious about addressing the waste legacy that exists at present then we must ensure that the reprocessing plant at Sellafield is operational in terms of the economic and safe operation of the plant.

France has a very successful reprocessing plant in operation at present recovering some 95% of spent fuel which is being used in nuclear power stations. Members of the group have visited the French reprocessing facility and suggest that the UK government re-examine their position regarding maintaining a reprocessing facility within the UK. The present government attitude seems to be out of step with not only the French but the Japanese and the Americans who we understand are considering building a reprocessing plant. We would urge the government to meet urgently with the private sector to discuss the continuation of reprocessing within the UK.

15. ARE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES OR INFORMATION THAT YOU BELIEVE NEED TO BE CONSIDERED BEFORE TAKING A DECISION ON GIVING ENERGY COMPANIES THE OPTION OF INVESTING IN NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS? AND WHY?

There are no overriding issues which we believe need to be considered before a decision is taken to allow energy companies to invest in new nuclear power stations. We believe this consultation process deals with the fundamental questions and the response by Government should lead to a decision to allow energy companies to invest in nuclear power stations. However, concerning the measurement of relative economic costs – including “externalities” – in terms of “net present value” over the next 25 years or so: the assured development and growing impact of international emissions trading – whereby the West will owe the rest of the world several hundred billion dollars a year through its purchase of other's “ration cards” - however successful we are in ensuring India and China row in – means that even without an argument in favour of nuclear energy.

This in turn should be reflected in the domestic tax system – with each ton of carbon being taxed the same whether for industry, aviation or motor transport etc. At present, the government are not only not doing this; they are denying nuclear the same tax position as “renewables” – of which nuclear is in effect one.

16. IN THE CONTEXT OF TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENSURING ENERGY SECURITY, DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE THAT IT WOULD BE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO GIVE ENERGY COMPANIES THE OPTION OF INVESTING IN NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS?

We agree that it would be in the public interest to give energy companies the option to invest in new nuclear power stations. Tackling climate change and ensuring energy security is best served by the building of a core source of electricity such as nuclear energy.

17. ARE THERE OTHER CONDITIONS THAT YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE PUT IN PLACE BEFORE GIVING ENERGY COMPANIES THE OPTION OF INVESTING IN NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS? (FOR EXAMPLE, RESTRICTING BUILD TO THE VICINITY OF EXISTING SITES, OR RESTRICTING BUILD TO APPROXIMATELY REPLACING THE EXISTING CAPACITY).

The only condition that we believe should be put in place before giving energy companies the option of investing in new nuclear power stations is agreement on the level of employment in terms of skills, both manual and academic. Maximising employment opportunities within the communities where new nuclear power stations may be built would we believe assist in the acceptance of nuclear power stations at these sites.

18. DO YOU THINK THESE ARE THE RIGHT FACILITATIVE ACTIONS TO REDUCE THE REGULATORY AND PLANNING RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCH INVESTMENTS? ARE THERE ANY OTHER MEASURES THAT YOU THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONSIDER?

We believe as a matter of urgency the Government should take the right facilitative actions to reduce the regulatory and planning risks associated with such investments. We cannot allow opponents of new nuclear build to draw out the planning and regulatory process. We need to build nuclear power plants as a matter of urgency. Sizewell was an experience we cannot allow to be repeated. If we do not address the issues that occurred then, we risk the loss of private sector support for new build as they will simply walk away. We would be left in a very dangerous position with the probable outcome of a new dash for gas.

The private sector must require stability and economic opportunities if they are to build new nuclear power stations. It is essential that planning permission and regulatory risks are discussed in an efficient and sensible manner. We

cannot go through the same process as at Sizewell, where the spurious legal challenges constantly ensured the planning and regulatory process was drawn out for an unreasonable length of time. There is a need for new nuclear power stations to be in production as soon as possible.

Even at this stage it would take roughly 6 to 8 years before any new nuclear power stations would be in production. Unless the proper procedures are in place then this time span would be impossible to achieve.

CONCLUSION

Taking all factors into consideration and putting the country and its needs first, our group believe that unless we embrace nuclear energy we could fail future generations. In our opinion it is time for the government, as it appears to be doing, to focus its attention both domestically and internationally on the damage being done to planet earth. Evidence of the growing problems associated with climate change becomes more convincing year by year. Energy producers have their part to play in finding solutions to tackling the threats of global warming and climate change, and we believe on energy there has to be a balanced energy policy including nuclear. If the lights are to stay on and we are to protect our citizens then nuclear must be acknowledged as a core source of energy. The group believe it is in the interests of the public in terms of employment, security of supply, economic prosperity and to cut CO₂ emissions to include nuclear in the mix, and hopes the government will listen to the public and the recommendations given in the nuclear consultation.

We are concerned that the elected Government listen more to the unelected environmental groups who have no responsibility and would not be criticised nor held accountable in the event of a shortage or disruption to our energy supply. It is obvious that no government could survive if the policies on energy led to a situation where the lights went out. We urge the Government to take immediate action to ensure that our citizens are protected and the country's security needs are put to the forefront of any decisions on energy supplies.