

Jonathan Tweedle  
Barbary House  
Castletown  
Portland  
DT5 1BD  
[REDACTED]

Good afternoon Sir,

My name is Jonathan Tweedle and I'm a resident of Castletown, so one of those who is going to be directly impacted by these plans. I'm a competitive sailor having raced at European and World Championship level and am a member of Castle Cove Sailing Club, here in the Harbour. I'm a serving member of the Royal Air Force, Aircrew by trade, but currently employed as Warrant Officer Safety and Environmental Protection at 22 Gp, within Air Command. As such, I have feed-in to the RAF's Net Zero and Jet Zero projects.

I was going to focus on the Traffic Issue, but any intelligent person will understand that if on Thur 26 Oct there were 161 HGV movements and 271 Bus and Coach movements in Castletown, adding an extra 80 HGVs (that's a 50% increase on HGVs!) will have a significant negative effect on health, safety, air quality and wellbeing for all those using and living there.

On Sunday 26 Nov there were just 2 HGV movements, so the addition of 80 HGVs a day, every day, will obliterate any respite from traffic noise and vibration currently enjoyed at the weekends.

You will, no doubt have seen reams and reams of data from people far more qualified than I, regarding pollution, traffic, noise, environmental effects and more, so I would just like to highlight 3 seeming paradoxes, presented by this proposal.

In a previous tour I instructed leadership on RAF Initial Officer Training, and one important part of this was the ability to 'Red Team' a plan – to apply critical thinking and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> order evaluation, in order to identify unintended consequences and make sure a plan is fit for purpose, but no matter how hard I try, I simply cannot find the logic in the following areas.

Firstly, ever since Powerfuel presented their plans 4 years ago, they've tried to sell it as a "Solution to Dorset's Waste Problem". The issue is that this county simply does not seem to have a waste problem! We have some of the best recycling figures in the country, and waste that does require incineration is dealt with through contracted agreements set to run for years. Powerfuel argued that with regards to the Proximity Principle, Dorset should require a facility in-County, and hence this proposal, however this argument ignores the fact that alternative sites are available far closer to the stated fuel sources. With all that in mind, why on earth would Powerfuel want to site an incinerator at such a remote, one-road-in-and-out position in a commercial Port, that would require 80 HGVs a day to service? It simply doesn't make sense. Unless, of course, the 'Solution to Dorset's

Waste Problem' is merely a smokescreen, with the real aim being to import waste from elsewhere by ship, which flies in the face of any Proximity Principle arguments. To this day, Powerfuel's website still cites the Proximity Principle as a driving factor. This wonderful Island should not be used as a dumping ground for the processing of other people's waste.

Secondly, we're told that another driver for this project is the Cruise Ship Industry's wish to 'decarbonise', by utilising shore-power for the ships when in port. I fail to see how switching off the fossil-fuel powered generators on board the 56 ships that visited Portland in 2023, only to power them from a fossil fuel powered generator sited just 100's of metres away, that operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, constitutes decarbonisation! Additional to this, at Southampton Docks, where shore power is available, of the 300 days when at least one cruise ship was docked in port between April 22 and July 23, it was used only 71 times. The Cruise Ship industry may be making all the right noises, but they're apparently not prepared to pay for it, which would leave Portland – our home - to face a 'double-whammy' of suffering emissions from the Incinerator AND the cruise ships.

Finally, the chimney stack. We all know what these are for – they've been around since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution and are designed to lift harmful emissions up and away, to be dispersed into the atmosphere away from where it can do harm to the population. We're all aware of the increasing evidence linking PM2.5 and ultra fine particulates with widespread and devastating health implications. What I don't understand is how it can possibly be acceptable to have an incinerator stack outlet just 500m or so away from family homes, at almost the exact same elevation! The Verne sits a similar distance away and is 60 metres higher! I simply don't understand how this could be allowed to happen, with wind directions and current eddies capable of blowing emissions directly into these areas!

In my time in the military, I have served in theatres such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Kosovo, Sierra Leone and others, and have put myself in harm's way in service of this country. I have laid on the ground in my helmet and respirator as missiles have exploded, expecting some of them to contain chemical and biological weapons, but I have CHOSEN to risk my life and health to do my duty. Portland is a deprived area, with relative poverty and some of the worst social mobility figures in the UK. House prices and rents are lower than elsewhere so for many, Portland is the only place they can afford to live. With the potential health effects of this incinerator - if approved - 100s, if not more will be unable to leave, even if they wished to do so. As said, I had a choice over my health and wellbeing – many Portlanders will not have the same luxury.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak Sir. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to deny this appeal, and in doing so protect this Island, its people and our surrounding environment.